

Greater Cambridge
Community Infrastructure Study
(June 2026)

Contents

1. Executive Summary	4
1.1 What this study does	4
1.2 Relationship to the Local Plan, IDP and related studies	4
1.3 Main findings	4
1.4 Planning response	5
1.5 Key planning implications	6
1.6 Recommendations	7
1.7 How the study should be used	8
2. How to use this study	9
2.1 What this study is for	9
2.2 Decision process for new development	10
2.3 Match the route to development scale	11
2.4 Testing existing provision	12
2.5 Using the study for Community Plans	12
2.6 How different users should use the study	13
2.7 Using the study through the planning process	14
2.8 What this study should not be used for	15
2.9 Appendix checklist	15
3. What community infrastructure means in this study	16
3.1 Working scope	16
3.2 Asset types in scope	16
3.3 Related provision and scope boundaries	17
3.4 How the scope should be applied	18
4. How evidence has been used	19
4.1 Main evidence used in the study	19
4.2 How mapped assets have been interpreted	20
4.3 How existing survey evidence has been used	20
4.4 How local evidence has been used	21
4.5 How standards and comparator evidence has been used	22
4.6 How growth and draft planning evidence has been used	23
4.7 How the evidence has been carried into site schedules and later sections	24
5. Cambridge City community infrastructure context	25
5.1 A dense city network with clear local gaps	25
5.2 Mapped assets and what they show	25
5.3 Council-supported centres, shared assets and wider community use	26
5.4 Future delivery framework for community facilities.	29
5.5 Area priorities across Cambridge City	30
5.6 Planning considerations for Cambridge City	35
6. South Cambridgeshire community infrastructure context	37
6.1 A distributed network of village, parish and growth-area provision	37
6.2 Mapped assets and settlement patterns	37
6.3 Audited facilities, quality and settlement-scale pressure	38

6.4 Area priorities across South Cambridgeshire	39
6.5 Stewardship, revenue and volunteer capacity	43
6.6 Planning considerations for South Cambridgeshire	43
7. Greater Cambridge Community Infrastructure Needs	45
7.1 How need has been assessed	45
7.2 Needs by scale	45
7.3 Needs by place type	46
7.4 Needs by function	48
7.5 Needs linked to growth and timing	50
7.6 Needs for groups at greater risk of exclusion	50
7.7 Summary of planning and delivery implications	51
8. Community Plans	53
8.1 Purpose of Community Plans	53
8.2 Relationship between the Community Plan and Community Needs Assessment	53
8.3 What a Community Plan should include	54
8.4 On-site and off-site provision	56
8.5 Phasing, early provision and meanwhile use	56
8.6 Stewardship, activation and long-term operation	57
8.7 Review and monitoring	57
8.8 Securing Community Plans through planning	58
9. Delivery, stewardship and funding	59
9.1 Purpose of this section	59
9.2 Match the response to development scale	60
9.3 Use planning routes to secure evidence-led requirements	61
9.4 Select the right funding route	63
9.5 Make contributions spendable	65
9.6 Build area project pipelines	65
9.7 Set stewardship arrangements before handover	67
9.8 Use existing assets where they are the right local answer	68
9.9 Requirements for Community Plans, site schedules and legal agreements	68
9.10 Decision checklist	69
10. Strategic growth areas: site requirements schedule	71
10.1 Purpose and use of the schedules	71
10.2 North East Cambridge	76
10.3 Cambridge East	78
10.4 North West Cambridge / Eddington, with Darwin Green context	80
10.5 Expanded Cambourne (including Cambourne North)	81
10.6 Northstowe	82
10.7 Waterbeach New Town	83
10.8 Grange Farm New Settlement	84
10.9 Cambridge Biomedical Campus	85
10.10 Wellcome Genome Campus	86
10.11 Babraham Research Campus and the Rural Southern Cluster	88

10.12 Common requirements across strategic sites	89
11. Access, inclusion and who provision needs to work for	90
11.1 Purpose of this section	90
11.2 What the evidence shows	90
11.3 Young people	92
11.4 Safety, identity and group-specific use	92
11.5 Faith spaces and shared civic assets	93
11.6 What Community Plans should demonstrate	96
11.7 Implications for site schedules and recommendations	97
12. Recommendations	98
12.1 Purpose of the recommendations	98
12.2 Summary recommendations	98
12.3 Detailed recommendations	99
12.4 Priority actions after adoption of the study	102
Appendices	104
Appendix A Community infrastructure decision checklist for new developments	104
Appendix B Asset scope and typology	115
Appendix C Mapped asset baseline and area summary tables	118
Appendix D Strategic growth area schedule summary	123
Appendix E Standards, benchmarks and comparator evidence	130
Appendix F Costing and funding assumptions	138
Appendix G Bibliography and evidence source list	144

1. Executive Summary

1.1 What this study does

1.1.1 This Community Infrastructure Study provides a practical planning tool for deciding what community infrastructure new development should provide or fund across Greater Cambridge.

1.1.2 The study focuses on the spaces, facilities and local assets that help people meet, organise, access support and take part in community life. This includes community centres, village halls, parish halls, libraries, faith spaces with active community use, youth spaces, women's and specialist support spaces, schools with genuine community use, and other stable community-serving assets.

1.1.3 The study brings together mapped asset-location data, community facilities evidence, workshop evidence, officer interviews, existing resident survey evidence, demographic and growth evidence, standards and comparator evidence, and draft planning evidence. Each evidence type helps answer a practical question about need, access, timing, delivery, funding and stewardship.

1.1.4 Draft Local Plan and Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) material is used as current planning context. The findings are intended to inform the Local Plan, IDP, site schedules, Community Plan requirements, planning obligations and later guidance.

1.2 Relationship to the Local Plan, IDP and related studies

1.2.1 This study forms part of the Greater Cambridge evidence base for community infrastructure. It is intended to inform the emerging Local Plan, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, strategic site schedules, Community Plan requirements, planning obligations and future guidance.

1.2.2 The study uses draft Local Plan and draft IDP material as current planning context. It does not replace those documents. Its role is to provide more detailed evidence and a practical decision process for how community infrastructure needs should be identified, tested, secured and reviewed through planning.

1.2.3 The study should be read alongside other evidence and strategies covering related forms of infrastructure, including sports, healthcare, green space, play, allotments, community growing, libraries, culture, cemeteries and burial space. It does not replicate those studies. It complements them by focusing on community-facing spaces, facilities and assets, and by showing how those assets should be considered through Community Plans, site schedules and planning obligations.

1.2.4 The study also provides a basis for later delivery work. This may include Community Plan templates, updated site schedules, area project pipelines, planning obligation and CIL project lists, officer checklists and monitoring arrangements. Those delivery tools can be updated as permissions, costs, population assumptions, facility conditions and local priorities change, without reopening the evidence base each time.

1.3 Main findings

1.3.1 Greater Cambridge has a wide community infrastructure network, with many community-facing assets already recorded. The key planning issue is how that network

works in practice: whether people can reach, afford, book, understand and rely on the spaces that exist.

1.3.2 Mapped asset-location data provides a shared baseline. It records 223 geolocated community-facing or contextual entries in Cambridge City and 517 in South Cambridgeshire. These records show distribution, clusters and possible gaps. Local testing is needed to confirm access, capacity, quality, cost, suitability, management and long-term availability.

1.3.3 Evidence also identifies practical challenges that need to be addressed through planning and delivery. Workshop and officer evidence highlighted gaps between buildings being present and provision working well, including visibility, welcome, affordability, booking, youth use, kitchens, storage, transport access, management capacity and revenue. Community facilities evidence shows that growth can place additional pressure on existing assets and stewardship arrangements, so new development needs to plan for early usable space, improvements to existing facilities, long-term management and clear routes for contributions.

1.3.4 Cambridge City has a dense community infrastructure network. It includes a stronger Council-supported community-centre network than South Cambridgeshire, alongside community-led provision, libraries, schools, faith spaces, specialist provision and wider civic assets. The city also has clear local gaps and growth pressures, especially where existing neighbourhoods sit close to major development areas such as North East Cambridge, Cambridge East, the eastern fringe and southern institutional growth locations.

1.3.5 South Cambridgeshire has a dispersed network of village, parish and growth-area provision. Many places rely on village halls, parish facilities, faith spaces, schools and volunteer-led management. The South Cambridgeshire community facilities evidence supports a 129 square metre per 1,000 population benchmark and shows that quality, accessibility, running costs and local stewardship are as important as the headline amount of floorspace.

1.3.6 Major growth locations need early, visible and usable provision. New settlements, strategic allocations, large urban extensions and employment-led campuses need Community Plans, clear phasing, on-site and off-site decisions, safeguarded capacity, youth-capable space, kitchen and storage capability, revenue support and long-term stewardship.

1.3.7 Community infrastructure needs to work for people who may face barriers to access. This includes young people and teenagers, older people, disabled people, carers, low-income households, non-drivers, women and girls, LGBTQIA+ communities, faith communities, new arrivals and groups that may need safe or trusted meeting space.

1.4 Planning response

1.4.1 The study uses the 129 square metre per 1,000 residents benchmark, derived from the South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Study 2025 and carried into current draft Greater Cambridge IDP community infrastructure assumptions, as the main local quantified starting point for residential growth. The final response should be confirmed through local testing, using the decision process in Section 2 and Appendix A.

1.4.2 The decision process asks officers and applicants to identify development scale, generated need, existing provision, usability, on-site or off-site response, early provision, funding route, stewardship and the planning mechanism needed to secure delivery.

1.4.3 Community Plans should be the main mechanism for larger developments and locally complex proposals. The Community Needs Assessment should sit inside the Community Plan, alongside the proposed provision, engagement, phasing, funding, stewardship, management, monitoring and review arrangements.

1.4.4 For smaller sites and windfall development, the practical response will often be a contribution to an existing facility or area project pipeline. Those contributions should be linked to a defined catchment, clear eligible spend, a deliverable project, and visible monitoring.

1.4.5 For strategic sites, the site schedules identify the starting requirement for each major growth area. They should be used with Community Plans to confirm on-site provision, off-site investment, early space, safeguarded future capacity, faith-space testing, youth provision, stewardship, revenue and review points.

1.5 Key planning implications

Table 1.1. Summary of planning implications

Issue	Planning implication
Mapped assets need local testing.	Use mapped asset-location data as a baseline, then test access, affordability, booking, quality, capacity, suitability, welcome, management and long-term availability.
The same benchmark can lead to different responses.	Use 129 sqm per 1,000 residents as the starting point, then decide whether the response should be on site, off site, shared use, improvement of an existing asset, or a combined package.
Strategic sites need early and permanent provision.	Secure early temporary or meanwhile space, permanent hubs, safeguarded future capacity, clear triggers and review points through Community Plans and legal agreements.
Improvement/Expansion of existing facilities can be the right local answer.	Use planning obligations, CIL, Neighbourhood CIL and project pipelines to improve halls, centres, libraries, faith/community spaces and other assets where they serve the development catchment.
Buildings need stewardship and revenue.	Secure operator route, management plan, maintenance, fit-out, affordable hire, community development capacity and monitoring before handover.
Access and inclusion shape whether provision works.	Build youth-capable space, accessible design, safe group use, faith-space testing, affordable booking, non-digital information and hosted activity into Community Plans and specifications.

1.6 Recommendations

1.6.1 The recommendations set out how Greater Cambridge should use this study in planning policy, development management, infrastructure planning, site masterplanning, planning obligations and delivery review.

1.6.2 In using this study on a day-to-day basis officers should start with using the decision process in Section 2 and Appendix A, embedding Community Plans in pre-application and application practice, and carrying the site schedules into Local Plan, IDP and infrastructure delivery work.

Table 1.2. Summary recommendations

Recommendation	Summary
1. Use the shared decision process.	Apply Section 2 and Appendix A at pre-application, application, planning obligation, condition discharge and review stages.
2. Use the 129 sqm benchmark as a starting point.	Apply the benchmark to residential growth, then test local provision, quality, access, timing, room mix, stewardship and revenue.
3. Require proportionate Community Plans.	Use Community Plans for strategic sites, qualifying major sites, large employment development and locally complex proposals.
4. Carry site schedules into planning and delivery.	Use Section 10 to inform site requirements, masterplans, planning obligations, CIL, phasing and review
5. Secure early provision on long build-out sites.	Provide usable temporary, meanwhile or shared-use space before permanent facilities are complete.
6. Build area project pipelines.	Create spendable local project lists for smaller sites, windfalls and cumulative growth.
7. Agree stewardship before handover.	Set ownership, operator, maintenance, revenue, affordable hire, community access and review arrangements early.
8. Use existing and shared assets where appropriate.	Protect and improve existing assets where they are accessible, trusted, affordable and able to serve the development catchment.
9. Build inclusion into core requirements.	Include youth provision, access, affordability, faith-space testing and safe group use in Community Plans and specifications.
10. Monitor and update the evidence.	Track delivery, spend, access, affordability, use and stewardship, and update baselines, schedules and project pipelines.

1.7 How the study should be used

1.7.1 The study should be used as a live planning and delivery tool. Development management officers, policy officers, infrastructure planners, applicants, parish councils, community teams, service providers and community organisations should use the same decision route so that community infrastructure requirements are clear, proportionate and deliverable.

1.7.2 The practical test for each proposal is whether community infrastructure will be in the right place, open at the right time, affordable and welcoming to the people it serves, supported by the right rooms and fit-out, and managed by a steward with the funding and capacity to keep it working.

2. How to use this study

2.1 What this study is for

2.1.1 This study should be used as a practical planning tool when new development is being assessed. It helps officers, applicants, infrastructure teams, community teams and local stakeholders decide what community infrastructure a development should provide or fund.

2.1.2 The study brings mapped asset-location data, community facilities evidence, workshop evidence, officer interviews, existing resident survey evidence, growth assumptions, standards and comparator evidence, and draft planning evidence into one decision route. Each evidence type helps answer a different question about need, access, timing, delivery and stewardship.

2.1.3 Draft Local Plan and draft IDP material is used as current planning context. The findings of this study are intended to inform the Local Plan, IDP, site schedules, Community Plan requirements, planning obligations and later guidance.

2.1.4 The study should be used alongside those documents as the practical route for testing community infrastructure requirements. It does not replace the Local Plan, IDP, site allocations or planning obligations process. It helps translate them into site-specific decisions on existing provision, on-site and off-site responses, early provision, funding, stewardship and review.

2.1.5 The study should help answer six practical questions: what need is generated; whether existing provision can meet it; whether the response should be on site, off site or a mix of both; when provision is needed; how it should be funded and secured; and who will manage, maintain and review it over time.

Table 2.1. Main uses of this study

Question	Where to look	How to use the answer
What counts as community infrastructure for this study?	Section 3 and the asset scope appendix.	Use the agreed scope to keep the study focused and avoid moving into areas covered by sports, health, green space, play, allotment or burial evidence.
Where is existing provision recorded?	Mapped asset-location data, Section 4 and the area context sections.	Use mapped assets as a starting point for local testing. Do not treat the presence of a building as proof that need has been met.
What need is generated by growth?	Needs analysis, growth evidence, draft infrastructure planning evidence and strategic site schedules.	Use the 129 sqm per 1,000 residents benchmark as a quantified starting point, then test place, quality, access, timing and stewardship.
What should a development provide or fund?	Figure 2.1, Appendix A, Community Plan requirements, Section	Use the decision process to identify on-site provision, off-site investment, enhancement of

	9 and strategic site schedules.	existing assets, early space, revenue support and stewardship requirements.
What should be secured through planning?	Section 9, Community Plan requirements and Appendix A	Translate the agreed response into land, floorspace, completed building, fit-out, planning obligations, CIL, community use agreement, management plan, revenue support, monitoring and review.

2.2 Decision process for new development

2.2.1 Figure 2.1 provides the main decision process for applying the study. It should be used at pre-application, application, planning obligation and review stages. Appendix A provides a fuller checklist for officers and applicants.

2.2.2 The process starts with development scale and then tests the local response. This helps avoid a narrow calculation exercise and gives a consistent route for judging when provision should be delivered on site, funded off site, provided early, or supported through stewardship and revenue arrangements.

Figure 2.1. How to decide what community infrastructure a development should provide or fund

Step	Question	Practical response
1	What scale and type of development is proposed?	Class as small windfall, medium site, major development, strategic allocation, new settlement, mixed-use area or employment-led site. Check cumulative growth where smaller sites together pass a relevant threshold.
2	What need does the development generate?	Estimate resident, worker and visitor demand. For larger sites, check plan-period and full build-out growth. Identify whether need is local, settlement-wide, area-wide or wider.
3	What existing provision is nearby?	Use mapped asset-location data and local evidence to identify relevant community centres, village halls, faith spaces, libraries, schools, youth spaces and specialist provision.
4	Can existing provision meet the additional need?	Test reach, cost, booking, suitability, welcome, availability, capacity, quality, accessibility, management and long-term availability.
5	Can existing provision be improved or expanded?	Where this is the best response, consider planning obligations, CIL, Neighbourhood CIL, shared-use agreements, fit-out, access improvements, kitchen or storage upgrades, equipment or management support.
6	Is new on-site provision needed?	Where the development creates a clear local need, identify land, location, floorspace, specification, phasing, fit-out, delivery trigger, operator route and community access requirements.

7	Is early provision needed?	For long build-out sites, new settlements and large urban extensions, test early temporary or meanwhile space, shared-use space, community development capacity and first-phase access.
8	What stewardship route will keep provision working?	Identify who will manage, maintain and activate the space. Test council, parish or town council, community organisation, trust, developer, commercial or hybrid routes, with revenue and maintenance.
9	What should planning secure?	Secure land, floorspace, building, fit-out, financial contribution, revenue support, community development resource, community use agreement, management plan, monitoring and review.

2.3 Match the route to development scale

2.3.1 Different scales of development need different levels of evidence and delivery commitment. Smaller developments will usually contribute to existing or planned provision. Major developments and strategic sites will often need on-site provision, early space, a Community Plan and clear stewardship arrangements.

Table 2.2. Development scale and expected route through the study

Development type	Likely route	What should normally be shown
Small windfall development	A proportionate contribution route.	Use the benchmark and local evidence to identify whether a contribution should support existing or planned provision. Link any contribution to an area priority, project pipeline or facility that serves the development population.
Medium sites and cumulative growth	A lighter-touch community infrastructure statement or checklist.	Show the local community infrastructure network, likely additional pressure, whether existing provision can absorb demand, and whether improvement, expansion or pooled contribution is needed.
Major residential development and larger employment development	A Community Needs Assessment and Community Plan where the scale, cumulative impact or local context requires fuller testing.	Test existing provision, local access, demographic need, engagement, on-site and off-site provision, early space, funding, stewardship, management, maintenance and review.
Strategic allocations, new settlements and	A full Community Plan linked to masterplanning, phasing, site	Identify land and buildings, early temporary provision, permanent provision, safeguarded future capacity, on-site and off-site split,

long build-out sites	schedules and planning obligations.	revenue support, community development capacity, operator route and review points.
Employment-led and mixed-use areas	A site-specific assessment of worker, visitor and surrounding community needs.	Test whether community-facing, social, or amenity provision is needed on site, whether nearby facilities will come under pressure, and whether off-site contributions or shared-use arrangements are justified.

2.4 Testing existing provision

2.4.1 Existing provision should be tested before it is treated as meeting need. The same test applies to mapped community centres, village halls, faith spaces, libraries, schools, youth spaces, specialist support spaces and community-serving assets.

2.4.2 A facility should count as usable provision only where there is enough evidence that people can reach it, afford it, book it, understand what it offers, feel welcome using it, and rely on it over time.

Table 2.3. Existing provision usability test

Test	Questions to answer
Access and location	Can residents reach the space by walking, cycling, public transport or accessible transport? Is the route safe and legible? Does the location work for the people expected to use it?
Availability and booking	Can groups book the space at the times they need? Are booking routes clear? Are there restrictions that limit community use?
Affordability	Are hire costs, deposits, insurance requirements or minimum spend expectations likely to exclude local groups or residents?
Suitability and fit-out	Does the space have the right room sizes, toilets, kitchen or catering capability, storage, digital access, acoustic separation, safeguarding arrangements and accessible facilities?
Welcome and safety	Will different groups feel safe and comfortable using the space? Does the management approach support young people, older people, disabled people, low-income households, faith communities, LGBTQIA+ communities and other groups who may need trusted places to meet?
Capacity and quality	Is the building already well used or under pressure? Is it in suitable condition? Can it absorb additional demand without displacing existing activity?
Management and longevity	Is there a realistic operator, budget, maintenance plan and community access arrangement? Is provision likely to remain available over time?

2.5 Using the study for Community Plans

2.5.1 Community Plans are the main place where local testing should be brought together for major developments, strategic sites, new settlements and other locally complex proposals. A Community Plan should include the Community Needs Assessment and set

out how need will be met through on-site provision, off-site investment, early provision, funding, stewardship and review.

2.5.2 The evidence in this study supports the use of proportionate Community Plans for strategic sites, larger residential developments, larger employment developments and other proposals where local context, cumulative growth or pressure on existing provision creates material community infrastructure issues. A Community Plan gives officers, applicants and communities a single place to test need, existing provision, on-site and off-site responses, early provision, funding, stewardship and review.

2.5.3 The emerging policy framework provides a route for securing this evidence-led requirement through planning. Current draft policy includes thresholds for residential and employment development, but the practical requirement should be applied through the decision process in this study. Where a proposal below those thresholds creates a clear community infrastructure issue, officers should use the same headings in a proportionate way to structure submissions, local testing and planning obligations.

2.5.4 Community Plans should be prepared early enough to influence masterplanning. They should help decide where community space should sit, what role it should play, how it connects to schools, local centres, public realm, green space and movement routes, and what must be secured through planning obligations or conditions.

2.6 How different users should use the study

Table 2.4. User guide

User	Use the study to	Main entry points
Development management officers	Set pre-application expectations, assess submitted Community Plans or statements, test on-site and off-site provision, and agree what should be secured through planning.	Decision process in Figure 2.1; Appendix A; Section 3; Section 4; Community Plan requirements; Section 9; strategic site schedules.
Policy, site allocation and masterplanning officers	Translate the evidence into policy wording, site requirements, masterplan expectations, safeguarded land or floorspace, and guidance for major sites.	Section 4; needs analysis; area context sections; strategic site schedules; standards and comparator evidence.
Infrastructure planning and IDP officers	Connect quantified need with site schedules, area priorities, costs, phasing, funding routes and delivery responsibilities.	Section 4; needs analysis; Section 9; strategic site schedules; standards and comparator table; Appendix A.
Applicants, promoters and developers	Prepare proportionate evidence, identify the right community infrastructure response, and show how provision will be funded, phased, managed and reviewed.	Figure 2.1; Appendix A; Community Plan requirements; Section 9; relevant site schedule.

Community services, parish, City and District teams	Add operational knowledge on existing assets, access barriers, facility quality, booking, revenue, staffing, local priorities and stewardship routes.	Area context sections; mapped asset-location data; Community Plans; access and inclusion; Section 9.
Community organisations and local stakeholders	Check whether proposals respond to local experience, existing assets, affordability, access, safety, youth need, specialist needs and long-term management.	Section 3; Section 4; access and inclusion; Community Plans; Appendix A; relevant site schedule.

2.7 Using the study through the planning process

Table 2.5. Applying the study through planning stages

Stage	What to use the study for	Expected output
Policy and guidance	Set clear expectations for community infrastructure, Community Plans, on-site provision, off-site contributions, early provision and stewardship.	Policy wording, supporting guidance and templates that reflect the evidence base.
Site allocation and masterplanning	Identify likely community anchors, existing assets to protect or enhance, land or floorspace to safeguard, movement links and phasing assumptions.	Site-specific expectations that can be tested through masterplans and planning applications.
Pre-application	Agree whether a Community Plan or lighter-touch statement is required, what evidence should be submitted, and what local provision needs testing.	Clear pre-application advice on evidence, provision, funding, phasing and stewardship.
Application assessment	Assess whether proposals respond to generated need, existing provision, access, timing, on-site/off-site delivery and long-term management.	A clear planning judgement on whether community infrastructure impacts are properly addressed.
Planning obligations, CIL and conditions	Secure the agreed response through land, buildings, fit-out, contributions, use agreements, revenue support, management plans, monitoring and review.	Heads of terms, obligations, conditions or CIL priorities that are specific enough to be deliverable and traceable.
Delivery and review	Check whether provision is being delivered, used, affordable, accessible and well managed as development phases come forward.	Review points linked to occupation, facility delivery, use, affordability, resident feedback and stewardship.

2.8 What this study should not be used for

2.8.1 This study should not be used as a final asset audit, a complete condition survey of every facility, or a substitute for site-specific engagement. It should also not be used to assume that every mapped asset is equally available, equally accessible or equally important.

2.8.2 This study is intended to complement, rather than replicate, other evidence and strategies covering related forms of social and community infrastructure. Formal sports provision, healthcare, green space, play, allotments, community growing, cemeteries and burial space are important to community life, but are covered mainly through other studies, strategies and IDP work. This study refers to those areas where they affect community access, co-location, shared use or local planning decisions, while keeping its main focus on community-facing spaces, facilities and assets.

2.8.3 Commercial and informal social spaces can support community life, but they should not be treated as automatic replacements for accessible community provision. Cafés, pubs, shops and community businesses need the same practical test as other assets: access, cost, welcome, governance, booking, long-term availability and who can realistically use them.

2.9 Appendix checklist

2.9.1 Appendix A provides a fuller Community infrastructure decision checklist for new development. Officers and applicants should use it alongside Figure 2.1 when preparing or assessing Community Plans, community infrastructure statements, heads of terms, management plans and delivery reviews.

3. What community infrastructure means in this study

3.1 Working scope

3.1.1 This study focuses on the spaces, facilities and local assets that help people meet, organise, access support and take part in community life. It uses a practical working scope so that mapped evidence, needs analysis, Community Plans, site schedules and delivery recommendations can be applied consistently.

3.1.2 Community infrastructure includes buildings and rooms, and also the conditions that make them usable: access, opening hours, affordability, booking arrangements, welcome, safeguarding, staffing, equipment, storage, kitchen capability, management and long-term stewardship.

3.1.3 The scope is based on the agreed community asset categories, mapped asset-location data, workshop evidence, officer feedback, community facilities evidence for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire, and current draft infrastructure planning evidence. It also reflects the need to keep the study focused, so that sports, health, green space, play, allotments, cemeteries and burial space are handled through the evidence and strategies that cover those areas directly.

3.2 Asset types in scope

3.2.1 The core asset types in scope are community centres and hubs, village halls and parish halls, libraries and public learning spaces, faith spaces where community use is active and welcomed, youth spaces, women's and specialist support spaces, schools where rooms are genuinely available for community use, and stable community-owned or community-serving assets that function as part of local community life.

3.2.2 Faith buildings are included where they provide active and welcomed community use, such as halls, meeting rooms, advice, food activity, youth work, older people's activity, cultural activity or support for local groups. Interpretation should reflect access arrangements, religious use, safeguarding, privacy and local trust.

3.2.3 Women's and specialist support spaces are included because they can be important community infrastructure for people who need safe, trusted or group-specific provision. Public-facing detail should remain proportionate where privacy, safeguarding or confidentiality matter.

3.2.4 LGBTQIA+ needs are addressed through the access, inclusion and safety requirements for community provision. The mapped baseline keeps this within the specialist-support and access requirements for community provision. Community Plans should consider whether local provision offers safe, welcoming, affordable and bookable space for LGBTQIA+ communities and other groups who may need to meet together in trusted settings.

Table 3.1. Scope used in this study

Category	Included in this study	How it should be used
Core community facilities	Community centres, community hubs, village halls, parish halls, public halls and meeting rooms.	Use as the main baseline for existing provision, new

		provision and developer contributions.
Community-facing shared assets	Libraries, faith spaces, schools with genuine community use, scout and guide buildings, and similar shared civic assets.	Use where access is real and workable. Check booking, cost, safeguarding, opening times and who can use the space.
Group-specific and specialist provision	Youth spaces, women's spaces, specialist support spaces and safe group meeting space for communities that may need to meet together.	Use to test whether generic provision is enough, and where privacy, safeguarding, safety or trust require more specific arrangements.
Community-owned and community-serving assets	Community pubs, shops, co-operative spaces, community businesses, CLT-held spaces and other stable assets with a community role.	Use as part of local resilience and stewardship evidence. Plan for space, affordability and a clear route to long-term management.
Related provision handled mainly elsewhere	Sports and leisure facilities, healthcare, parks, green space, play, allotments, cemeteries and burial space.	Cross-reference where relevant, but avoid moving the study into areas covered by other evidence, strategies or IDP chapters.

3.3 Related provision and scope boundaries

3.3.1 Some assets are closely related and interconnected to the facilities considered in this study. Sports pavilions, school buildings, places of worship, libraries, pubs, cafés, community businesses and cultural facilities may all support community life where community access is real, regular and affordable. Their relevance depends on how they work in practice, including access, cost, booking, safeguarding, opening times, staffing and who feels able to use them. It should be noted that any reference to cultural facilities is for context only. It is not uncommon to have multi-functional facilities that perform both a community function and other use such as supporting cultural activities. While future community facilities may also support cultural activities, the provision of cultural facilities is a separate process, addressed by the Greater Cambridge Cultural Infrastructure Strategy.

3.3.2 Sports and leisure facilities, health facilities, parks and green space, play areas, community growing spaces, cemeteries and burial space remain important forms of social and civic infrastructure. This study refers to them where they affect community use, shared access, co-location or local planning decisions, while keeping the main baseline focused on community-facing spaces and facilities. Co-location with libraries, health, sports, education or other services may provide good value and operational benefits in some places, but the timing, specification and delivery route for those services should be tested through site-specific masterplanning, phasing strategies, service planning and the relevant topic evidence.

3.3.3 One-off events, pop-up activity and informal groups are not mapped as assets unless they have a stable host space. They may still be important evidence of demand, especially where repeated activity shows a need for bookable rooms, storage, kitchen access, low-cost hire or a more permanent local base.

3.4 How the scope should be applied

3.4.1 The asset categories provide a starting point for analysis. A mapped asset should still be tested against function and access before it is treated as meeting need. Key questions are whether people can reach it, afford it, book it, understand what it is for, feel welcome using it, and rely on it over time.

3.4.2 Community Plans and site schedules should use this scope to identify the type of provision required, how it should be phased, what should be provided on site, what can be supported off site, and what stewardship arrangements are needed. This keeps the study practical while allowing local evidence to shape the final response.

4. How evidence has been used

4.1 Main evidence used in the study

4.1.1 This study uses mapped assets, local facilities evidence, workshop evidence, officer interviews, existing resident survey evidence, growth evidence, standards and comparator material, and draft planning evidence to assess community infrastructure need across Greater Cambridge.

4.1.2 Each evidence type answers a different practical question. Mapped asset-location data shows where known assets are recorded. Community facilities evidence helps test quantity, quality and accessibility. Workshop evidence and officer interviews show how spaces work in practice. Existing resident survey evidence points to access issues that need local testing. Growth and draft infrastructure planning evidence help identify future pressure, costs, phasing and delivery routes. Standards and comparator evidence provide useful starting points for judging scale, hierarchy, timing and delivery models.

4.1.3 The full bibliography and source list are included in the appendices. This section explains how the main evidence has been used and how its limits have been handled.

Table 4.1. Main evidence types and how they have been used

Evidence type	What it contributes	How it has been used
Mapped asset-location data	A baseline of known community-facing assets within the agreed study scope, including community centres, village halls, faith spaces, libraries, youth spaces, specialist spaces, schools with community use, food aid and community-serving assets.	Used to identify the distribution of known provision, possible gaps, clusters, shared-use opportunities and places requiring local testing.
Community facilities evidence	Structured evidence on quantity, quality, accessibility, building condition, management, running costs and investment needs, especially through Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire evidence.	Used to test whether mapped provision is likely to be adequate, usable and capable of supporting future demand.
Workshop evidence and officer interviews	Practical evidence on how provision is experienced, delivered and managed by residents, community groups, developers, officers and local organisations.	Used to understand issues that mapped data cannot show, including welcome, visibility, booking, affordability, kitchen and storage requirements, youth provision, early provision and stewardship.

Existing resident survey evidence	Existing Healthy Places JSNA survey evidence on residents' stated importance and access across built-environment themes, including community buildings, sense of community and local decision-making.	Used as a supporting indicator for access and inclusion questions, and to identify issues that should be tested through Community Plans, engagement, site schedules and local infrastructure planning.
Growth and draft infrastructure planning evidence	Population and development assumptions, site trajectories, indicative floorspace benchmarks, costs and infrastructure planning assumptions.	Used to understand the scale and timing of future need. Draft IDP and draft Local Plan evidence is treated as current planning context and as material this study is intended to inform.
Standards and comparator evidence	Local standards, national policy context, best practice examples and comparator models, including Space in the Place and faith-space guidance referenced in Greater Cambridge planning obligations material.	Used to test whether provision is likely to be sufficient, well distributed, phased and deliverable. Standards are applied with local evidence rather than as fixed tariffs.

4.2 How mapped assets have been interpreted

4.2.1 Mapped asset-location data provides the starting point for understanding current provision. It shows where known community-facing assets are recorded, where provision appears clustered, where provision appears thinner, and where shared-use assets may form part of the local picture.

4.2.2 The mapping needs local testing before it can show whether provision meets need. A recorded asset may be hard to reach, expensive to hire, poorly fitted for particular activities, unavailable at the right time, unsuitable for some users, or dependent on fragile volunteer capacity. A place with several recorded assets may still need new or improved provision. A place with fewer recorded assets may have strong provision where a shared asset is accessible, trusted and well managed.

4.2.3 The mapping is used with workshop evidence, officer interviews, community facilities evidence and growth assumptions. The analysis focuses on how provision works in practice, including access, affordability, suitability, fit-out, management and long-term availability.

4.3 How existing survey evidence has been used

4.3.1 This study draws on existing resident survey evidence from the Community Survey and Engagement Report. The survey was carried out for the Healthy Places JSNA across Cambridgeshire and Peterborough. It was commissioned outside this Community Infrastructure Study and provides useful evidence on how residents experience access to parts of the local built environment.

4.3.2 The survey ran from February to April 2024 and analysed 762 valid records. It asked residents to rate eight themes: local decisions, local healthcare, sense of community, green spaces, active travel, affordable options for healthy food, community buildings, and healthy play and leisure. For each theme, respondents rated how important it was to them and how easy it was to access.

4.3.3 The survey calculated an unmet need score by comparing the importance score with the access score. A higher score means residents rated something as important but harder to access. A lower or negative score means reported access was closer to, or better than, the importance rating.

4.3.4 In this study, the unmet need score is a supporting indicator. It helps identify access questions for Community Plans, site schedules and local infrastructure discussions. For example, where existing survey evidence shows weaker access to community buildings or sense of community, a Community Plan should test whether residents can reach, afford, book and feel welcome in local spaces.

4.3.5 Officers can use this evidence to identify issues for local testing and engagement. Developers can use it to shape early provision, community space specifications, booking arrangements, opening hours, transport links, accessibility, youth provision and stewardship plans. Community organisations and local stakeholders can use it to highlight access barriers that may not appear in mapped asset data.

4.3.6 The unmet need score should not be used as a ranking of settlements, wards or development sites. It does not explain the cause of a gap, and it does not replace local engagement, mapped provision, facility quality evidence, officer judgement or Community Plan work.

4.3.7 The survey evidence also has limits. It was not designed specifically for this study, and the sample was uneven across age and demographic groups. Younger residents were underrepresented. Free-text responses were added after the survey opened and are illustrative. For that reason, the survey is used as part of the evidence base, rather than as a standalone measure of community infrastructure need.

4.4 How local evidence has been used

4.4.1 Workshop evidence and officer interviews add practical knowledge about how community infrastructure is experienced and delivered. They identify issues that mapped data and floorspace standards cannot show, including whether spaces are visible, welcoming, easy to book, affordable, properly equipped, well managed and available when people need them.

4.4.2 This evidence is qualitative. It is used to identify recurring issues, test assumptions and shape planning requirements. It does not provide a statistically representative survey of Greater Cambridge.

4.4.3 Community facilities evidence for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire adds a more structured view of existing facilities. It helps the study consider quantity, quality, accessibility, building condition, operating pressures, developer contributions and the difference between an asset being present and an asset meeting current or future need.

4.5 How standards and comparator evidence has been used

4.5.1 Standards and comparator evidence provide starting points for local judgement. They help test the scale, type and timing of provision that may be needed. They do not replace local evidence from mapped assets, community facilities evidence, workshops, officer interviews, Community Plans or site-specific assessment.

4.5.2 This study uses the South Cambridgeshire community facilities benchmark of 129 sqm per 1,000 population as the main local community floorspace benchmark. Draft infrastructure planning evidence currently uses this benchmark to estimate additional community centre floorspace and cost. This study uses the benchmark with evidence on quality, accessibility, local function, early provision, stewardship and the type of space needed.

4.5.3 The 129 sqm per 1,000 residents benchmark is appropriate as the shared Greater Cambridge starting point because it is locally derived, already used in current draft infrastructure planning evidence, and sits within the range of comparator standards reviewed in Appendix E. Although the benchmark comes from South Cambridgeshire facilities evidence, it is not applied as a fixed district-specific standard. It is used as a consistent baseline for residential growth across both Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire, then tested against local evidence on existing provision, quality, accessibility, facility role, growth context and stewardship.

4.5.4 Appendix Table E.2 shows that other authorities use broadly comparable community hall or community centre standards, while some new-community models use higher whole-place standards where the definition includes a wider mix of cultural, leisure, library, park-related or workspace uses. This supports using 129 sqm per 1,000 residents as a reasonable baseline quantum for Greater Cambridge, while retaining local testing to decide whether the response should be new on-site provision, enhancement of existing facilities, shared use, off-site contribution or a combined package.

4.5.5 Comparator evidence from Ebbsfleet's Space in the Place model is useful because it shows how a large new community can plan for a hierarchy of local, settlement and wider civic provision. Its 311 sqm per 1,000 residents benchmark covers a broader mix of uses than this study, including flexible community space, arts and culture, sports and leisure, libraries, park-related facilities and touchdown workspace. It is used here as a comparator for ambition, typology, phasing, gap analysis and stewardship, rather than as the local Greater Cambridge community facilities standard.

4.5.6 Faith-space evidence is used through current draft planning obligations guidance for Greater Cambridge. That guidance refers to the 2008 Cambridgeshire Horizons faith-space recommendation as a starting point for negotiation in new communities. The same guidance also recognises that where standalone faith space is not feasible, other community meeting spaces may need to be enhanced to accommodate faith uses. This is used as a prompt for Community Plans and strategic site schedules where faith-space need may arise.

Table 4.2. Standards, benchmarks and comparator evidence

Evidence or standard	What it says	How this study uses it
----------------------	--------------	------------------------

South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Study 2025	Identifies 20,860 sqm of functional community facilities space across South Cambridgeshire, equivalent to 129 sqm per 1,000 population, and recommends using that standard to guide new provision and developer contributions.	Used as the main local benchmark for community floorspace, alongside evidence on quality, accessibility and local function.
Draft Greater Cambridge IDP community and culture evidence	Uses the 129 sqm per 1,000 residents benchmark to estimate additional community centre floorspace, capital cost and start-up operating and management costs for growth linked to new allocations and windfall development.	Used as current draft infrastructure planning context. This study is intended to inform how that planning evidence is refined and applied.
Space in the Place, Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	Uses a wider whole-place community infrastructure model of 311 sqm per 1,000 residents, with a hierarchy from neighbourhood houses to community hubs, beacon buildings and landmark buildings. It also tests need against planned planning-obligation delivery and opportunity projects.	Used as a comparator for large growth locations, especially typology hierarchy, gap analysis, early provision, planned versus required space, and long-term stewardship.
Faith-space guidance referenced in Greater Cambridge planning obligations material	Refers to the 2008 Cambridgeshire Horizons recommendation of 0.5 hectares of free or heavily discounted land per 3,000 dwellings as a starting point for negotiation in new communities.	Used as a prompt for strategic site schedules and Community Plans, including whether faith needs should be met through land, shared community space, early premises, or enhancement of other meeting spaces.
National planning policy and planning obligation tests	Supports planning for healthy, inclusive and safe places and requires planning obligations to be necessary, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.	Used to keep Community Plan requirements, planning obligation and CIL contributions, and off-site funding routes proportionate and linked to development impact.

4.6 How growth and draft planning evidence has been used

4.6.1 The evidence in this section supports the decision process in Section 2 and Appendix A, helping officers and applicants test development scale, existing provision, local access, timing, funding and stewardship before agreeing what a development should provide or fund.

4.6.2 Growth evidence is used to understand where new residents, workers and visitors are likely to create additional demand for community infrastructure. This includes the difference between need generated during the plan period and need generated by the full build-out of larger strategic sites.

4.6.3 Draft Local Plan and draft IDP material is used as current planning context. The findings of this study are intended to inform the Local Plan, IDP, site schedules, Community Plan requirements, planning obligations and later guidance.

4.6.4 For large sites, the study uses both plan-period and whole-site growth assumptions where available. This helps identify early requirements, permanent provision, land safeguarding, off-site contributions and review points as places build out over time.

4.7 How the evidence has been carried into site schedules and later sections

4.7.1 Later sections use the evidence in a practical sequence. The needs analysis identifies the main types of need. The place context sections explain how need differs between Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire. The strategic site schedules set out site-specific requirements. The delivery, stewardship and funding section identifies the practical arrangements needed to secure and maintain provision.

4.7.2 The strategic site schedules use a consistent structure: current and committed provision, plan-period and whole-site growth, benchmark need, local evidence, on-site and off-site requirements, early provision, stewardship, funding and further testing. This allows standards and comparator evidence to shape the schedules without replacing local judgement.

4.7.3 The schedules use a protect, enhance, provide and contribute logic where it helps clarify the planning response. Existing assets may need protection where they already serve a local role. Some places need enhancement through refurbishment, access improvements, fit-out, kitchens, storage, digital access, booking improvements or management support. Larger growth locations will also need new provision, land, early temporary space or financial contributions.

4.7.4 This approach keeps the study usable for planning decisions. It shows where evidence supports on-site provision, off-site contributions, early temporary provision, new or improved facilities, shared-use arrangements, Community Plans, stewardship arrangements or further local testing.

5. Cambridge City community infrastructure context

5.1 A dense city network with clear local gaps

5.1.1 Cambridge City has a substantial community infrastructure network. It includes a stronger Council-supported community-centre network than South Cambridgeshire, alongside community-led provision, libraries, schools and community wings, faith spaces, food hubs, youth spaces, women's and specialist support spaces, scout and guide buildings, social clubs and other community-facing assets. This gives the city a different starting point from many villages in South Cambridgeshire, where provision is often held through one main hall or a small number of parish-scale assets.

5.1.2 The main planning issue in Cambridge City is how the network works in practice. Some neighbourhoods have a visible and well-used community centre. Other places rely on a mix of smaller rooms, faith buildings, schools, specialist spaces or informal civic assets. Some facilities serve a wider catchment than the immediate neighbourhood. This creates different access, management and capacity questions across the city.

5.1.3 Cambridge City community-centres strategy treats centres as part of community development, anti-poverty work, neighbourhood support and local participation. It was prepared through audit work, mapping, 15-minute walk-time analysis, gap analysis and centre-by-centre review. It identified 107 community facilities across the city and used that evidence to assess current coverage, local gaps and future priorities.

5.1.4 That strategy shows that community infrastructure in Cambridge City is managed through an active network rather than left to emerge without direction. It records council-supported centres, community-managed centres, centres opened in growth areas, and further provision linked to major development. It also identifies priority responses for The Meadows, Buchan Street, 37 Lawrence Way, Nuns Way Pavilion, Ross Street, 82 Akeman Street, Trumpington Pavilion and Brown's Field, together with gap responses in Abbey, Cherry Hinton, East Chesterton and Queen Edith's. The strategy has also informed delivery decisions. Data-led analysis identified where changes to existing provision could meet community need more effectively while also releasing land for new council housing. This included demolishing Buchan Street and the old Meadows community centres and replacing them with a purpose-built community centre including community meeting space, performance space, a nursery school, a dedicated youth room and a safe space for women.

5.2 Mapped assets and what they show

5.2.1 Mapped asset-location data records 223 geolocated community-facing or contextual assets across Cambridge City wards. The largest recorded categories are faith spaces, schools and school-linked community spaces, food aid and food support, community centres, scout and guide buildings, sports and leisure context entries, other community-facing assets, libraries, youth spaces, women's spaces and village halls. This gives a broad picture of the city network, while leaving important questions for local testing.

5.2.2 The strongest mapped concentrations are in Market, Queen Edith's, Abbey, Petersfield, Arbury, Trumpington, East Chesterton, Romsey and Cherry Hinton. These numbers should be read as a starting point. A ward with many mapped assets may still

have access, cost, capacity or suitability issues. A ward with fewer mapped assets may have strong provision where a single centre or shared asset works well.

Table 5.1. Cambridge City mapped asset-location baseline by type

Asset type	Mapped entries
Community centres	21
Village halls	2
Faith spaces	63
Schools and school-linked community spaces	52
Libraries	8
Youth spaces	8
Women's spaces	6
Food aid and food support	22
Scout and guide buildings	13
Other community-facing assets	12
Sports pavilions	4
Leisure/sport context entries	12
Total mapped entries	223

5.3 Council-supported centres, shared assets and wider community use

5.3.1 Dedicated community centres are a defined part of the Cambridge City network and carry significant public investment. The city strategy records nine community centres at the start of the review, with six directly managed by the council. It also records two new facilities opened in 2018 at Storey's Field and Clay Farm, with further centres planned through major growth locations including Cambridge Northern Fringe, Darwin Green, land north of Cherry Hinton, Mill Road Depot and Cromwell Road.

5.3.2 The same strategy records 137,000 visits to council-managed community centres in 2017. It describes annual investment of about £900,000 in community-centre provision, with a net cost of about £607,000 after more than £293,000 income. These figures show that community infrastructure in Cambridge City includes ongoing staffing, operating costs, income, asset decisions and service priorities.

5.3.3 Officer evidence used by this study identifies about £1.3 million of annual council investment in operating the city network, with 7 council-run and 4 community-organisation-run city community centres. Officers also point to recent capital investment through four

new centres in the last four years, and a wider delivery record that would take the city to 8 community centres opened in 10 years by spring 2027.

5.3.4 The City network depends on revenue, staffing, management and maintenance capacity as well as buildings. Future growth may increase pressure on existing centres and community-facing assets, so the ability of the network to absorb additional demand will depend on operating capacity, stewardship arrangements, affordability, booking systems and the condition and suitability of individual facilities.

5.3.5 Workshop evidence adds practical detail on how this network is experienced. Participants highlighted welcome, clear information, affordable access, flexible rooms, storage, kitchens, youth-capable space and early provision in growth areas. That evidence helps explain why the presence of a mapped asset is only a starting point for local testing.

5.3.6 New development in Cambridge City should be planned against this existing managed network. Community Plans, site schedules and planning obligations should test where growth needs a new on-site facility, where it should strengthen an existing centre, and how major development should relate to the nearest usable community infrastructure in the wider city network.

5.3.7 Table 5.2 summarises the main Cambridge City community facilities evidence used in this study. The City evidence gives a strong picture of network coverage, centre management, public investment, local gaps and growth-area priorities. It does not provide a full city-wide condition survey or quantified floorspace audit equivalent to the South Cambridgeshire community facilities study.

Table 5.2. Headline Cambridge City community facilities evidence

Theme	Evidence	Implication for this study
Network coverage	The Cambridge City community-centres strategy used audit work, mapping, 15-minute walk-time analysis, gap analysis and centre-by-centre review. It identified 107 community facilities across the city and used that evidence to assess coverage, local gaps and future priorities.	Cambridge City has a substantial community infrastructure network, but the presence of a facility does not confirm that provision is accessible, affordable, bookable, suitable or able to absorb growth.
Dedicated community centres	The City strategy recorded nine community centres at the start of the review, with six directly managed by the Council. It also recorded new provision at Storey’s Field and Clay Farm, and further community-centre provision linked to major growth locations.	Cambridge City starts from a stronger managed community-centre network than many parts of South Cambridgeshire. Community Plans and site schedules should test whether the right response is to protect existing provision, enhance a local centre, provide new space

		or contribute to the wider network.
Local gaps and priorities	The City strategy identified priority responses for The Meadows, Buchan Street, 37 Lawrence Way, Nuns Way Pavilion, Ross Street, 82 Akeman Street, Trumpington Pavilion and Brown's Field. It also identified gap responses in Abbey, Cherry Hinton, East Chesterton and Queen Edith's.	Local priorities should be visible in Community Plans, site schedules and planning obligation and CIL discussions, especially where growth places pressure on neighbourhoods already identified as having gaps or improvement needs.
Mapped asset baseline	The mapped asset-location data records 223 community-facing or contextual entries in Cambridge City, including community centres, village halls, faith spaces, schools and school-linked community spaces, libraries, youth spaces, women's spaces, food support, scout and guide buildings and other community-facing assets.	The mapped baseline gives a wider view of the City network than community centres alone. It should be used as a starting point for local testing, not as proof that need has been met.
Investment, use and operating capacity	The City strategy recorded 137,000 visits to Council-managed community centres in 2017 and annual investment of about £900,000 in community-centre provision, with a net cost of about £607,000 after income.	Future management, revenue, staffing and maintenance capacity need to be considered alongside capital provision. Existing facilities cannot be assumed to absorb additional growth unless operating and stewardship arrangements are realistic.
Growth-area provision	City evidence identifies community-centre provision linked to major growth areas, including completed and planned provision in places such as Storey's Field, Clay Farm, Darwin Green, North East Cambridge, land north of Cherry Hinton, Mill Road Depot and Cromwell Road.	Major growth areas need clear decisions on on-site provision, off-site investment, early or meanwhile space, shared use, stewardship and review points. Requirements should be tested through site schedules and Community Plans.
Practical usability	Workshop evidence highlighted welcome, clear information, affordable access, flexible rooms, storage, kitchens, youth-	The planning test should focus on whether provision works in practice: access, affordability, booking, capacity, quality,

	capable space and early provision in growth areas.	suitability, welcome, management and long-term availability.
--	--	--

5.4 Future delivery framework for community facilities.

5.4.1 Strategy framework and action plan for future delivery of community facilities. The strategy framework focuses on the following four principles:

- **Protect:** The study supports the protection of existing community-facing assets where they play an important local role and would be difficult to replace if lost. This includes community centres, village halls, parish rooms, faith/community spaces, libraries, schools with genuine community use, youth spaces, women’s and specialist support spaces, scout and guide buildings, and other trusted local assets. Protection should focus on the community function as well as the building, including access, affordability, availability, management and long-term community use.
- **Enhance:** Existing facilities should be improved where they can serve current and future communities more effectively. Enhancement may include refurbishment, extension, accessibility improvements, acoustic treatment, kitchens, storage, toilets, digital access, safeguarding, energy efficiency, booking systems, fit-out, equipment, community development capacity, management support or clearer shared-use arrangements. Enhancement will often be the right response where an existing facility is trusted, well located and capable of serving growth if practical barriers are addressed.
- **Provide:** New community infrastructure should be provided where growth creates a clear local need that cannot be met through existing provision. This may include new community centres, hubs, halls, flexible meeting rooms, youth-capable space, food-enabled community space, early or meanwhile provision, land safeguarding, shell and core space, fit-out, or completed buildings. New provision should be planned early enough to shape masterplanning, local centres, phasing, stewardship and long-term revenue.
- **Contribute:** Development may contribute to off-site facilities, shared-use improvements or area project pipelines where this is the most effective and proportionate response. Contributions should be linked to a defined facility, catchment, project or area priority, and should support practical improvements such as extension, fit-out, access, kitchens, storage, acoustic treatment, energy works, community development, early activation or management capacity. Contributions should be spendable, lawful, clearly monitored and related to the development population or impact.

5.4.2 Council-approved action plans and communities-team project lists should also be taken into account when developing Community Plans, site schedules, planning obligations, CIL discussions and local project pipelines. These should be treated as living documents that identify current local projects, facility priorities and spendable opportunities that off-site, windfall or pooled contributions may be able to support. They can help turn the study’s

evidence into practical delivery priorities without reopening the whole evidence base each time local projects, costs or facility needs change.

5.5 Area priorities across Cambridge City

5.5.1 The area summaries below bring together City community facilities evidence, mapped asset-location data, workshop evidence, planning officer interviews and current draft infrastructure planning evidence. They identify the main community infrastructure issues for each broad city area and provide a practical starting point for Community Plans, site schedules, planning obligation and CIL discussions and local project planning.

Table 5.3. Cambridge City area-based needs and planning implications

Area	Current provision and character	Growth and pressure points	Least well served groups or places	Practical implications
West / Central	Institutionally dense part of the city with major venues, civic buildings, public realm, libraries and other community-facing assets. Provision is generally stronger than in the main gap areas, but access and affordability still matter.	Main pressure comes from intensification, student and worker populations, city-centre uses, and demand on civic and community assets.	Groups who struggle to access or afford city-centre provision; smaller community groups needing affordable rooms; people who need clear information about what can be booked or used.	Focus on better public access to existing civic and community assets, protection of venues that support social life, and smaller flexible provision where intensification creates local gaps.
North	Mixed area of established neighbourhoods, regeneration areas and major future change. The City community facilities evidence identifies important existing centres and assets, including The Meadows, Campkin Road, Brown’s Field and Arbury Community Centre.	<p>North East Cambridge is expected to come forward as a commercially led mixed-use policy area, with around 1,000 homes and significant employment-led change focused around existing campuses and Cambridge North station.</p> <p>There is no immediate prospect of larger planned residential growth at Hartree while Waste Water Treatment Plant relocation funding remains unresolved, although policy</p>	East Chesterton, high-need neighbourhoods close to NEC, young people, and communities with limited easy access to local community space	Test NEC against the development scenario being brought forward. The response should focus on proportionate community-facing space, campus and science-park shared-use opportunities, public-facing outreach space, and links or contributions to Brown’s Field, The Meadows, Campkin Road, Arbury Community Centre and other northern assets where this provides the better planning response

		<p>flexibility may allow residential development if circumstances change.</p> <p>Wider northern neighbourhoods still need visible local anchors, youth-capable space and better links between existing and future provision.</p>		
East	<p>Established neighbourhoods sit alongside newer growth areas and eastern fringe development. The City strategy identified Abbey and Cherry Hinton as gap areas, and officer evidence highlights The Nest in East Barnwell and unresolved stewardship for Springstead Hall.</p>	<p>Main pressure comes from Cambridge East, Marleigh / Springstead, East Barnwell, Cherry Hinton and the surrounding fringe. Growth will add demand to an already uneven network.</p>	<p>East Barnwell / Abbey, Cherry Hinton fringe areas, young people, and people needing informal, affordable and safe places to meet.</p>	<p>Combine new provision in growth areas with strengthened neighbourhood assets. Clarify stewardship for Springstead Hall, recognise The Nest, support Cherry Hinton and East Barnwell provision, and improve links between existing communities and new development.</p>

South	The southern city includes important community assets alongside major institutional and growth areas, including Clay Farm, Trumpington, Queen Edith's and the Biomedical Campus area.	Pressure comes from the interaction between residential growth, institutional growth, worker populations, transport corridors and neighbourhood needs.	Residents living next to major institutional sites, communities needing visible local provision, and users who need accessible and affordable rooms rather than institutional space that feels closed or hard to use.	Strengthen shared use where it is realistic, protect southern community anchors, and make community-facing provision clearer around major institutions and southern growth areas. Address Queen Edith's gap evidence through partnership provision, planning obligations and CIL where appropriate.
-------	---	--	---	---

Table 5.4. Cambridge City: new, enhanced and protected provision by area

Area	New provision to plan for	Existing provision to enhance	Provision to protect
West / Central	Targeted small-scale provision where intensification or mixed-use growth creates a clear local requirement.	Libraries, civic rooms, community venues where clearer access, programming, affordability or fit-out would increase community use.	City-centre and west/central assets that already support a large share of everyday civic and community life.
North	Proportionate community-facing provision in North East Cambridge, reflecting its current commercially led mixed-use role, with ~1,000 homes and significant employment-led change focused around existing campuses and Cambridge North station. There is no immediate prospect of larger planned residential growth at Hartree while Waste Water Treatment Plant relocation funding remains unresolved, although policy flexibility may allow residential development if circumstances change. Requirements should be tested through the latest site policy, Community	Brown's Field, The Meadows, Campkin Road, Akeman Street, Arbury Community Centre, Storey's Field, Darwin Green, scout and guide buildings, faith/community venues and other northern assets that could support more use with refurbishment, fit-out, clearer access, shared use or community development support.	Existing community anchors in high-need northern neighbourhoods, especially where redevelopment, intensification or campus-led change could weaken access or increase pressure on local provision.

	Plan work and links to surrounding northern neighbourhoods.		
East	New or expanded provision linked to Cambridge East and eastern growth areas, with early usable space and clear arrangements for permanent provision.	The Nest, East Barnwell provision, Cherry Hinton provision, Springstead Hall, local faith/community venues, scout/cadet buildings and community rooms that can support more local use.	Existing eastern assets that support everyday community life and specialist support, especially in Abbey, Cherry Hinton and fringe neighbourhoods.
South	New or expanded community-facing provision where southern growth or institutional expansion creates demand that the current network cannot absorb.	Clay Farm, Trumpington and other southern hubs, community rooms and dual-use spaces where access, booking, storage, kitchens or programming can be improved.	Existing southern community anchors that provide accessible local space and should remain community-facing as growth continues.

5.6 Planning considerations for Cambridge City

5.6.1 New development in Cambridge City should be assessed against the existing community infrastructure network and local access, capacity and stewardship issues. A floorspace figure will not be enough on its own. Community Plans should identify the local centre/anchor people will use, rooms and functions required, the expected phasing, the stewardship route, the relationship to existing Council-supported and community-led assets, and any off-site improvements or revenue support needed to make the wider network work better.

5.6.2 Where growth is large or place-forming, especially at North East Cambridge and Cambridge East, new community provision should be secured through site allocations, masterplans and planning obligations. The response should identify any on-site facility required, how it connects to surrounding neighbourhoods, what early or meanwhile provision is needed, and how long-term stewardship will be secured.

5.6.3 Some forms of community infrastructure are sometimes better delivered through off-site investment in an existing or area-wide facility, rather than through a new room within each individual development. This is particularly relevant for specialist, trusted or catchment-based provision, including youth provision, faith-sensitive space, women's and safe group spaces, advice and support services, food and community resilience infrastructure, culturally specific provision, and support for groups that need privacy, safeguarding, specialist management or trusted access.

5.6.4 Where this is the right response, development is expected to contribute to off-site provision if there is evidence that the facility or project serves the development catchment, meets an identified community infrastructure need, or provides a more effective and sustainable response than on-site provision. This includes extension, refurbishment, fit-out, accessibility works, storage, catering facilities, safeguarding, digital access, energy efficiency, management support or early activation of existing community assets.

5.6.5 Off-site contributions should be linked to a defined project, facility, catchment or area project pipeline. They should be supported by evidence of need, deliverability, stewardship and community access, and secured through the appropriate planning mechanism. Any planning obligation must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.

5.6.6 This approach is particularly important in Cambridge City and other established areas where growth, windfall development, regeneration, estate renewal or intensification may place pressure on existing community infrastructure. In those cases, the most appropriate planning response may be to strengthen an existing community centre, faith/community asset, youth facility, women's or specialist support space, shared civic building or other trusted local provision.

5.6.7 Draft IDP and draft Local Plan material should be read as current planning context. The findings in this study provide further detail on what community infrastructure should

mean in city neighbourhoods, how local evidence should be tested, and how provision should be secured through Community Plans, site schedules, planning obligations and later guidance.

6. South Cambridgeshire community infrastructure context

6.1 A distributed network of village, parish and growth-area provision

6.1.1 South Cambridgeshire has a broad and dispersed community infrastructure network. Community life is often held through village halls, community centres, parish rooms, faith spaces, schools with community use, scout and guide buildings, sports pavilions, libraries, food support, women's spaces, youth spaces and other local civic assets. This creates a different planning context from Cambridge City. In many places, a single building or a small group of local assets may carry a large share of community activity.

6.1.2 The strongest evidence for South Cambridgeshire combines three sources. South Cambridgeshire community facilities evidence gives detailed information on primary-use indoor community facilities, including quantity, quality, accessibility, management and costs. Mapped asset-location data shows the wider network around those facilities. Workshop evidence and officer interviews explain how provision works in practice, especially in new settlements and places where old and new communities need to be better connected.

6.1.3 These sources need to be read together. A parish with an audited village hall may still need investment in quality, access, kitchens, storage or energy efficiency. A growth area with temporary space may still need a permanent centre, early hosted activity and a clear stewardship route. A smaller village with limited formal provision may rely on a valued shared asset that needs protection and support.

6.2 Mapped assets and settlement patterns

6.2.1 Mapped asset-location data records 517 geolocated community-facing or contextual entries across South Cambridgeshire. The largest mapped categories are faith spaces, schools and school-linked community spaces, village halls, women's spaces, sports pavilions, scout and guide buildings, community centres, food aid and food support, libraries, youth spaces, other community-facing assets and leisure/sport context entries. The data gives a wider view than the audited facilities study because it includes shared and specialist assets as well as primary-use community facilities.

6.2.2 Places with the largest number of mapped entries include Sawston, Cottenham, Cambourne, Histon and Impington, Waterbeach, Fulbourn, Linton, Comberton, Melbourn, Girton, Northstowe and Willingham. These figures help identify clusters and possible gaps.

Table 6.1. South Cambridgeshire mapped asset-location baseline by type

Asset type	Mapped entries
Community centres	32
Village halls	76
Faith spaces	144
Schools and school-linked community spaces	79
Libraries	19

Youth spaces	18
Women's spaces	36
Food aid and food support	24
Scout and guide buildings	33
Other community-facing assets	12
Sports pavilions	35
Leisure/sport context entries	9
Total Mapped Entries	517

6.3 Audited facilities, quality and settlement-scale pressure

6.3.1 South Cambridgeshire community facilities evidence provides the main audited evidence on primary-use indoor community facilities. It was commissioned by South Cambridgeshire District Council and prepared by Cambridgeshire ACRE. It included town and parish council consultation, physical audits of community facilities and facility manager questionnaires. The parish council response rate was 90%, and the facility manager response rate was 93%.

Table 6.2. Headline South Cambridgeshire community facilities evidence

Theme	Evidence	Implication for this study
Quantity	The audit identified 20,860 square metres of functional indoor community floorspace, equal to 129 square metres per 1,000 population. District-wide provision is close to the proposed benchmark, with a small calculated current shortfall of 53 square metres.	The 129 square metres per 1,000 population benchmark is a useful starting point for new provision and contributions. Local context still needs to shape the final response.
Quality	Of 93 audited facilities, 64 were rated Good or Excellent, 25 Average and 4 Poor. Many management committees have undertaken refurbishment, and many plan further works.	Investment in quality, maintenance, energy efficiency, kitchens, toilets, storage and accessibility can be as important as new floorspace.
Accessibility	Most villages have some access to facilities, but the study identifies places where access is poor or where no dedicated indoor facility is recorded. Teversham is the only village with more than 2,000 people and no dedicated indoor community facility.	Community Plans should test whether residents can reach, afford and use provision, especially in larger settlements and growth-edge locations.

New settlements	Northstowe, Waterbeach New Town, Bourn Airfield and Cambourne require bespoke provision. The evidence identifies temporary, planned and S106-secured provision across these places.	New settlements need phased plans for early usable space, permanent provision, community access agreements and long-term stewardship.
Management and finance	Many facilities depend on volunteers and local fundraising. The study identifies pressure around running costs, volunteer recruitment, maintenance and access to planning obligation funding information.	Planning obligations should address operating assumptions, maintenance, start-up support, access, affordability and local project pipelines.

6.3.2 The largest calculated shortfalls are concentrated in larger settlements and growth locations. The South Cambridgeshire study identifies shortfalls in Histon and Impington, Cambourne, Sawston, Waterbeach, Melbourn, Great Shelford, Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth and other larger settlements. These figures need local testing because secondary-use spaces, schools, churches, sports clubs and social clubs may also provide community rooms. Their role depends on reliable access, affordability, governance and suitability.

6.3.3 New settlements and major growth locations need a planned response. Northstowe has a permanent facility delivered as part of phase 1 of the development and a school dual use. Waterbeach New Town has interim provision and planned permanent facilities linked to occupation triggers. Bourn Airfield has obligations for a new community centre. Cambourne has existing provision, planning-obligation-secured contributions for The Hub, youth provision and community access to school facilities.

6.4 Area priorities across South Cambridgeshire

6.4.1 The area summaries below bring forward the useful area-based material from the earlier draft and update it against the current South Cambridgeshire facilities evidence, mapped asset-location data, workshop evidence, planning officer interviews and draft infrastructure planning evidence. The areas are broad and should be used as planning prompts, with final delivery boundaries shaped by local evidence and project geography.

Table 6.3. South Cambridgeshire area-based needs and planning implications

Area	Current provision and character	Growth and pressure points	Least well served groups or places	Practical implications
North	Broad rural and small-town network of village halls, faith spaces, schools and other parish-scale assets. Provision is present across much of the area, with larger growth locations needing a clearer planned response.	Strongest pressure from Northstowe, Waterbeach and the wider northern growth corridor. Workshop evidence highlights the need for visible hubs, shared anchors, early provision and stronger links between old and new communities.	Residents in the largest new-settlement locations where social infrastructure is still forming; existing villages where provision is relied on heavily or clustered away from new growth.	Secure town- and settlement-scale anchors in the main growth locations. Strengthen nearby village-scale assets. Plan early usable space and practical links between existing and new communities.
South East	Mixed geography of established villages, heritage assets, eastern fringe locations and strategic employment or growth areas. Provision varies across villages and growth-edge places. Teversham is a specific cross-boundary issue because it has no dedicated indoor community facility in the South Cambridgeshire audit and sits close to Cambridge East, Marleigh and Springstead.	Pressure comes from Grange Farm, Wellcome Genome Campus, the eastern Cambridge fringe, Fen Ditton, Teversham and links with Cambridge East, Marleigh and Springstead. Community infrastructure planning should recognise that residents may use facilities across the City / South Cambridgeshire boundary where catchments, movement routes and existing provision overlap.	Teversham, eastern fringe communities, young people, non-drivers, and places where village and growth-site provision could develop separately.	Test the relationship between Teversham, the eastern fringe and Cambridge East through Community Plans, site schedules and planning obligations. Where evidence shows that Cambridge East growth would place pressure on Teversham or eastern-fringe assets, or that those assets provide the best shared response, consider off-site contributions, shared-use arrangements or access improvements, subject to the normal planning obligation tests. Strengthen village-scale assets and avoid separate provision that

				does not connect existing and new communities.
South West	Strong parish-based geography with many village-scale assets, dispersed settlements and rural access issues. Community infrastructure is spread across local halls, schools, faith/community buildings and civic assets.	Major pressure comes from Cambourne North and the wider Cambourne area, alongside other committed or planned growth in the south-west. Cambourne has existing provision and secured investment, but further growth will increase demand and widen the area that provision needs to serve. Some rural settlements may relate more strongly to nearby city-fringe growth or local village assets than to Cambourne, so catchments should be tested locally.	Cambourne, Cambourne North and nearby growth locations; smaller rural settlements where existing assets may be fragile, isolated or dependent on volunteers; places where the nearest practical community infrastructure relationship may be with the city fringe or a local village asset.	Plan Cambourne and Cambourne North as a wider town network, with neighbourhood provision, youth-capable space, accessible local rooms and investment in existing facilities where they will serve growth. Use local catchment testing to decide whether smaller settlements should be linked to Cambourne, city-fringe provision or village-scale assets. Use pooled contributions where smaller growth adds pressure to existing halls and local anchors.

Table 6.4. South Cambridgeshire: new, enhanced and protected provision by area

Area	New provision to plan for	Existing provision to enhance	Provision to protect
------	---------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------

North	New and growing settlement hubs in Northstowe and Waterbeach, with early usable space before permanent build-out is complete.	Existing civic and community assets in and around Northstowe, Waterbeach and northern villages, especially where fit-out, storage, booking, kitchens, accessibility or shared use would help them work harder.	Village-scale and neighbourhood-scale assets that already act as local anchors and would be difficult to replace if weakened or lost.
South East	New or shared provision in and around major growth locations where current community infrastructure is weak or growth creates a clear change in demand, including Teversham, the eastern fringe and links to Cambridge East.	Teversham and eastern-fringe assets, local halls, school-linked spaces, faith/community venues, pavilions and other mapped assets that could play a stronger role if upgraded, made more accessible or better connected to surrounding growth.	Community-facing assets in villages and edge-of-City locations that already support everyday social life and may come under greater pressure as Cambridge East, Teversham and eastern-fringe growth relationships develop.
South West	Multi-use community infrastructure in Cambourne and Cambourne North, distributed so provision is visible and usable across neighbourhoods, with local testing of how wider rural settlements relate to Cambourne, city-fringe provision or village-scale assets.	Cambourne facilities, village halls, community buildings, pavilions and other local assets across the wider south-west rural cluster where refurbishment, extension, energy efficiency, kitchens, storage or stronger shared use would increase capacity.	Village-scale assets that carry local community life in smaller settlements and may become more important as surrounding growth increases pressure.

6.5 Stewardship, revenue and volunteer capacity

6.5.1 South Cambridgeshire's community infrastructure network depends heavily on local volunteering, charitable management and parish-level stewardship. This is a strength because many buildings are locally rooted and well understood. It also creates risk where facilities depend on small committees, unpaid trustees, local fundraising and rising operating costs.

6.5.2 South Cambridgeshire facilities evidence shows that many buildings are active, valued and in need of investment. Management committees report pressures around running costs, energy efficiency, repairs, volunteer recruitment, maintenance and match funding. Discounted hire supports access and reduces unrestricted income. This matters for planning because new and improved facilities need realistic operating arrangements alongside capital funding.

6.5.3 Investment in existing provision should form part of the planning response. Extensions, refurbishment, accessibility improvements, kitchens, storage, heating, energy efficiency, booking systems and support for volunteer-led management can all increase practical capacity. This is especially important where smaller developments add cumulative pressure and are best handled through improvements to existing local assets.

6.6 Planning considerations for South Cambridgeshire

6.6.1 In smaller villages and established settlements, the most proportionate planning response will often be support for existing provision. This may include contributions to extensions, refurbishment, accessibility, kitchens, storage, heating, energy efficiency, booking systems or other changes that increase capacity and usability.

6.6.2 In larger settlements, towns and new communities, the response may need to combine new provision, improved existing provision and shared-use agreements. Large new settlements should be treated as bespoke cases, with clear phasing, early usable space, permanent provision, community access agreements, stewardship arrangements and review points linked to growth.

6.6.3 Community Plans should test what already exists, what is genuinely accessible, what is under pressure and what kind of provision would work best. In South Cambridgeshire, this means asking whether the available network is visible, affordable, flexible, well managed and able to serve existing residents and new communities.

6.6.4 The evidence also supports a stronger area-based approach to contributions. Smaller developments can add pressure to halls, libraries, community rooms, faith spaces, youth provision and other local anchors, with those pressures best handled through an area-based investment response. A clear project pipeline would make it easier to direct contributions to agreed local priorities and to show how cumulative growth is supporting improvements to community infrastructure.

6.6.5 This would require a follow-on delivery task. The task should create and maintain area project pipelines for South Cambridgeshire, using the community facilities evidence, mapped asset-location data, parish and town council input, existing planning obligations, CIL records, known facility priorities and growth assumptions. Each pipeline should identify

the catchment, facility or project, need being addressed, proposed works, estimated cost, delivery lead, funding gap, planning link, spendability and review date. The pipeline should then be reviewed regularly through infrastructure monitoring, so that it remains current and usable for planning obligations, CIL, Neighbourhood CIL and local project planning.

7. Greater Cambridge Community Infrastructure Needs

7.1 How need has been assessed

7.1.1 Community infrastructure need in Greater Cambridge varies by place, scale, function and timing. The assessment draws on mapped asset-location data, workshop evidence, officer interviews, resident survey evidence, community facilities evidence for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire, demographic evidence, and current draft infrastructure planning evidence.

7.1.2 Mapped asset-location data provides a shared baseline of community-facing assets across Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire. It shows a broad network of facilities, including community centres, village halls, faith spaces, libraries, schools with community use, youth spaces, women's and specialist support spaces, and other community-facing assets. The data also shows clustering, gaps, uneven distribution and categories where local validation remains important.

7.1.3 The mapping baseline has clear limits. A map location confirms where an asset is recorded. Further local evidence is needed to understand access, affordability, availability for community use, suitability for different groups, ease of booking, maintenance and financial security. The assessment combines asset locations with the practical conditions that affect whether those assets work for communities.

7.1.4 Workshop evidence adds practical and lived insight. Participants described community infrastructure as the combination of place, provision and the people who make it work. Repeated themes included visible welcome, community connectors, youth and teen provision, early provision in new developments, non-car access, flexible rooms, kitchens, storage, affordable use, and ongoing revenue to animate and steward spaces.

7.1.5 Draft infrastructure planning evidence provides a quantified starting point. It currently uses a benchmark of 129 square metres of indoor community space per 1,000 additional residents and identifies additional community centre floorspace and costs linked to planned growth. This study uses those figures as current planning assumptions and tests them against mapped provision, community facilities evidence, workshop evidence and officer interviews. The findings are intended to inform the Local Plan, draft IDP, site schedules, planning obligations and future guidance.

7.1.6 Community facilities evidence for South Cambridgeshire is especially useful because it assesses quantity, quality and accessibility together. Cambridge City evidence is also important because it shows an established urban network, a history of evidence-led investment, and a need to plan community centres alongside deprivation, growth, service delivery and changing management models. These local evidence sources help keep the needs analysis grounded in the different conditions across the two districts.

7.2 Needs by scale

7.2.1 Community infrastructure operates at several scales. Some needs are local and should be met close to where people live. Some facilities serve a wider city, district or Greater Cambridge catchment. A clear scale of need helps decide what should be delivered on site, what should be improved nearby, and what should be planned through wider infrastructure funding.

7.2.2 Local need is the most common planning issue. It covers the everyday spaces that help people meet, organise, access support and build confidence in a place. This includes community hubs, village halls, local meeting rooms, youth-capable space, library-based community space, faith spaces with active community use, food-enabled community space and welcoming front doors into local community life.

7.2.3 City-wide and district-wide need is different. It includes facilities that serve several neighbourhoods, rural catchments or settlement clusters. These may include larger shared hubs, libraries, youth and family provision, specialist support spaces, community spaces, and assets that help smaller places share capacity across a wider area.

7.2.4 Greater Cambridge-wide and wider needs include more specialised provision, larger civic assets, strategic community, and facilities linked to major movement patterns, large employment locations or major growth corridors. These needs are usually best planned through wider strategies, pooled funding or partnership delivery, with site contributions where appropriate.

Table 7.1. Scales of community infrastructure need

Scale of need	What it covers	Typical planning response
Local	Everyday meeting, support, youth-capable, faith/community, library, food-enabled and flexible space that people can use close to home.	On-site provision on larger sites; direct improvement to nearby facilities; clear early provision where growth starts before permanent facilities are ready.
City-wide or district-wide	Facilities serving several neighbourhoods, villages or settlement clusters, including larger hubs, libraries, youth/family provision and specialist support space.	Area-based priorities; pooled contributions; investment in existing facilities where a single site is too small for a standalone building.
Greater Cambridge-wide	Facilities and networks that support wider participation, community activity, cross-boundary movement patterns and larger growth locations.	Strategic infrastructure planning, pooled CIL and planning obligations, partnership funding and site schedules for major growth areas.
Wider or specialist	Specialist, civic, community or support provision with a larger catchment.	Recognition in wider planning and infrastructure programmes, with contributions where a direct relationship to growth can be shown.

7.3 Needs by place type

7.3.1 Greater Cambridge contains several different community infrastructure contexts. Cambridge City has a dense urban network with a mix of Council-supported community centres, community-managed facilities, libraries, faith spaces, schools, youth provision, food and support spaces, and local civic assets. South Cambridgeshire has a dispersed

network of village halls, parish facilities, faith spaces, community centres, libraries, schools and growth-area provision across a much larger rural district.

7.3.2 Cambridge City needs should be understood through both existing provision and growth pressure. Community centres evidence identifies a long-running role for centres in connecting Council services, residents and communities, particularly in areas with higher need. City provision also needs to respond to new and changing growth areas, including Cambridge East, North East Cambridge, the northern fringe, Cherry Hinton, Trumpington, Eddington and other urban growth locations.

7.3.3 South Cambridgeshire needs sit strongly in the existing network. Community facilities evidence identifies 20,860 square metres of functional indoor community floorspace across the audited district facilities, equivalent to 129 square metres per 1,000 residents. The same evidence identifies local differences in quality, accessibility and quantity, which means some places need investment even where district-wide provision appears close to the benchmark.

7.3.4 New settlements and strategic growth sites need a stronger early response. Northstowe, Waterbeach, Cambourne North, Bourn Airfield, Grange Farm, Cambridge East and North East Cambridge all raise questions of timing, anchors, phasing, movement, stewardship and whole-site build-out. Workshop evidence from Northstowe and Waterbeach highlighted the importance of visible hubs, early usable space, social connectors and provision that can adapt as communities form.

7.3.5 Smaller sites and windfalls create cumulative pressure. They will often be too small to support standalone new buildings. They still add demand to the local network. In many places, the practical response will be improvement, extension, fit-out, accessibility upgrades, kitchen and storage improvements, shared-use agreements, or pooled contributions to facilities that already serve the area.

Table 7.2. Needs by place type

Place type	Main needs	Likely response
Cambridge City neighbourhoods and urban growth areas	Maintain and improve a dense, uneven network; protect accessible community-facing space; plan for growth pressure; strengthen youth, support, food and flexible provision where need is highest.	Use City community centres evidence, mapped asset-location data and officer evidence to guide site schedules, Community Plans and area priorities.
South Cambridgeshire villages and rural centres	Sustain a dispersed network of halls, parish assets, faith spaces and shared-use facilities; address quality, accessibility and transport barriers; support adaptation as villages grow.	Use community facilities evidence to identify quantity, quality and accessibility priorities; direct smaller-site contributions towards local project pipelines.
New settlements and strategic growth areas	Provide visible anchors, early usable space, held capacity, youth-capable provision, food/kitchen capability, and clear	Require Community Plans, site schedules, phasing triggers, early provision and long-term operator/stewardship planning.

	stewardship before local need becomes acute.	
Employment-led and campus locations	Support workers, visitors and nearby communities through social, , wellbeing and everyday amenity space, especially where sites function as large daily destinations.	Assess community infrastructure through site-specific evidence, movement patterns and links to nearby communities.
Smaller sites and windfalls	Address cumulative pressure on existing provision, especially where assets are thin, ageing, hard to access or already heavily used.	Use pooled contributions, facility upgrades, accessibility works, fit-out, shared-use improvements and area-based priorities.

7.4 Needs by function

7.4.1 The evidence points to a set of recurring functional needs. These sit alongside floorspace and help define whether provision will work in practice. They should be considered in Community Plans, site schedules, local project pipelines and future guidance.

7.4.2 Welcome and visibility are central. Workshop evidence repeatedly highlighted the value of a clear front door, visible hosting, simple information about what is available, and spaces where people feel expected and comfortable. This is especially important for new arrivals, people with low confidence using formal services, and people who are socially isolated.

7.4.3 Youth and teen provision is a clear recurring need. Workshop evidence identified “somewhere to go” for teenagers as a persistent gap, often linked to transport, affordability and the location of secondary schools. Youth-capable provision needs to include appropriate rooms, informal space, safe access, affordable programming, storage and opening times that match how young people use space.

7.4.4 Food and kitchen capability should be treated as part of the practical specification for many larger community spaces. Workshop evidence distinguished between refreshment-making and kitchens that can support community meals, cooking clubs, food projects, mutual aid, events, enterprise and income-generating activity. Larger hubs and halls will usually need kitchens, storage, safe operating arrangements and management capacity to support this kind of use.

7.4.5 Flexible rooms, storage and booking arrangements are also recurring needs. A community building can have enough space on paper and still be hard to use if rooms are the wrong size, storage is missing, safeguarding arrangements are unclear, booking systems are difficult, costs are high, or access depends on a small number of overstretched volunteers.

7.4.6 Acoustic tolerance should be treated as a core functional need for community centres and larger shared community spaces. Community buildings need to support normal active uses, including celebrations, children’s parties, exercise classes, music sessions, choirs,

faith activity, performances and larger group gatherings. Where community space is placed within, next to or directly below housing, acoustic design, ventilation, servicing, entrances, hours of use and planning conditions need to be considered early. If noise limits are set too tightly at planning stage, the space may be unable to host a normal range of community uses, even where the floorspace has technically been provided. Main community centres and larger shared community spaces should not be placed within, below or immediately next to housing unless the design, servicing, ventilation, access and planning conditions allow normal community-centre activity in practice. Where those conditions cannot be met, a standalone, better-separated or off-site provision route may provide the stronger planning response.

7.4.7 Shared use needs practical detail. Schools, faith buildings, libraries, sports pavilions and other assets can all support community life where community access is real and well managed. Shared use needs clear arrangements for access, safeguarding, opening hours, costs, cleaning, insurance, booking, staffing and responsibility. Where those arrangements are weak, shared use should be treated as potential capacity until agreements make community access clear.

Table 7.3. Functional needs to test in Community Plans and site schedules

Functional need	What to test	Why it matters
Welcome and visibility	Front door, hosting, information, outreach, confidence to enter, visible invitation to use the space.	Helps people find and use provision, especially new arrivals and people with low confidence or limited networks.
Youth and teen provision	Youth-capable rooms, informal space, affordable sessions, safe access, storage, opening times and transport links.	Responds to a recurring gap identified through workshops and officer feedback.
Food and kitchen capability	Kitchen quality, storage, extraction, permissions, insurance, food safety arrangements and links to community meals or food projects.	Enables social connection, health, affordability, enterprise and community-led activity.
Flexibility and storage	Room sizes, subdivision, equipment storage, bookability, access controls and adaptability over time.	Allows provision to serve different groups and changing demographics.
Access and affordability	Walking, cycling and public transport access; disability access; hire costs; free or subsidised use; social accessibility.	Determines whether mapped provision is usable for the people most likely to need it.
Stewardship and revenue	Operator model, staffing, maintenance, programming, community development roles and long-term running costs.	Keeps facilities active, affordable and accountable after they are built or improved.
Acoustic tolerance	Whether the space can support normal community-centre activity, including celebrations, exercise, music, choirs,	A community centre can meet the floorspace requirement on paper but fail in practice if

and active use	youth activity, faith activity and larger group gatherings. Test acoustic separation, ventilation, entrances, servicing, hours of use and any likely planning-condition limits, especially where space sits within, next to or below housing.	noise limits prevent normal community use. Acoustic and operational requirements need to be designed in early, before layout, specification and planning conditions are fixed.
----------------	---	--

7.5 Needs linked to growth and timing

7.5.1 Timing is a major part of community infrastructure need. Major sites can take many years to build out, while residents begin forming social patterns from the point they move in. Workshop evidence repeatedly highlighted the gap between first occupation and usable community space. Planning officer interviews raised the same issue through examples where specifications, stewardship or operational assumptions were fixed too early or addressed too late.

7.5.2 Early provision should be planned as a real part of delivery. It may take the form of a temporary room, meanwhile use, a staffed community development base, an early hub, a school or faith space with secured community access, or pre-serviced space that can be activated quickly. The key requirements are visibility, affordability, availability, hosting and a clear route from interim provision to permanent provision.

7.5.3 Held capacity is also important. Long-term sites need enough safeguarded land, floorspace or adaptable building capacity to respond to the community that emerges. This helps avoid facilities being designed too tightly around early assumptions and gives councils, operators and communities more room to respond as demographics, travel patterns, employment patterns and service needs become clearer.

7.5.4 Draft infrastructure planning evidence provides a current quantified baseline for plan-period need. It should be used alongside whole-site build-out evidence on strategic sites so that long-term community infrastructure remains visible where only part of the development will be completed by 2045. Community Plans and site schedules should show both the immediate phase response and the longer-term path to permanent provision.

7.6 Needs for groups at greater risk of exclusion

7.6.1 Community infrastructure need is experienced unevenly. Workshop evidence repeatedly identified low-income households, young people, older residents, new arrivals, people with limited mobility, non-drivers and people with low confidence using formal institutions as groups more likely to face barriers to provision.

7.6.2 Demographic evidence points to continued growth in both older and younger populations. Housing needs evidence identifies substantial projected growth in the population aged 65 and over, and significant absolute growth in the under-16 population over the plan period. These changes will place different demands on local meeting space, accessible design, family and youth provision, social support, intergenerational activities and spaces that can adapt over time.

7.6.3 Resident survey evidence adds further context. The survey tested importance and access across themes including sense of community, community buildings, healthy play

and leisure, active travel, local healthcare and affordable healthy food. The survey responses were unevenly distributed across demographic groups, so the findings should be read alongside workshop evidence, officer evidence and local facility data.

7.6.4 Accessibility should be understood broadly. Physical access matters, including step-free access, toilets, safe routes and transport. Financial access also matters, especially where commercial “third places” require spending. Social access is equally important: people need to know a space exists, understand how to use it, feel welcome, and trust that the space is for them.

7.6.5 Women’s and specialist support spaces, youth spaces and faith spaces need careful handling. They are part of the agreed scope where they function as community infrastructure. Public-facing detail should be proportionate and sensitive where safety, safeguarding or confidentiality is relevant. The needs analysis should recognise these forms of provision without exposing sensitive services or relying on mapped locations alone.

7.7 Summary of planning and delivery implications

7.7.1 The needs analysis points to a clear planning response. Greater Cambridge needs to plan for enough community space, in the right places, with the practical features, access, early delivery and stewardship needed for that space to work.

7.7.2 The 129 square metre per 1,000 residents benchmark remains a useful starting point for quantifying growth-related need in South Cambridgeshire; and also represents an appropriate starting point for assessing need in Cambridge. It should be applied with local evidence on existing provision, quality, accessibility, place type, growth phase, and the practical functions required in each location.

7.7.3 Community Plans should be used on strategic and qualifying large sites to test mapped provision, identify local and wider needs, distinguish on-site and off-site responses, set early provision, define functional requirements, and confirm stewardship arrangements. They should also address youth and teen provision, food/kitchen capability, shared use, access, affordability and review points.

7.7.4 Windfall, regeneration, estate renewal, mixed-use intensification, student and worker growth, institutional expansion and district-centre redevelopment can all add pressure to community infrastructure. These forms of growth may not require a new on-site community facility in every case, but they should still be assessed where they increase demand on local centres, shared civic assets, faith/community spaces, youth provision, food and advice infrastructure, or other trusted local provision.

7.7.5 Smaller allocations and windfall development should make proportionate contributions where they add pressure to an identified local need, where existing provision needs improvement to serve the development population, or where an area project pipeline provides a lawful, proportionate and deliverable route for mitigation. Contributions should be linked to a named facility, defined catchment, spendable project or agreed area pipeline, rather than treated as a general payment.

7.7.6 Regeneration and redevelopment should also test whether existing formal or informal community use would be lost, displaced or made harder to access. Where this is the case, the planning response should protect, re-provide or enhance the existing community function. This may include better replacement space, fit-out, accessibility works, storage,

kitchen capability, safeguarding, management support, shared-use agreements, early activation or contribution to a nearby facility that serves the same catchment.

7.7.7 Monitoring should cover delivery, use, access, affordability and stewardship.

Floorspace and financial contributions provide part of the picture. Greater Cambridge will also need to know whether spaces are open, used, affordable, accessible, visible, well managed and able to adapt as communities change.

8. Community Plans

8.1 Purpose of Community Plans

8.1.1 Draft Policy WS/NC Meeting the needs of new and growing communities in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan provides the main policy trigger for detailed community needs assessment and community, cultural and sports strategies. It applies to proposals of at least 200 residential units, cumulative residential development of at least 200 units, or at least 5,000 sqm of employment floorspace. For community infrastructure, this study recommends that the Community Plan is used as the practical document for bringing that evidence and delivery response together.

8.1.2 For sites that meet this threshold, Community Plans should be the main mechanism for determining what community provision applicable proposals should provide. It should use the findings of this study as an initial framework, including the baseline mapping to guide site-specific planning, delivery and stewardship requirements for applicable developments.

8.1.3 A Community Plan is a practical delivery document. It should explain how a development will meet the community infrastructure needs it generates, how it will relate to existing provision nearby, what will be delivered on site, what will be funded or supported off site, and how community infrastructure will be activated, managed and reviewed over time.

8.1.4 Community Plans should help development officers, infrastructure teams, community services, service providers, developers and communities work from a shared and transparent basis. They should reduce ambiguity by setting out, in one place, the evidence, engagement, proposed provision, delivery route, phasing and long-term stewardship arrangements for the community infrastructure associated with a site.

8.1.5 The Community Plan should be evidence-led. It should respond to the needs identified through this study and through up-to-date site-specific assessment and engagement. It should not restate policy requirements or provide a generic statement of community benefit.

8.1.6 Community Plans will be particularly important for strategic growth areas, large mixed-use sites, sites that will create new neighbourhoods or local centres, larger employment-led developments, and sites where development will place material additional demand on existing community facilities. For sites below the Policy WS/NC thresholds, officers should use the same headings proportionately where local evidence shows a material community infrastructure issue, such as pressure on a nearby facility, loss or replacement of existing provision, cumulative growth, weak local access, or a need for early provision, specialist provision or off-site contribution.

8.2 Relationship between the Community Plan and Community Needs Assessment

8.2.1 Where a Community Plan is prepared, the Community Needs Assessment should sit within the Community Plan and should not be treated as a separate or parallel requirement.

8.2.2 The Community Needs Assessment is the evidence component of the Community Plan. It should identify the likely community infrastructure needs generated by the

development, taking account of the scale and phasing of growth, the expected population, the needs of different demographic groups, existing facilities nearby, gaps in provision, access barriers, and relevant local strategies.

8.2.3 The wider Community Plan should then show how those needs will be met. This includes the proposed mix of on-site provision, off-site contributions, early or interim provision, stewardship arrangements and review points.

8.2.4 This integrated approach should make the Community Plan easier to use and update. Where local needs, population assumptions, phasing or delivery arrangements change materially, the Community Plan can be reviewed without reopening the whole Local Plan policy framework.

8.3 What a Community Plan should include

8.3.1 A Community Plan should be proportionate to the scale and complexity of the development. For larger and more complex sites, it should include the full set of components in Table 8.1. For smaller sites where a full Community Plan is not required, the same headings can be used in a lighter-touch way to structure developer submissions and planning obligations.

8.3.2 Community Plans should use a protect, enhance, provide and contribute logic: protect existing assets where they already serve an important community role; enhance facilities where improvement is the right response; provide new on-site space where growth creates a clear local need; and contribute to off-site facilities or area project pipelines where that is more effective and proportionate.

Table 8.1. Core components of a Community Plan

Component	What it should cover	Why it matters
1. Site and community context	The site's location, existing communities nearby, relevant local centres, existing community facilities, movement links, planned growth and known local issues.	Grounds the plan in the real place, not a geographic boundary.
2. Community Needs Assessment	The needs generated by the development, including population growth, demographic mix, existing capacity, accessibility, quality, suitability and gaps in provision.	Provides the evidence base for what the development should deliver or fund.
3. Engagement and local intelligence	Engagement with existing communities, emerging communities where possible, service providers, community organisations, parish councils where relevant, City or District community teams and other stakeholders.	Ensures the plan reflects lived experience and operational knowledge

4. Community infrastructure vision	The intended role of community infrastructure within the place: local identity, social connection, inclusion, youth provision, access to support, shared activity and links to wider centres.	Helps community infrastructure shape the development, rather than being treated as a residual obligation.
5. Relationship with related infrastructure	How community infrastructure will connect with sport and leisure provision, green infrastructure, play, active travel, health and wellbeing provision, education, libraries and cultural infrastructure, where these affect community access, co-location, shared use, phasing or stewardship.	Helps ensure community facilities are planned as part of a functioning place, while avoiding duplication of the separate evidence bases and strategies that cover those infrastructure types.
6. On-site provision	The land, floorspace, rooms, flexible spaces, community hub, youth-capable space, shared-use facilities, community-facing space or other provision to be delivered within the site.	Secures provision where the development creates a clear local catchment need.
7. Off-site contributions	Contributions to existing facilities, extensions, upgrades, shared facilities or wider community infrastructure serving the development.	Supports the wider network where off-site provision is more effective or accessible than a standalone on-site facility.
8. Early and interim provision	The welcoming, informal, affordable and easy-to-access spaces, meanwhile uses, temporary rooms, hosted activity or community development support available from the early phases of occupation.	Helps people meet, organise and build community life before permanent facilities are delivered.
9. Phasing and triggers	What will be delivered at each phase, with clear links to occupation, floorspace delivery, population thresholds or other measurable triggers.	Prevents community infrastructure being delayed until after need has already arisen.
10. Stewardship and management	Who will own, lease, manage, operate, maintain and programme facilities; how costs will be met; how access will be protected; and how residents and users can shape provision over time.	Ensures facilities remain usable, affordable, active and well-managed after delivery.
11. Funding and viability	Capital cost, fit-out, early activation, revenue support, maintenance, renewal and any income-generating arrangements that support long-term operation.	Avoids securing buildings without a credible route to operation.

12. Review and monitoring	Review points, monitoring indicators, governance arrangements and processes for responding to changes in need, phasing or operator viability.	Allows provision to adapt as the community grows and matures.
---------------------------	---	---

8.4 On-site and off-site provision

8.4.1 Community Plans should distinguish clearly between provision that should be delivered on site and provision that should be supported off site. This distinction is central to making planning obligations workable and proportionate.

8.4.2 On-site provision should normally be expected where a development creates a clear local catchment need. This may include a community anchor or hub, local meeting space, youth-capable provision, community development space, food-enabled community space, flexible rooms, or shared-use facilities that support everyday community life.

8.4.3 Off-site contributions should normally be used where the better planning response is to extend, improve, adapt or support existing provision that already serves the area, or where the facility works at a wider city-wide, district, sub-regional or regional scale.

8.4.4 A hybrid approach will often be appropriate. A large development may need to deliver a local hub on site and also contribute to wider shared infrastructure. A smaller site may not justify a standalone building, but may still need to contribute clearly and proportionately to the community infrastructure network it will rely on.

Table 8.2. Deciding between on-site, off-site and hybrid provision

Delivery route	When it is likely to be appropriate	What the Community Plan should show
On-site provision	The development creates a clear local need; the facility needs to be close to residents or workers; the site is large enough to support a viable facility; early community formation is important.	Location, scale, specification, phasing, access arrangements, delivery trigger, fit-out, operator route and stewardship model.
Off-site contribution	Existing nearby provision can be expanded or improved; an off-site location is more accessible; the need is best met through a wider network; the development's impact is cumulative rather than standalone.	Which facility or priority will be supported, why this is the better response, the contribution mechanism, timing, governance and expected outcome.
Hybrid provision	The development needs local everyday space but also relies on wider facilities; the site will mature over time; needs cannot be fully met	The balance between on-site and off-site provision, how each element relates to identified need, and how delivery will be phased and reviewed.

	through a single building or payment.	
--	---------------------------------------	--

8.5 Phasing, early provision and meanwhile use

8.5.1 Community Plans should set out how community infrastructure will be provided from the early phases of development. Early provision does not always need to be permanent, but it does need to be real, usable and visible to the people moving into or affected by the development.

8.5.2 Early provision may include a temporary community room, meanwhile use of a vacant building, a flexible ground-floor unit, a staffed community development base, access to a school or faith space by agreement, outdoor gathering space with supporting facilities, or hosted activity in an existing nearby facility.

8.5.3 Meanwhile use should be used where it has a clear purpose and a route into later phases. In community infrastructure terms, this could include:

- an early welcoming and affordable meeting place;
- a temporary base for community development and hosted activity;
- an adaptable room or hall that can operate before a permanent hub opens;
- temporary use of vacant land or buildings that begins to build patterns of shared activity and local confidence.

8.5.4 Meanwhile provision should not be used as a substitute for permanent provision where permanent provision is required. The Community Plan should explain the transition from interim or meanwhile provision to permanent facilities, including the trigger for that transition and the arrangements for continuity of activity, community relationships and operator involvement.

8.6 Stewardship, activation and long-term operation

8.6.1 A Community Plan should address stewardship from the outset. It is not enough to identify a building, land parcel or financial contribution. The plan should explain how the provision will be made usable, affordable, active, maintained and responsive to community need over time.

8.6.2 Stewardship arrangements should be proportionate to the scale and type of provision. They may involve council-run facilities, parish-led facilities, community organisations, charitable operators, trusts, community ownership, management companies, hybrid models or carefully structured commercial arrangements. The appropriate model will depend on the place, the facility, the revenue position and the capacity of local partners.

8.6.3 The Community Plan should identify the proposed operator or the process for selecting one. Where the operator is not yet known, the plan should set out a transparent route for operator identification, including the role of the Local Planning Authority, community services teams, existing providers and community stakeholders.

8.6.4 Activation should be treated as part of delivery. This means the practical work that enables a facility to be used well, including hosting, staffing, communications, programming,

booking systems, partnership-building, youth and community development activity, and support for emerging groups.

8.6.5 Where appropriate, Community Plans should consider revenue and income models as well as capital delivery. This may include early-years revenue support, fit-out contributions, maintenance and renewal arrangements, affordable hire policies, shared-use agreements, or income-generating space that supports the long-term viability of community provision.

8.7 Review and monitoring

8.7.1 Community Plans should include review points that allow provision to respond to changing needs. Reviews may be linked to occupation thresholds, phase completion, population changes, opening of major facilities, changes in nearby provision, or evidence that existing facilities are under pressure.

8.7.2 Review should test whether a facility is usable, welcoming and properly stewarded. This should include affordability, accessibility, opening arrangements, room mix, storage, kitchen or food capability where relevant, youth use, community development activity, operator viability, maintenance and whether provision still matches the social mix of the site as it develops.

8.7.3 The review process should identify any required changes to delivery, management, programming, use agreements or future contributions. Where obligations or conditions require formal approval, the Community Plan should make clear how updates will be agreed and who will be responsible for implementing them.

8.8 Securing Community Plans through planning

8.8.1 Community Plans should be prepared early enough to shape site-wide masterplanning, before land use, building footprints and phasing are fixed

8.8.2 The Community Plan should inform the planning application, the heads of terms for any Section 106 agreement, infrastructure delivery planning, phasing conditions, reserved matters where relevant, and any later management or maintenance plans.

8.8.3 Where community infrastructure is secured through planning obligations, the obligations should be specific enough to protect the intended outcome while allowing appropriate flexibility for the Community Plan to respond to changing local need. This is particularly important on long-term strategic sites, where population mix, delivery rates, operator capacity and nearby provision may change over time.

8.8.4 The Community Plan should be treated as both a planning submission document and a live delivery document. Its purpose is to make community infrastructure visible, deliverable and accountable throughout the lifecycle of growth. It should also show how community infrastructure will integrate with related infrastructure where this affects community use, including sport and leisure provision, green infrastructure, play, active travel, health and wellbeing provision, education, libraries and cultural infrastructure.

8.8.5 The Community Plan should not duplicate the separate strategies or evidence that cover those infrastructure types. Its role is to identify the practical interfaces that need to be coordinated through masterplanning, phasing, planning obligations, management plans and review. These may include co-location opportunities, shared access, movement routes,

early provision, stewardship, booking arrangements, community use agreements, and dependencies between community facilities and other local infrastructure.

9. Delivery, stewardship and funding

9.1 Purpose of this section

9.1.1 Community infrastructure delivery in Greater Cambridge depends on clear decisions about what a development should provide or fund, how provision will be phased, who will manage it, and how it will remain affordable and usable over time.

9.1.2 The decision process in Section 2 and Appendix A should be used at pre-application, application and obligations stages. It helps officers and applicants test development scale, existing provision, local access, timing, funding and stewardship before agreeing the community infrastructure response.

9.1.3 This section explains how the outcome of that decision process should be secured through planning obligations, CIL, land or building provision, fit-out, early temporary space, revenue support, community development capacity, management arrangements and monitoring.

9.1.4 Draft infrastructure planning evidence provides a quantified starting point for plan-period growth. It currently identifies 5,787 square metres of additional community space, an estimated capital cost of £23.2 million and £680,000 for start-up operating and management costs. This study uses those figures as current planning assumptions and tests them against mapped provision, local facilities evidence, workshop evidence, officer experience and site-specific judgement.

Table 9.1. Using the decision process to identify the planning response

Decision question	What to test	Likely planning response
What scale of development is proposed?	Small windfall, medium site, major development, strategic allocation, new settlement, employment-led or mixed-use growth.	Scale the response proportionately. Larger and more complex sites usually need a Community Plan and clearer on-site, off-site and stewardship requirements.
Is suitable provision already accessible nearby?	Distance, safe routes, public transport, cost, booking, capacity, quality, opening hours, equipment, safeguarding, welcome and long-term management.	Use existing assets where they can meet need in practice. Secure improvement or expansion where existing provision needs investment.
Can the need be met through improvement of existing assets?	Whether nearby facilities can absorb additional use with extension, refurbishment, access improvements, kitchen, storage, fit-out, energy works or management support.	Use Planning Obligations, CIL, neighbourhood CIL or project-pipeline funding where the improvement serves the development population.

Is new on-site provision needed?	Scale of growth, distance from existing provision, first occupation, long build-out, place centre role, youth need, employment population and cumulative pressure.	Secure land, shell and core, completed building, fit-out, early space, community use agreement and operator route as appropriate.
Is need local, area-wide or strategic?	Whether the facility mainly serves the site, a neighbourhood, a settlement, a district catchment or a wider Greater Cambridge role.	Use on-site provision for local need. Use off-site or pooled funding where existing or planned facilities serve the development catchment.
What stewardship route is realistic?	Owner, operator, lease terms, management body, revenue, maintenance, hire policy, resident voice, review points and handover responsibilities.	Secure a management and maintenance plan, revenue support where needed, community development capacity and monitoring requirements.
What should the legal agreement secure?	The practical items needed to make provision work, including land, floorspace, fit-out, equipment, early activity, revenue, staffing, access and review.	Draft obligations with clear purpose, catchment, eligible spend, indexation, trigger points, fallback routes and reporting.

9.2 Match the response to development scale

9.2.1 Community infrastructure requirements should vary by development scale, local context and the role of nearby assets. The same benchmark can lead to different responses in different places: a contribution to a village hall, an extension to an existing centre, early temporary space, a new on-site hub, or support for a wider network of facilities.

9.2.2 Small and windfall developments are more likely to contribute towards existing or planned provision. Major developments, strategic sites and new settlements are more likely to require on-site provision, safeguarded land or building space, early temporary facilities, Community Plans and long-term stewardship arrangements.

Table 9.2. Typical delivery response by development type

Development type	Typical community infrastructure response	What should be secured or checked
Small and windfall development	Proportionate contribution to existing or planned provision where the development creates additional need and a lawful route exists.	Contribution purpose, catchment, eligible spend, project pipeline, spend period and fallback route.
Medium and major residential development	Contribution to existing assets, new or improved local space, Community Plan where threshold	Community Plan scope, site-specific need, off-site options, timing, facility

	or complexity requires it, and checks on access, affordability and capacity.	specification and management route.
Strategic allocation or new settlement	Whole-site community infrastructure planning, early provision, permanent facilities, phased review and long-term stewardship.	Land, floorspace, shell/core or completed building, fit-out, revenue, community development resource, handover, operator and monitoring.
Employment-led or mixed-use development	Public-facing community space, worker/community amenity, local centre activity, off-site contributions or place-management funding where growth creates wider pressure.	Public access, timing, eligible users, evening/weekend use, links to local communities, BIDs or place-management routes where relevant.
Existing facility serving growth catchment	Investment in extension, access, refurbishment, energy, kitchens, storage, youth-capable rooms, digital booking or management support.	Facility condition, ownership, permissions, deliverability, governance, procurement route, long-term maintenance and community access.

9.3 Use planning routes to secure evidence-led requirements

9.3.1 The evidence in this study identifies the community infrastructure requirements that new development should address. These include local and wider need, existing provision, access, timing, on-site and off-site responses, early provision, stewardship, revenue, management and review.

9.3.2 Planning policy, planning obligations, CIL, conditions, Community Plans and management arrangements should be used to secure those requirements where they are necessary, proportionate and related to the development. Draft Local Plan and draft IDP material provide current planning context, and this study provides further evidence to inform how that framework is applied, refined and monitored.

9.3.3 Development should provide or fund the community infrastructure needed to address the demand it creates and the pressure it places on existing facilities. For some sites, this will mean land, floorspace, a completed building, fit-out, early temporary space, community development capacity, or a management and maintenance plan. For others, it will mean a contribution to an existing facility, a shared-use agreement, an area project pipeline or a wider funding route.

9.3.4 Draft Policy WS/NC Meeting the needs of new and growing communities in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan provides the main policy trigger for a detailed assessment and strategy, including proposals of at least 200 residential units, cumulative residential development of at least 200 units, or at least 5,000 sqm of employment floorspace. In this study, that requirement is translated into the Community Plan route for community infrastructure. Smaller sites may require a lighter-touch Community Infrastructure Statement or officer-recorded assessment where they create a material

community infrastructure issue. This may include cumulative growth, pressure on an identified local facility, loss or replacement of community space, reliance on off-site provision, need for early provision, or specialist, trusted or catchment-based provision. Further detail on expected routes for different types and scales of development is set out in Appendix A.3.

9.3.5 Existing facilities should be protected, enhanced or replaced where development would otherwise reduce the quality, range or accessibility of community provision. New or enhanced provision should be secured where local evidence shows that existing facilities cannot meet the additional need in practice.

9.3.6 Temporary and meanwhile uses should be used where they provide real early community benefit during long build-out, regeneration or phased development. They should have clear access, safety, booking, fit-out, operating and transition arrangements, so that they support early community life while permanent provision is being prepared.

9.3.7 Planning obligations must meet the statutory tests: they must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. This means each requirement should have a clear evidence basis, defined catchment, practical delivery route, eligible spend, trigger, stewardship arrangement and review point.

Table 9.3. Evidence-led requirements and planning mechanisms

Requirement identified by this study	Main planning mechanism	What should be secured
Need generated by development	Planning obligation, CIL, Community Plan, planning condition or direct delivery	Land, floorspace, facility delivery, financial contribution, or a clear statement that existing provision can meet the need.
Community Plan requirement	Community Plan secured through policy, condition, obligation or agreed submission route	Community Needs Assessment, engagement, on-site and off-site provision, early provision, phasing, funding, stewardship, management and review.
On-site community provision	Planning obligation, CIL, Neighbourhood CIL, design code, reserved matters or condition	Land, location, floorspace, building specification, fit-out, trigger, access, operator route, management plan and handover terms.
Off-site investment in existing provision	Planning obligation, site allocation requirement or area project pipeline	Named facility or project pipeline, catchment, eligible works, contribution amount, trigger, indexation, delivery lead and fallback route.

Protection or replacement of existing facilities	Planning policy, planning condition, planning obligation or replacement provision requirement	Evidence of current use, quality and accessibility; replacement or mitigation where loss would reduce local provision.
Early temporary or meanwhile provision	Planning obligation, condition, meanwhile use agreement or management plan	Temporary room or building, opening date, minimum specification, public access, affordability, operator, revenue support and transition to permanent provision.
Access, inclusion and health-related requirements	Community Plan, Health Impact Assessment, design requirements, condition or management plan	Youth-capable space, older people's access, disability access, safe group use, faith-space testing, affordable booking, non-digital information and review.
Stewardship, revenue and maintenance	Planning obligations, management and maintenance plan, lease, transfer agreement or funding agreement	Owner, operator, lease terms, maintenance, lifecycle costs, revenue support, affordable hire, community development capacity, resident voice and review.
Monitoring and review	Planning obligation monitoring clause, Infrastructure Funding Statement, Community Plan review or IDP monitoring	What has been secured, received, spent, delivered, opened, used, reviewed and changed over time.

9.4 Select the right funding route

9.4.1 Funding should be matched to the type of need and the legal or policy route available. Currently, the main funding route for securing site-specific mitigation in Greater Cambridge is through Planning Obligations. The Councils could consider adopting a CIL and Neighbourhood CIL to support in securing cumulative growth and shared area priorities where those funding routes are available and aligned with agreed infrastructure priorities. Wider funding can strengthen stewardship, community ownership or fit-out once the core planning requirement is clear.

9.4.2 Planning obligations are often used where a development needs to provide a named facility, land, floorspace, fit-out, temporary provision, community development support, maintenance funding, or improvements to a nearby facility that serves the development catchment.

9.4.3 Planning obligations, CIL and Neighbourhood CIL can all support improvements to existing facilities, depending on the funding strategy and legal route available. This may include extensions, accessibility improvements, energy works, kitchen upgrades, storage, youth-capable rooms, booking systems, fit-out and refurbishment. These routes work best when linked to a visible, costed and regularly updated area project pipeline.

9.4.4 Business Improvement Districts and other place-management bodies can help in town-centre, employment-led or mixed-use areas where businesses benefit from better public realm, events, safety, visitor experience and local activity. These routes can add local benefit alongside planning obligations needed to make development acceptable.

9.4.5 Community Asset Transfer, long leases, Assets of Community Value and the Community Right to Bid can help protect or move assets into community stewardship. Asset of Community Value status gives a community time to prepare a bid if a listed asset is sold. Community Asset Transfer and long leases need condition surveys, affordable terms, advice, business planning, reserves and clear protection for community access.

9.4.6 Grant funding, philanthropy, social investment and community shares can support fit-out, refurbishment, energy improvements, community-led delivery and income-generating community businesses. They are most useful when the core planning requirement, asset terms and operating model are already clear.

Table 9.4. Funding and finance routes

Funding route	Best used for	Checks before relying on the route
Planning obligations	Site-specific land, buildings, fit-out, temporary space, community development, management support or off-site improvements serving the development catchment.	Statutory tests, purpose, catchment, trigger, spend categories, indexation, fallback route, monitoring and deliverability.
CIL	Area-wide priorities, cumulative growth, upgrades to existing assets and shared facilities serving several developments.	Project pipeline, infrastructure list or spending priority, cost estimate, delivery lead and timing.
Neighbourhood CIL	Local facility improvements, parish priorities, equipment, access, fit-out, kitchens, storage and smaller capital works.	Parish or neighbourhood priority, community support, match funding, delivery capacity and maintenance implications.
Business Improvement Districts / place management	Town-centre, campus or mixed-use activity, public realm, events, safety, visitor experience and shared local services.	Business mandate, levy rules, public access, relationship to planning obligations and long-term management.
Community Asset Transfer / long lease	Community stewardship of council or public assets where community management is viable.	Condition, liabilities, lease terms, business plan, governance, reserves, support needs and public access.
Asset of Community Value / Community Right to Bid	Protection of valued community assets at risk of sale.	Listing evidence, community capacity, funding route, valuation, acquisition plan and operating model.

Grants, philanthropy and social investment	Fit-out, refurbishment, energy works, community enterprise, business planning and revenue development.	Eligibility, match funding, repayment terms, governance, cashflow and long-term affordability.
Community shares	Community-owned assets with income potential and strong local support.	Viable business model, community mandate, share offer costs, regulation, governance and investor risk.

9.5 Make contributions spendable

9.5.1 Developer contributions only help communities when they can be received, allocated and spent. Common barriers include narrow legal wording, fixed geographic limits, changing local need, deed variations, monitoring capacity, small pots of money that are hard to administer and limited public visibility over what has been secured and delivered.

9.5.2 Greater Cambridge can reduce these risks by using clearer contribution wording. Legal agreements should identify the purpose, catchment, eligible types of spend, indexation, spend period, fallback route, reporting requirement and responsible body.

9.5.3 For community infrastructure, eligible spend should be broad enough to include the practical works that make facilities usable: extension, refurbishment, access, kitchens, storage, youth-capable space, energy improvements, fit-out, community development, start-up activity and maintenance where appropriate.

9.5.4 Contribution schedules should connect to one of three routes: a named on-site facility, a named off-site facility, or an area project pipeline for a defined catchment. This keeps the link to development clear while allowing funding to move to a deliverable project if the first option changes.

9.5.5 Public reporting should be easy to understand. A useful record would show what has been secured, what has been received, what has been spent, what remains unspent, where the money can be used, who is responsible for delivery, what has been delivered, and what review actions are needed.

9.6 Build area project pipelines

9.6.1 Area project pipelines should provide a clear route from evidence to funded improvements. They are especially important for smaller sites, cumulative growth and existing facilities that serve several developments. They can also help parish councils, community organisations and council teams prepare projects before contributions are received.

9.6.2 A pipeline should be specific enough to support planning judgements and contribution decisions. It should identify the facility, catchment, need addressed, proposed works, estimated cost, delivery lead, funding already secured, funding gap, likely funding route, project status, dependencies, priority level and expected community benefit.

9.6.3 Projects should be added to a pipeline where there is evidence that they respond to growth-related need, address a recognised access or quality issue, serve a defined

catchment, and have a realistic delivery body. This keeps off-site contributions linked to identifiable community infrastructure outcomes, rather than broad area aspirations.

9.6.4 Prioritisation should be based on need, relationship to growth, deliverability, readiness, funding gap, community benefit and whether the project can be secured and spent lawfully. Higher priority should be given to projects that address a clear local gap, serve planned growth, unlock access or capacity, and have a delivery route that can be monitored.

9.6.5 Pipelines should be maintained through infrastructure monitoring. Updates should record new evidence, changed costs, permissions, funding received, spend, delivery progress, completed works and any projects that are no longer deliverable. This allows planning obligations, CIL, Neighbourhood CIL and local project planning to remain linked to current and spendable priorities.

9.6.6 In South Cambridgeshire, project pipelines can build on parish and village facility evidence, the 129 sqm per 1,000 population benchmark, quality audits and accessibility findings. In Cambridge City, pipelines can build on community-centre priorities, growth-area facilities, mapped assets, planning-obligation-backed priorities and local evidence of need.

Table 9.5. Area project pipeline fields

Field	What to record	Why it matters
Facility or project	Named facility, site, asset or programme.	Shows where the contribution can be spent.
Catchment	Neighbourhood, village, ward, settlement, strategic site or wider area served.	Keeps the link to development clear.
Need addressed	Capacity, access, quality, youth provision, kitchens, storage, affordability, energy, management or early provision.	Connects the project to the evidence base.
Works or activity	Extension, refurbishment, fit-out, equipment, community development, management support, access, activation or maintenance where appropriate.	Makes the eligible spend practical.
Cost and funding gap	Estimated cost, secured funding and remaining funding gap.	Supports contribution negotiation and prioritisation.
Delivery lead	Council, parish/town council, community organisation, trust, developer, operator or partnership.	Identifies who can deliver the project.

Priority and planning link	Priority level, relevant growth area, nearby developments, planning obligation link, CIL route or Neighbourhood CIL route.	Shows why the project is relevant to growth and how it can be funded.
Status and dependencies	Concept, feasibility, design, consent, procurement, delivery, match funding or land issue.	Shows whether the project is spendable.
Monitoring record	Funding secured, funding received, spend, delivery progress, completed works and review actions.	Keeps contributions traceable and supports public reporting.
Review date	Date for updating cost, status, need and delivery route.	Keeps the pipeline current.

9.7 Set stewardship arrangements before handover

9.7.1 Stewardship should be agreed before a facility is handed over. The delivery agreement should identify the owner, leaseholder, operator, maintenance body, programming lead, booking arrangements, charging approach, resident voice route and review points.

9.7.2 The right steward will vary by place. Cambridge City has a Council-supported community centres network and a different ward-based context from parished South Cambridgeshire. South Cambridgeshire has more parish and village hall structures, but many halls rely on volunteer committees and face maintenance, energy, access and fundraising pressures. Strategic sites may need hybrid arrangements while the community grows and permanent local governance becomes clearer.

9.7.3 Community ownership and community management can support local control, local trust and reinvestment of income. National community asset evidence also shows that transfer and ownership need time, advice and resources. Maintenance costs, weak revenue, limited volunteer capacity and limited access to grant funding can affect long-term financial health.

9.7.4 Community Asset Transfer, long leases and community ownership should be used where the receiving body has the capacity, terms and support to succeed. A transfer should include a condition survey, schedule of liabilities, realistic repair and replacement costs, business plan, governance check, community access commitments, reserves strategy and clear route for support if the operating model struggles.

Table 9.6. Stewardship options and delivery checks

Stewardship route	Where it may work	Checks needed
Council-owned or Council-supported centre	Cambridge City centres, growth-area facilities or facilities where public oversight is needed.	Capital responsibility, operating budget, management team, booking policy, community access, maintenance and review.

Parish or town council	Village halls, parish facilities, local growth contributions and smaller settlement provision.	Capacity, appetite, legal powers, maintenance liabilities, local support, revenue and volunteer capacity.
Community organisation, charity or trust	Facilities with strong local governance, clear community use and income potential.	Business plan, governance, safeguarding, lease terms, reserves, staffing, affordability and asset-lock or public benefit protections.
Faith or school shared-use arrangement	Where existing buildings can serve wider community use without undermining their primary purpose.	Access agreement, safeguarding, booking, cost, insurance, opening hours, storage, privacy and inclusive use.
Developer or estate management company	Early phases, mixed-use areas, employment campuses or interim arrangements.	Public access, affordability, accountability, handover route, service charge implications and long-term review.
Portfolio trust or place trust	Large strategic sites where several assets need coordinated management over time.	Governance, income model, endowment or revenue route, asset transfer terms, resident voice and public accountability.

9.8 Use existing assets where they are the right local answer

9.8.1 Existing assets are central to the delivery strategy. Mapped asset-location data shows extensive faith, school, hall, library, food aid, youth, women’s space and community centre provision across Greater Cambridge. Facility presence gives a starting point for local testing and shows where investment, shared use or protection may provide the best local response.

9.8.2 South Cambridgeshire community facilities evidence points to a practical role for extensions, refurbishment, maintenance, accessibility improvements and energy measures. It also supports the use of off-site contributions for smaller developments, with parish and town councils consulted because they often hold current knowledge of local projects, costs and facility condition.

9.8.3 Cambridge City community centres evidence points to a different set of delivery choices. The City has existing community centres, planned growth-area facilities and areas where investment or re-provision can address identified gaps. Funding decisions should sit alongside community development capacity, centre management, asset condition, affordability and the ability of local organisations to take on management where appropriate.

9.8.4 Protection routes should be used where a valued local facility is at risk. Planning policy provides a route to protect community facilities. Asset of Community Value listing and the Community Right to Bid can give communities time to respond to a sale. These routes need advice, funding options and a credible ownership or operating plan if community acquisition is pursued.

9.9 Requirements for Community Plans, site schedules and legal agreements

9.9.1 Community Plans, site schedules and planning obligations should use a consistent set of delivery requirements. This will help planning officers, infrastructure teams, developers, parish councils, community organisations and facility operators understand what needs to be secured and when it should be reviewed.

9.9.2 The requirements should be proportionate to the site and place type. Large strategic sites will need whole-site community infrastructure planning, early provision, permanent facilities and long-term stewardship. Smaller developments will often need contributions to existing facilities or area project pipelines. Employment-led and mixed-use sites may need on-site amenity, off-site contributions, public-facing space or place-management funding, depending on use, catchment and local pressure.

9.9.3 The same basic checks should apply across all routes: the need being met, the funding route, the timing, the steward, the revenue and maintenance approach, the legal wording, the project pipeline, and the public record of what has been delivered.

Table 9.7. Delivery requirements to carry into Community Plans and obligations

Requirement	What should be clear	Where it should be secured
Need and catchment area	What need is being addressed, who the facility serves and whether the need is local, area-wide or strategic.	Community Plan, site schedule, officer report, planning obligation heads of terms / planning obligation / planning obligation specification
Provision type	New facility, extension, refurbishment, shared use, temporary space, fit-out, contribution or project-pipeline funding.	Community Plan, planning condition, planning obligation, CIL or project pipeline.
Delivery Schedule	Occupation triggers, early temporary provision, permanent delivery date, phased review and fallback route.	Planning obligation, phasing plan, infrastructure delivery schedule.
Specification	Floorspace, rooms, kitchen, storage, toilets, accessibility, safeguarding, equipment, public access and flexibility.	Design code, reserved matters, planning obligation specification, community use agreement.
Funding	Capital, fit-out, maintenance, revenue, community development, indexation, spend period and eligible uses.	Planning obligation, CIL pipeline, funding agreement.
Stewardship	Owner, operator, lease, management, maintenance, hire policy, resident voice and review.	Management and maintenance plan, lease, transfer agreement, planning obligation.

Monitoring	How delivery, spend, access and community benefit will be reported and reviewed.	Monitoring clause, Infrastructure Funding Statement, Community Plan review.
------------	--	---

9.10 Decision checklist

9.10.1 Appendix A provides a fuller community infrastructure decision checklist for use by officers, applicants and promoters. It should be used alongside this section when preparing Community Plans, planning statements, infrastructure schedules, planning obligation heads of terms and funding proposals.

9.10.2 The checklist should help users move from evidence to action: identify the scale of development, test existing provision, decide whether on-site or off-site provision is needed, identify early provision, choose the right funding route, agree stewardship and set out what planning should secure.

9.10.3 The delivery aim is practical: community infrastructure should open at the right time, be usable by the people it is intended to serve, remain affordable, have a named steward, and have funding arrangements that support both the building and the activity that makes it work.

10. Strategic growth areas: site requirements schedule

10.1 Purpose and use of the schedules

10.1.1 Major growth locations will generate community infrastructure needs at neighbourhood, district and settlement scale. The schedules below give a practical site-by-site record of likely requirements for the main strategic growth areas.

10.1.2 The schedules are intended to support draft Local Plan site requirements, masterplanning, Community Plans, phasing, planning obligations and infrastructure delivery. They should help show what needs to be provided on site, what may be funded off site, and what needs further testing through the development process.

10.1.3 The figures use the current 129 sqm per 1,000 additional population benchmark as a starting point. They show both plan-period need and whole-site need, because several locations will continue to grow beyond 2045. For long build-out sites, safeguarding enough long-term capacity matters as much as meeting the first phase.

10.1.4 The figures in Table 10.1 and Appendix D are rounded for planning use. They should be treated as starting points for Community Plan testing, not as final floorspace requirements or fixed capital requirements. More precise figures can be retained in working calculations, IDP spreadsheets and delivery schedules where needed.

10.1.5 Draft infrastructure planning evidence is used here as current planning evidence. Site capacities, delivery assumptions, funding routes and phasing will to be refined through future stages of the planning process. The findings in this study are intended to inform that work.

10.1.6 The schedules should also be read alongside the existing community infrastructure network around each growth area. Community Plans should identify the relevant nearby centres, halls, faith/community venues, schools with community use, libraries, youth provision and other trusted local assets, and should test whether strategic growth should protect, enhance, connect to or contribute to those assets alongside any new on-site provision. This is especially important where strategic growth sits next to established neighbourhoods or villages, and where existing assets may help provide early access, shared use, off-site enhancement or links between new and existing communities.

10.1.7 The schedules sit alongside Community Plans. For each major site, a Community Plan should confirm local provision, the on-site and off-site split, early and permanent provision, youth-capable space, kitchen and storage requirements, access and affordability, stewardship, revenue support and review points.

10.1.8 The schedules should be read through the same protect, enhance, provide and contribute logic: identifying existing assets to protect or improve, new provision needed on site, and off-site contributions or project-pipeline links where these provide the most effective response.

10.1.9 Indicative capital ranges are included where useful. They use a working rate of about £4,010 per sqm from draft infrastructure planning evidence and a higher comparison rate of about £5,300 per sqm from recent large community hub benchmarks. They exclude land, abnormal costs, specialist fit-out and long-term revenue unless stated.

Table 10.1. Summary of strategic growth area community infrastructure requirements

Strategic location	Community space starting point	Current and committed provision	Main requirement
North East Cambridge	<p>In the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan, it currently sets out an employment-led scenario, with around 1,000 homes, the resident-based requirement should be recalculated from the latest housing and population assumptions.</p> <p>There is no immediate prospect of larger planned residential growth at Hartree while Waste Water Treatment Plant relocation funding remains unresolved, although policy flexibility may allow residential development if circumstances change.</p> <p>Worker, visitor, student and surrounding-community impacts should be assessed separately. If a more substantial residential scenario comes forward, the benchmark indicates around 2,200 sqm whole-site and 1,200 sqm by 2045, to be reviewed against the final development scenario.</p>	<p>No dedicated community facility within NEC itself has been identified in the evidence reviewed. Brown’s Field is the nearest existing City community centre; The Meadows, Campkin Road, Akeman Street and Arbury Community Centre sit within the wider northern network. Emerging provision through Cambridge Business Park, Cambridge Science Park redevelopment, a new Trinity Centre, Cambridge Science Centre outreach activity and other campus or science-park shared-use spaces should be tested for community-facing access.</p>	<p>Secure proportionate public-facing community provision through campus redevelopment, shared meeting or activity space, outreach provision, early or meanwhile provision and clear access to suitable community-facing facilities. Surrounding centres should support transition and network strengthening alongside any dedicated NEC provision, with off-site contributions to northern assets where this provides the better response. If a more substantial residential scenario comes forward, a larger on-site multifunctional hub, planned with library provision where practical, may be required.</p>

Cambridge East	<p>3,700 sqm whole-site; 2,100 sqm by 2045.</p> <p>Confirm the remaining requirement through the Community Plan after committed provision and wider eastern-network assets have been tested.</p>	<p>Marleigh and Springstead include committed community space, including the Hangar at Marleigh, Springstead Hall, Park Pavilion provision, meanwhile provision and secured community-development / activation contributions.</p> <p>The Nest, Cherry Hinton Hub, East Barnwell / Abbey provision, Teversham, faith/community venues and eastern-fringe assets form part of the wider network.</p>	<p>Stronger eastern network, with substantial airport-area provision, flexibility for meanwhile provision as the scheme builds out, tested links to East Barnwell, Abbey, Cherry Hinton, Teversham and the eastern fringe, and a final requirement confirmed through the Community Plan.</p> <p>The response should test whether off-site contributions, shared-use improvements or access improvements are needed where nearby assets serve the wider eastern catchment.</p>
North West Cambridge / Eddington, with Darwin Green context	<p>1,500 sqm whole-site; 1,200 sqm by 2045 for Eddington.</p>	<p>Storey's Field is a strong existing anchor. Darwin Green has community rooms and library provision in a more constrained mixed-use setting, alongside secured community-support, youth, sport development and grant funding.</p>	<p>Review capacity against densification, Eddington Phase 2 and later phases. Secure additional provision, fit-out, activation support or investment if existing anchors cannot absorb growth while remaining accessible and affordable.</p>
Expanded Cambourne	<p>5,700 sqm whole-site; 1,700 sqm by 2045.</p> <p>Figures are indicative and should be tested through integration with existing Cambourne town facilities, committed provision and secured contributions.</p>	<p>Cambourne Hub, Cambourne West commitments and known investment in community and youth facilities provide a base, but Cambourne North changes the town-scale requirement.</p>	<p>Plan for a larger town network, with neighbourhood provision, a stronger central or gateway anchor, youth-capable space and investment in existing facilities where they will serve growth.</p>

Northstowe	<p>3,100 sqm whole-settlement based on an eventual population of 24,000; 2,300 sqm by 2045.</p> <p>Figures should be read against the substantial planning-obligation-secured provision already in place.</p>	<p>Unity Centre is operational. Secured provision includes Phase 1 and Phase 3A community buildings, a Phase 2 Community Hub, a Health and Library Facility, faith/community land in later phases, about £300,000 for community support workers and about £100,000 for community projects and grant funding.</p>	<p>Multi-hub town model with review points, revenue, activation and stewardship checks. The main task is to ensure secured provision and community development support are delivered, usable, accessible and well managed as phases come forward, rather than treating the benchmark as a standalone additional floorspace requirement.</p>
Waterbeach New Town	<p>4,000 sqm whole-site; 2,100 sqm by 2045.</p>	<p>Interim community space and four permanent facilities are scheduled in the western consented area.</p> <p>The consented eastern area has provision for a further two community buildings.</p>	<p>Whole-new-town Community Plan covering village interface, east-west coordination, early provision, permanent hubs, library relationship and stewardship.</p>
Grange Farm New Settlement	<p>2,200 sqm whole-site; 900 sqm by 2045.</p>	<p>No operational provision yet. Draft policy evidence identifies a local centre and community uses.</p>	<p>Early local-centre community anchor, with whole-site safeguarding, links to nearby villages and employment areas, and clear stewardship from the first phases.</p>
Cambridge Biomedical Campus	<p>200 sqm linked to planned homes. This resident-based figure does not capture the full community infrastructure role of the campus. Provision is also needed to serve workers, patients, visitors, students and nearby communities.</p>	<p>Campus amenities and mixed-use facilities already provide some community-facing functions.</p> <p>These should be tested for genuine public access, affordability, booking, welcome, opening hours and suitability for community use.</p>	<p>Enhance and secure genuinely accessible shared-use community space for residents, workers, patients, visitors, students and nearby communities.</p> <p>The campus should provide community-facing space as part of its wider place function, rather than relying only on commercial or institutional amenities.</p>

<p>Wellcome Genome Campus</p>	<p>At least 1,100 sqm as a minimum testing figure.</p> <p>This combines the resident-based component of c.550 sqm with a further worker/community-facing allowance of c.550 sqm linked to the 4,300 new jobs identified in the policy evidence.</p> <p>Visitor, education, conference, nursery, leisure, public-access and nearby-village effects should be assessed separately.</p>	<p>Outline permission S/4329/18/OL includes up to 22,750 sqm GEA of non-residential institutions, community and leisure uses, with the community-facing element still to be specified through reserved matters and delivery documents.</p> <p>The permission also secured funding towards Hinxton Village Hall and in-kind community development funds or initiatives.</p>	<p>Make the full community-facing package explicit, including resident, worker, visitor, campus-user and nearby-community access, early or meanwhile provision, affordability, shared use, stewardship and links to Hinxton and nearby villages.</p> <p>The campus should provide community-facing space as part of its wider place function, rather than relying only on private campus amenities or the resident benchmark.</p>
<p>Babraham Research Campus and Rural Southern Cluster</p>	<p>No cluster-wide residential benchmark applied. Apply the 129 sqm per 1,000 residents benchmark where housing, tied accommodation or key-worker housing generates a resident population; assess employment-led and campus impacts locally.</p>	<p>Rural Southern Cluster growth sits close to villages with varied community capacity. South Cambridgeshire evidence identifies weaker provision in some small villages.</p> <p>Planning permission 25/04634/OUT includes 850 sqm of nursery space and up to 500 sqm of retail and community facilities; the community-facing role of this provision should be tested.</p>	<p>Assess employment-led and key-worker housing impacts locally. Contributions may be needed to strengthen nearby village and cluster facilities where campus-only rooms, nursery, retail or staff-focused provision would provide limited public community benefit.</p>

10.2 North East Cambridge

Field	Schedule entry
Growth and current evidence	North East Cambridge is currently designated in the Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan as a major policy area for commercially led mixed-use change, focused around existing campuses and Cambridge North station. The current position is for around 1,000 homes, alongside significant employment-led change. Due to the withdrawal of funding to relocate the Cambridge Waste Water Treatment Plant, there is no immediate prospect of larger planned residential growth at Hartree coming forward, although policy flexibility may allow residential development if circumstances change. The area sits next to established northern and north-eastern communities, including East Chesterton, where community centre evidence has previously identified gaps.
Quantified starting point	Should the full residential component come forward through comprehensive redevelopment, around 2,200 sqm of indoor community-facility space would be generated for the full site, using the current 129 sqm per 1,000 residents benchmark, with around 1,200 sqm by 2045. These figures would need to be reviewed against the final NEC development scenario. In the current Local Plan employment-led scenario, the resident-based requirement would be materially lower and should be recalculated from the latest housing and population assumptions. Worker, visitor, student and surrounding-community needs should be assessed through site-specific evidence, because the 129 sqm per 1,000 residents benchmark only captures resident population need.
Provision already identified	No dedicated community facility within NEC itself has been identified in the evidence reviewed. Brown's Field Community Centre sits closest to the area and should be recognised as part of the surrounding network. The Meadows, Campkin Road, Akeman Street and Arbury Community Centre also form part of the wider northern provision. In the current Local Plan employment-led scenario, community-facing provision may come through Cambridge Business Park, Cambridge Science Park redevelopment, a new Trinity Centre, Cambridge Science Centre outreach activity and other campus or science-park shared-use spaces, where access, booking, affordability and stewardship arrangements are clear. If a more substantial residential scenario comes forward, a new multifunctional community hub and library relationship should be tested through the site-wide Community Plan.
Main requirement	If comprehensive redevelopment at Hartree comes forward, NEC would need a visible, central and easy-to-reach community hub within the development. It should support community meetings, youth activity, advice and support, social and cultural use, food-related activity, flexible rooms, storage and informal welcoming space, with library provision planned where practical. In the current Local Plan employment-led

	<p>scenario, the requirement should be proportionate to the smaller residential population and the employment-led role of the area. This may include public-facing community space within campus redevelopment, shared meeting or activity rooms, outreach space, meanwhile or early provision, and contributions to existing northern facilities where that provides the better response. Surrounding centres can help during early phases, alongside any dedicated NEC provision.</p>
<p>Phasing and Community Plan requirements</p>	<p>In any development scenario, a Community Plan or equivalent community infrastructure statement is likely to be required at masterplan or outline stage to support applications. It should identify which development scenario is being planned for, the expected resident, worker, visitor and student populations, the location and role of any community-facing provision, how early residents and/or campus workers would access usable space, how temporary or meanwhile provision will work, and how triggers link to occupation or floorspace delivery. The plan should also test how NEC provision will connect with Brown's Field, The Meadows, Campkin Road, Akeman Street, Arbury Community Centre and other nearby northern assets, including whether off-site enhancement, shared use or community development support is needed during transition.</p>
<p>Delivery, stewardship and checks</p>	<p>Delivery and stewardship should be matched to the development scenario. If comprehensive redevelopment at Hartree comes forward, capital delivery is likely to be developer-led, with Cambridge City Council, Greater Cambridge and Cambridgeshire County Council involved in commissioning, library planning and long-term operating decisions. In the current Local Plan employment-led scenario, delivery may sit more strongly with campus owners, science-park operators, developers and public-facing institutions, with planning requirements focused on access, community use, outreach and links to the wider northern network. In both scenarios, stewardship, revenue support, service charges, affordable hire, youth access, public access, booking, evening and weekend use, maintenance and review points should be defined early. The indicative capital range of about £8.8m-£11.7m for the full community-space requirement, or £4.8m-£6.4m for the plan-period element, should be treated as applying to the comprehensive redevelopment scenario only and recalculated once the final residential capacity, provision type and delivery model are confirmed.</p> <p>Where community-facing space is provided within campus, mixed-use or residential-adjacent development, it should be specified to support normal active community uses. Acoustic design, ventilation, entrances, servicing, management arrangements and noise-related planning conditions should be tested before conditions are fixed, so that the space can operate as community infrastructure rather than being limited to quiet meeting-room use.</p>

10.3 Cambridge East

Field	Schedule entry
Growth and current evidence	<p>Cambridge East includes the longer-term airport area, Marleigh, Springstead and the wider eastern growth corridor. The airport site is expected to create a large new urban quarter over a long development horizon. Marleigh and Springstead already provide committed and meanwhile provision, as well as learning on specification, activation, stewardship and links between new and existing communities. The schedule should also be read across the wider eastern network, including East Barnwell, Abbey, Cherry Hinton, Teversham and the eastern fringe.</p>
Quantified starting point	<p>The current benchmark generates a starting point of 3,700 sqm of indoor community-facility space for the full Cambridge East growth area, with 2,100 sqm generated by currently modelled plan-period growth. These figures should not be treated as a simple additional requirement on top of all committed provision. The Community Plan should confirm what remains needed for the airport area and wider eastern network after existing and committed provision has been tested.</p>
Provision already identified	<p>Marleigh includes a committed community hall of 200 sqm gross internal floorspace, excluding any parish office, and 2,600 sqm of Park Pavilion provision. The Hangar at Marleigh is part of the current community infrastructure context for the eastern network. Additional community provision within an allotment building has also been secured through Marleigh Phase 3 uplift permissions; the role, access and size of that provision should be confirmed.</p> <p>Marleigh outline planning permission also secured approximately £200,000 for community development workers and a grant fund to support community groups and activities. Springstead includes meanwhile community provision in adapted former homes, run through St Andrew's Church in Cherry Hinton. Springstead Hall has also been delivered through application 25/011098/REM, providing a 250 sqm community hall alongside associated uses. Springstead also includes flexible mixed-use Class E / F2 / sui generis floorspace, and financial contributions of approximately £250,000 have been secured for community support workers, kick-starting community activities, children's centre equipment and support to help set up community facilities.</p> <p>The Nest in East Barnwell, Cherry Hinton Hub, East Barnwell / Abbey provision, faith spaces, schools, youth-related assets and Teversham / eastern-fringe assets also form part of the wider eastern network. Park, leisure, allotment-related and mixed-use provision should count towards the community infrastructure requirement only where the relevant space is genuinely community-facing, accessible, affordable, bookable and suitable for wider community activity.</p>

<p>Main requirement</p>	<p>Cambridge East needs a stronger eastern community infrastructure network, with the airport area providing a substantial and visible community infrastructure response. The Community Plan should identify the balance between committed provision, new airport-area provision and investment in nearby eastern assets.</p> <p>The response should avoid a pattern of isolated small rooms. It should include a clear main anchor, smaller neighbourhood spaces where justified, youth-capable rooms, intergenerational space, kitchens, storage, acoustic tolerance, active-use capability, and simple booking and access arrangements.</p> <p>The main community anchor should be designed and located so that it can support normal community-centre uses, including celebrations, exercise classes, youth activity, music, choirs, faith activity and larger group gatherings. Where community rooms are proposed within or close to housing, the Community Plan should test acoustic separation, ventilation, access, servicing and likely noise conditions before the layout and specification are fixed.</p>
<p>Phasing and Community Plan requirements</p>	<p>A Community Plan should cover the airport site, Marleigh, Springstead and links to East Barnwell, Abbey, Cherry Hinton, Teversham and the eastern fringe. Because Cambridge East has a long development horizon, the plan should allow for meanwhile or temporary provision so that usable space is available as phases come forward.</p> <p>It should show how early provision will respond to the development phase and community need, how temporary and permanent spaces relate to each other, and how triggers link to occupation, phasing and permanent provision. It should also identify which committed spaces count towards the community infrastructure requirement, which are complementary or contextual, and what additional airport-area provision is still needed.</p>
<p>Delivery, stewardship and checks</p>	<p>The airport area should carry a major on-site requirement unless the Community Plan demonstrates that committed and nearby provision can meet part of the need in practice. Existing secured funding for community development workers, activity kick-starting, children’s centre equipment and community-group grants should be recognised as part of the activation and stewardship baseline, but it does not remove the need to test physical provision, access, capacity and long-term management.</p> <p>The Community Plan should also test whether Teversham and other eastern-fringe assets form part of the practical catchment for Cambridge East. Teversham should be treated as a specific issue because South Cambridgeshire community facilities evidence records no dedicated indoor community facility there. Where Cambridge East growth is expected to place pressure on Teversham or eastern-fringe assets, or</p>

where investment in those assets would provide the best shared response, the planning response may include off-site contributions, shared-use arrangements, access improvements or support for an eastern-area project pipeline, subject to the normal planning obligation tests.

Stewardship should be tested before specifications are fixed, drawing on learning from Marleigh and Springstead. The indicative capital range of about £14.8m-£19.6m for the full benchmark, or £8.4m-£11.1m for the plan-period benchmark, should be recalculated once committed in-scope provision, existing assets and the airport-area delivery model are confirmed.

10.4 North West Cambridge / Eddington, with Darwin Green context

Field	Schedule entry
Growth and current evidence	North West Cambridge / Eddington already has a strong community and cultural anchor in Storey's Field. Draft planning evidence identifies further growth at Eddington, with later-phase detail still being tested through the planning process. Darwin Green is a nearby growth location with community rooms and library provision in a more constrained mixed-use setting.
Quantified starting point	Around 1,500 sqm of indoor community-facility space is identified for the full Eddington growth requirement, with 1,200 sqm generated by currently modelled plan-period growth.
Provision already identified	Storey's Field provides high-quality flexible hall, meeting and foyer space and has a dedicated stewardship structure. Darwin Green has community rooms and library provision, but local delivery evidence highlights that rooms within mixed-use blocks can be more constrained by noise, ventilation, access, visibility and long-term operating arrangements. Secured Darwin Green contributions for community support, youth, sport development and community grants should also be recognised as part of the wider activation and stewardship picture.
Main requirement	The main issue is capacity, access and fit rather than absence of provision. Further Eddington growth should test whether Storey's Field and other nearby spaces can absorb additional demand while remaining affordable, locally useful and available for everyday community use. Darwin Green should be reviewed as part of the wider north-west network rather than treated as a fully separate answer.
Phasing and Community Plan requirements	A Community Plan or site update should set out expected use, access arrangements, added demand, any required additional rooms or extensions, and review triggers. It should include a practical check on youth, family, food, informal social and community development uses, rather than focus only on bookable venue capacity. The review should also respond to the latest Eddington Phase 2 position once the planning and delivery assumptions are clearer.

Delivery, stewardship and checks	<p>The schedule supports review before any additional provision is confirmed. Where existing anchors cannot meet future demand, further developer delivery or contributions should secure additional capacity, fit-out, staff support, community development, youth support, grant funding or shared-use improvements. Indicative capital range for the Eddington benchmark is about £6.0m-£8.0m full-site, or £4.8m-£6.4m for the plan-period element, before taking existing provision and secured contributions into account.</p> <p>Review should include whether existing and proposed community rooms can support active community uses, not only quieter meetings. Where rooms sit within mixed-use or residential blocks, the review should test acoustic separation, ventilation, access, booking arrangements and noise-related conditions. If those constraints limit normal community use, additional capacity, off-site investment or alternative provision may be needed.</p>
----------------------------------	---

10.5 Expanded Cambourne (including Cambourne North)

Field	Schedule entry
Growth and current evidence	Expanded Cambourne combines Cambourne West, the existing town and Cambourne North. Draft strategy evidence treats expansion as a way to grow Cambourne into a larger settlement with stronger critical mass, helped by East West Rail and improved public transport. Cambourne North also includes significant employment space.
Quantified starting point	The benchmark indicates 5,700 sqm of indoor community-facility space for the full expanded Cambourne area, with 1,700 sqm generated by currently modelled plan-period growth. These figures should be treated as indicative and tested as part of a wider Cambourne town network, taking account of existing facilities, committed provision, secured contributions, access, capacity, phasing and stewardship.
Provision already identified	Cambourne already has the Hub and other local facilities. South Cambridgeshire community facilities evidence identifies around £1.744m of known community-centre-related commitments from Cambourne West, including investment linked to the Hub, sports and communities land, Cambourne Village College community facilities, Back Lane and the Blue School. Youth provision has also been secured separately.
Main requirement	Expanded Cambourne needs a town-scale community infrastructure network. Existing facilities should be protected and improved where they will serve growth, but Cambourne North should also include provision that feels local to new neighbourhoods and visible at the emerging gateway or centre. Youth-capable space, food-enabled community space, family support and older people's social access should be built into the requirement.

	The final provision package should integrate new neighbourhood provision with the existing Cambourne town network, rather than treating Cambourne North as a fully separate community infrastructure catchment.
Phasing and Community Plan requirements	A Community Plan should cover Cambourne North, Cambourne West and the existing town network. It should show how early residents will access usable space, how new and existing facilities connect, how the railway and public transport changes affect catchments, and which facilities will receive investment from pooled or site-specific contributions.
Delivery, stewardship and checks	Delivery is likely to combine on-site provision, contributions to existing facilities and phased investment across the town. Stewardship should be coordinated with existing local governance and operators. Indicative capital range: about £22.9m-£30.2m for the full benchmark requirement, or £6.8m-£9.0m for the plan-period element, before accounting for existing provision, secured commitments and the final integration with existing town facilities.

10.6 Northstowe

Field	Schedule entry
Growth and current evidence	Northstowe is an existing new settlement with several phases and long-term build-out. Community facilities evidence identifies temporary provision, school dual use, the Unity Centre and later planned facilities. The main planning issue is how secured provision, later phase delivery, community development capacity, stewardship, revenue and review work together as the town grows.
Quantified starting point	The benchmark indicates 3,100 sqm of indoor community-facility space for an eventual population of 24,000 residents. The currently modelled plan-period figure is 2,300 sqm. These figures should be read against the substantial S106-secured provision already in place, rather than as an additional unmet requirement.
Provision already identified	<p>Unity Centre is operational. The main planning obligation-secured provision includes a Phase 1 Community Building of 950 sqm; Faith/Voluntary Groups Land of 0.25 hectares; a Phase 2 Community Hub of 1,265 sqm; a Health and Library Facility of 2,817 sqm; a Phase 3A Community Building of 342 sqm; and Phase 3B Faith and Community Land of 0.1675 hectares.</p> <p>Phase 1 also secured about £300,000 for community support workers, and Phase 2 secured about £100,000 for community projects and grants. Not all secured provision should be treated as equivalent general community-centre floorspace, especially where it is shared, faith-related, health-related, library-related, land-based or activity-based. The package does, however, provide the main framework for Northstowe's settlement-scale community infrastructure.</p>

Main requirement	Northstowe should continue to be planned as a multi-hub town model. The focus should be on delivery, phasing, functionality, activation and stewardship rather than identifying a simple additional floorspace requirement. Later hubs should come forward before one early facility carries town-wide demand for too long. Provision should include town-centre functions, neighbourhood-scale spaces, youth-capable rooms, food and kitchen capacity, storage, community development space and informal welcoming space.
Phasing and Community Plan requirements	A settlement-wide Community Plan should be maintained and updated as phases progress. It should show the role of each hub, the timing of later facilities, temporary provision where needed, links to schools and shared-use spaces, and how new neighbourhoods will avoid long periods without usable community space. It should also identify which secured facilities count towards general community infrastructure, which are shared or specialist facilities, how community support worker and grants funding is being used, and where further fit-out, access, revenue or management support is needed.
Delivery, stewardship and checks	<p>The main check is whether capital provision, community development capacity, revenue, staffing and stewardship keep pace with population growth. Review points should be linked to occupation, use, affordability, booking demand, financial performance, resident feedback, community support activity, grants activity and the delivery of later phases.</p> <p>The benchmark capital equivalent is about £12.4m-£16.4m for the full settlement figure, or £9.2m-£12.2m for the plan-period element, before accounting for existing and secured provision. Given the scale of provision already secured, this should not be treated as a new capital requirement unless review shows that the secured facilities and activation support do not meet community infrastructure need in practice.</p>

10.7 Waterbeach New Town

Field	Schedule entry
Growth and current evidence	Waterbeach New Town is a long build-out new settlement next to an existing village. Community and workshop evidence highlights the need to avoid a divide between the existing village and the new town, and to make early provision visible, useful and affordable.
Quantified starting point	Around 4,000 sqm of indoor community-facility space for the full Waterbeach New Town population, with around 2,100 sqm generated by currently modelled plan-period growth.
Provision already identified	The western consented area has interim community space of around 250 sqm. Four permanent facilities are scheduled at occupation triggers of around 250, 1,850, 4,000 and 5,200 homes. Two are around 350 sqm, one is up to around 750 sqm, and the fourth is around 1,050 sqm with permanent library provision in the town centre.

	The eastern consented area has provision secured in the s106 agreement for two more permanent facilities, to be provided at occupation triggers of 1250 and 2750 dwellings on the eastern part. Both buildings shall together provide a total of 1,050 sqm of usable community space.
Main requirement	The scheduled facilities appear to provide a strong starting point for plan-period need in the western area. The whole-new-town requirement still needs to be checked across the full build-out, the eastern area, the existing village relationship and the long-term role of the town centre.
Phasing and Community Plan requirements	A whole-new-town Community Plan should bring the consented western provision, later eastern provision and existing village context together. It should show early provision, permanent hubs, shared village/new town activity, routes for non-drivers, youth and teen provision, kitchens, storage and governance across phases.
Delivery, stewardship and checks	Delivery needs coordination between master developers, the district council, parish or town governance and long-term operators. Review points should test actual use, affordability, booking, operating costs and whether village and new town residents are both being served. Indicative capital range: about £16.0m-£21.2m for the full requirement, or £8.4m-£11.1m for the plan-period element, before accounting for already scheduled facilities.

10.8 Grange Farm New Settlement

Field	Schedule entry
Growth and current evidence	Grange Farm is a proposed new settlement in the Rural Southern Cluster, close to major employment areas and the proposed Cambridge South East Transport Scheme. It will create a large new residential population in an area where nearby village and employment-campus relationships will matter.
Quantified starting point	Around 2,200 sqm of indoor community-facility space for the full site, with around 900 sqm generated by currently modelled plan-period growth.
Provision already identified	No operational community provision exists for the settlement at this stage. Draft planning evidence identifies a local centre and community uses, but the scale, location, phasing, fit-out and stewardship of community provision need to be specified through later planning stages.
Main requirement	Grange Farm needs an early local-centre community anchor, designed for both the first phases and whole-site build-out. It should support informal social contact, youth and teen activity, advice and support, food-related activity, family use, storage, flexible rooms and links to health, education and active travel.
Phasing and Community Plan requirements	A Community Plan should be required from the start. It should show early provision before the permanent hub, the location and safeguarded capacity of the permanent hub, links to nearby villages and employment sites, arrangements for non-drivers, and review triggers as the settlement grows.

Delivery, stewardship and checks	The settlement needs its own community infrastructure, with nearby village facilities treated as partners for shared activity and off-site investment where growth creates direct pressure or shared-service opportunities. Stewardship and revenue support should be part of the early delivery plan. Indicative capital range: about £8.8m-£11.7m for the full requirement, or £3.6m-£4.8m for the plan-period element.
----------------------------------	---

10.9 Cambridge Biomedical Campus

Field	Schedule entry
Growth and current evidence	Cambridge Biomedical Campus is an employment-led and institutional location with planned residential growth. It already has a large worker, patient, visitor and student population, alongside future residents and nearby neighbourhoods. The community infrastructure question is access to shared-use space and everyday social infrastructure for a complex campus population.
Quantified starting point	<p>Around 200 sqm of indoor community-facility space is generated by the planned residential population using the current benchmark. This figure only captures resident population need and should be read alongside the wider campus population and amenity role.</p> <p>The resident-based figure should not be used as the full measure of community infrastructure need for the campus. The Community Plan or equivalent site-level assessment should also test the need generated by workers, patients, visitors, students and nearby communities.</p>
Provision already identified	Existing and planned campus amenities, including the Amenities Hub and mixed-use services, provide some community-facing functions. These spaces need to be assessed against public access, affordability, booking, welcome, opening hours and whether they support residents as well as workers and visitors.
Main requirement	<p>The campus should provide or secure genuinely accessible shared-use community space as part of the mixed-use campus offer. This should include informal social space, meeting/activity rooms, food-enabled space and clear public-facing access arrangements.</p> <p>Provision is needed to serve campus workers and users as well as residents and nearby communities. Commercial amenities should count only where community use is real, affordable, visible and suitable for wider community activity.</p>
Phasing and Community Plan requirements	A site-level Community Plan or equivalent should show how residents, workers, patients, visitors and nearby communities can access community-facing space. It should also address evening and weekend use, safety, inclusive access, non-commercial space and the relationship with nearby southern Cambridge communities.

Delivery, stewardship and checks	Campus stewardship arrangements should identify who owns, manages, books and funds community-facing space. Indicative capital range for the resident benchmark is about £0.8m-£1.1m, but the final requirement should also reflect campus scale, surrounding neighbourhood links and the public role of the site.
----------------------------------	---

10.10 Wellcome Genome Campus

Field	Schedule entry
Growth and current evidence	<p>Wellcome Genome Campus is an employment-led campus expansion with planned housing, supporting services and public-facing campus uses. The permitted development includes substantial research and translation floorspace, up to 1,500 homes for campus workers, and supporting community, education, conference, nursery, leisure and related uses. The community infrastructure question is not limited to the residential population. It also includes workers, visitors, campus users, new residents and nearby communities, including Hinxton and the Rural Southern Cluster.</p> <p>The campus should therefore be treated as an employment-led allocation that still needs a clear community-facing offer, because it will function as a major daily destination as well as a place with new homes.</p>
Quantified starting point	<p>The resident-based component should be recalculated from the latest housing mix and population yield for the permitted 1,500 homes. The schedule should use at least 1,100 sqm as a minimum testing figure. This combines the resident-based component of c.550 sqm with a further allowance of c.550 sqm linked to the scale of employment growth, using the 4,300 new jobs identified in the policy evidence as the basis for a cautious worker/community-facing test.</p> <p>This is not an employment tariff or a final requirement. It is a low-bar starting point for Community Plan testing, reflecting that the campus will include workers, visitors, new residents, public-facing campus activity and access to the wider campus, as well as the permitted 22,750 sqm GEA of non-residential institutions, community and leisure uses. The final requirement should be confirmed once the community-facing element of the permitted floorspace, reserved matters detail, access arrangements, off-site village investment and stewardship model are clear.</p>
Provision already identified	<p>Outline permission S/4329/18/OL allows up to 22,750 sqm GEA of non-residential institutions, community and leisure uses, including nursery, conference facility and education. The community-facing part of that provision has not yet been specified in a way that allows it to be counted as meeting community infrastructure need. Reserved matters and later delivery documents should confirm what part of this floorspace will function as accessible community infrastructure, who can use it, when it will be available, how it will be booked, how affordable it will be, and how</p>

	<p>it will be managed. The outline permission also secured about £75,000 towards an extension of Hinxton Village Hall and about £380,000 in kind for community development funds or initiatives.</p>
<p>Main requirement</p>	<p>The campus should provide a clearly defined community-facing package. This should include accessible meeting and activity space, informal social space, food-related provision, shared-use arrangements, early or meanwhile provision, and clear links to public realm, outdoor activity and nearby village facilities. Provision is needed to serve campus workers and users as well as residents, visitors and nearby communities.</p> <p>Campus amenities, conference space, education space, nursery provision and leisure uses should only count towards community infrastructure where access is genuine, affordable, visible, bookable where relevant, and suitable for wider community use. The final package should combine on-site provision with off-site support for nearby facilities where campus growth creates pressure or where village-based investment provides the better shared response.</p>
<p>Phasing and Community Plan requirements</p>	<p>A Community Plan or equivalent delivery document should confirm the resident-based requirement, the additional worker and visitor-related requirement, the community-facing element of the permitted non-residential floorspace, the role of early or meanwhile provision, and the relationship with Hinxton and nearby villages.</p> <p>The plan should distinguish between private campus amenities, resident-facing provision, worker and visitor provision, and spaces that nearby communities can use. It should also explain how the secured contribution to Hinxton Village Hall and in-kind community development funding will be used, and whether further off-site investment is needed.</p>
<p>Delivery, stewardship and checks</p>	<p>The long-term steward is likely to be campus-led or campus-partner-led. Key tests are access, affordability, visibility, booking, evening and weekend use, eligibility, active-use capability and whether spaces are open enough to support everyday community life. Campus-led stewardship should confirm who manages and books community-facing space, what uses are allowed, how residents and nearby communities will know what is available, and how community access will be protected over time.</p> <p>The indicative capital range should be based on at least the 1,100 sqm minimum testing figure, giving an initial range of about £4.4m-£5.8m before land, abnormal costs, specialist fit-out and long-term revenue. This should be reviewed once the resident population yield, community-facing floorspace, reserved matters detail, off-site village investment and stewardship model are confirmed.</p>

10.11 Babraham Research Campus and the Rural Southern Cluster

Field	Schedule entry
Growth and current evidence	Babraham Research Campus and the wider Rural Southern Cluster are predominantly employment-led developments. Draft strategy evidence identifies additional employment at Babraham and wider growth around the southern cluster, alongside Grange Farm and the Wellcome Genome Campus. South Cambridgeshire community facilities evidence also shows that some smaller nearby villages have limited community infrastructure.
Quantified starting point	A standard residential benchmark should only be applied where housing, tied accommodation or key-worker housing generates a resident population. Employment-led growth should still be assessed for its practical effect on nearby community facilities, transport, shared spaces and village assets.
Provision already identified	<p>Campus facilities may support some workers and visitors. They should be assessed separately from open community infrastructure. Planning permission 25/04634/OUT includes 850 sqm of nursery space within Class E(f) and up to 500 sqm of retail and community facilities within Class E(a, b, d) and Class F2(a-b).</p> <p>The community-facing role of this provision should be tested before it is counted as meeting wider community infrastructure need. Nearby village facilities vary in capacity, accessibility and quality. Babraham village was identified in community facilities evidence as lacking a stronger local heart.</p> <p>The retail and community facilities should be tested to confirm which parts are genuinely community-facing, accessible, affordable, bookable where relevant, and suitable for wider community use. Nearby village facilities vary in capacity, accessibility and quality. Babraham village was identified in community facilities evidence as lacking a stronger local heart.</p>
Main requirement	<p>Where campus or cluster growth creates demand beyond the campus boundary, contributions may be needed to improve nearby village or cluster facilities. Campus-only rooms, nursery space, retail space or staff-focused amenities with limited public access should be treated as private or restricted provision.</p> <p>Public community infrastructure needs clear public access, suitable rooms, affordability, booking arrangements where relevant, and a realistic stewardship route.</p>
Phasing and Community	Future applications should include a proportionate assessment of community infrastructure effects. This should cover worker and resident populations, nearby villages, non-driver access, lunch-time and evening

Plan requirements	use, and whether shared-use or off-site investment would provide better community benefit. Where permitted retail or community floorspace is relied on as part of the community infrastructure response, the assessment should explain who can use it, when it will be available, how it will be managed, and whether it can support wider community activity.
Delivery, stewardship and checks	Campus operators, developers, parish councils, South Cambridgeshire District Council and relevant landowners should agree practical access and contribution routes where impacts are identified. Any community-facing space should have clear access, booking, stewardship and affordability terms. The role of the permitted retail/community floorspace should be checked before it is counted as meeting community infrastructure need.

10.12 Common requirements across strategic sites

10.12.1 Every strategic site should have a Community Plan that sits alongside the masterplan or outline application and is updated as phases come forward.

10.12.2 Community Plans for strategic sites should show how community infrastructure will integrate with related infrastructure where this affects how the place will work. This includes sport and leisure provision, green infrastructure, play, active travel, health and wellbeing provision, education, libraries and cultural infrastructure. The Community Plan should identify practical interfaces such as co-location, shared access, movement routes, phasing, stewardship, community use agreements, booking arrangements and delivery dependencies.

10.12.3 Community infrastructure space should be safeguarded at masterplan stage, with enough capacity for the whole place and for later phases as well as the first plan-period phases.

10.12.4 Early residents should have access to usable community space before permanent buildings are complete, including meanwhile, temporary, shared-use space or fitted-out early spaces.

10.12.5 Community buildings should include the practical features that make them work: flexible rooms, storage, kitchens, toilets, accessible entrances, simple booking, affordable hire, staff or hosting space and clear management responsibilities.

10.12.6 Youth and teen use should be designed into the requirement from the start, with dedicated indoor arrangements where general room hire or outdoor provision would leave gaps.

10.12.7 Stewardship, revenue and maintenance should be agreed early. Capital delivery without an operating plan creates a risk of under-used, expensive or inaccessible space.

10.12.8 Existing nearby facilities should be protected and enhanced where they will serve growth, while large sites still provide necessary on-site provision.

10.12.9 Review points should be linked to occupation, population mix, use, booking demand, affordability, resident feedback and the delivery of later phases.

11. Access, inclusion and who provision needs to work for

11.1 Purpose of this section

11.1.1 Community infrastructure needs to work for the full range of people who live, work, study and spend time in Greater Cambridge. Access and inclusion need to shape location, design, management, funding and review. The requirements below draw on equality, access, workshop, survey, mapping and facilities evidence.

11.1.2 The focus is usability. A facility can be present in a neighbourhood and still be hard to use because it is difficult to reach, expensive to hire, poorly advertised, physically inaccessible, socially uncomfortable, unavailable at the right times, or unsuitable for the activities people need.

11.1.3 This section gives some attention to young people and teenagers because they were raised repeatedly in workshops, survey evidence and officer feedback. It also covers older people, disabled people, carers, low-income households, new arrivals, people without access to a car, women and girls, LGBTQIA+ communities, faith communities and other groups that may need safe and welcoming places to meet.

11.1.4 The practical response is to make community infrastructure safe, affordable, bookable, visible and suitable for different users, with scope for groups to meet separately at particular times where that is needed. Community Plans and site proposals should show how this will work in buildings, management arrangements and programming.

11.2 What the evidence shows

11.2.1 Workshop evidence describes community infrastructure as a combination of place, provision and people. Participants repeatedly raised welcome, trust, affordable access, youth and teen provision, transport for people who cannot drive, flexible rooms, kitchens, storage, clear booking arrangements and ongoing staffing or hosting.

11.2.2 Workshop evidence also identified groups more likely to be least served by current provision: low-income households, young people and teenagers, older residents, new arrivals, people with limited mobility, and people with limited confidence using formal systems or institutions.

11.2.3 Resident survey evidence shows that younger respondents tended to report lower access scores, particularly for sense of community, green spaces, community buildings and local decisions. Disabled respondents reported lower access scores across all themes apart from community buildings. Free-text responses raised accessibility, safety and anti-social behaviour, public transport, cost, community buildings and healthy play and leisure.

11.2.4 Demographic evidence shows two important pressures at the same time. Greater Cambridge has an above-average share of 15 to 34-year-olds, while the older population is projected to grow substantially. The 65+ population is projected to increase by 43% between 2024 and 2045, with large increases in people with dementia and mobility problems. This strengthens the case for accessible, flexible and well-located community provision.

11.2.5 Draft equalities evidence for the emerging Local Plan highlights age, disability, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, rurality, digital inclusion and socio-economic disadvantage as relevant to planning decisions. It also links inclusive design and community

safety to the needs of disabled people, older people, young children and groups protected under the Equality Act.

11.2.6 Mapped asset-location data records a wide range of community-facing assets, including faith spaces, schools, community centres, village halls, youth spaces, women’s spaces, libraries, food support and other local assets. The data is useful as a baseline, but it does not show whether each place is affordable, bookable, welcoming, physically accessible or suitable for different groups.

11.2.7 Community facilities evidence for South Cambridgeshire assesses quantity, quality and accessibility together. It shows a broad village and parish network, with facility quality varying across the district and accessibility treated as both physical location and the level of access available to the public. Cambridge City evidence points to an established community centre network and the need to align provision with growth, deprivation, service access and changing patterns of use.

Table 11.1. Access and inclusion tests for community infrastructure

Test	What this means in practice	What Community Plans and site proposals should show
Location and travel	People can reach provision by walking, wheeling, cycling, public transport or community transport, including in the evening and at weekends.	Travel routes, public transport links, safe crossings, cycle parking, disabled parking, evening access and links to nearby settlements or neighbourhoods.
Physical and sensory access	Buildings, routes, entrances, toilets, kitchens, storage and outdoor links work for disabled people, older people, carers, children and people with sensory impairments.	Accessible layouts, step-free access, toilets, changing facilities where appropriate, hearing support, lighting, signage, safe surfaces and usable parking/drop-off.
Cost and booking	Community groups can use space without hire costs, deposits, insurance requirements or booking systems becoming barriers.	Hire policy, free or discounted access, simple booking, support for small groups, clear rules, and arrangements for groups without formal organisational status.
Safety and welcome	People feel expected, respected and safe when they arrive and while they use the space.	Management arrangements, staffing or hosting, safeguarding, anti-harassment expectations, lighting, clear entrance arrangements and processes for handling concerns.
Opening times and programming	Provision is available when different groups need it, including teenagers, working	Opening hours, evening and weekend use, youth sessions, intergenerational

	adults, carers, older people and shift workers.	activity, low-cost activities and space for informal social contact.
Information and visibility	People know the space exists, what it offers and how to use it, including people without strong local networks or digital access.	Local publicity, non-digital information routes, clear signage, welcome packs for new residents, community connectors and links to voluntary/community organisations.

11.3 Young people

11.3.1 Young people and teenagers need specific attention because they are consistently visible in the evidence. Workshop participants described the need for youth-safe space, places to go, activities, and rooms that work for youth sessions. Survey responses also highlighted limited age-appropriate provision for older children and teenagers.

11.3.2 Youth provision should be built into the wider community infrastructure requirement from the start. Major developments should identify space that can support supervised and informal youth use, including evenings, weekends and school holiday periods.

11.3.3 At this stage, the available evidence supports a clear functional requirement for youth-capable provision. Any later youth floorspace standard would need further local evidence on type of provision, catchment, staffing model and the relationship between community buildings, schools and outdoor space. Community Plans should show how youth use will be provided through the main community space, outdoor social space, meanwhile space, schools or other shared facilities, and how youth work or community development capacity will be funded where needed.

11.3.4 Youth-capable space should include practical design and management features: rooms that can tolerate active use, storage, toilets, safeguarding arrangements, clear supervision, outdoor spill-out space where appropriate, and access routes that feel safe for young people travelling independently.

11.4 Safety, identity and group-specific use

11.4.1 Some people need spaces where they can meet with others who share a protected characteristic, identity, faith, culture, life experience or support need. This can include LGBTQIA+ communities, women and girls, disabled people, carers, faith communities, ethnic minority communities, new arrivals, young people, older people and people recovering from trauma or isolation.

11.4.2 The practical planning issue is whether community infrastructure allows those groups to meet safely, visibly or discreetly as needed, and with manageable cost and administration. Flexible, well-managed community buildings can usually support this need while serving the wider community.

11.4.3 LGBTQIA+ needs should be recognised through safety, welcome, booking, programming and management arrangements. The current study scope supports requirements on safety and suitability within general community provision. Mapping LGBTQIA+-specific facilities as a separate category would need additional local evidence. Community Plans should consider whether LGBTQIA+ residents and groups have access to safe and suitable places to meet, organise and socialise.

11.4.4 The same principle applies to other groups that may need dedicated sessions or group-specific use. A community building should be able to host a women's group, youth group, faith-linked community activity, carers' group, older people's lunch, disability support group or LGBTQIA+ social activity without each use having to justify itself as exceptional.

11.4.5 This makes management important. Booking policies, room hire rules, publicity, staffing, complaints processes and safeguarding arrangements all affect whether groups feel able to use a space. These arrangements should be part of Community Plans and management plans, not left until after the building opens.

11.4.6 Specialist infrastructure does not always mean a separate building or a fixed category of floorspace. It means provision that has been designed, fitted out, managed or funded so that particular users and activities can happen safely and realistically. Some needs can be met within a well-designed community hub. Others may be better met through investment in a trusted existing facility, shared-use agreement, specialist provider, youth setting, faith/community asset, advice space or area project pipeline.

11.4.7 Applicants should show how specialist and safe-space needs have been tested through the Community Plan. This should include access, safeguarding, privacy, storage, management, trust, affordability, programming and whether the right response is on-site provision, off-site contribution, fit-out, revenue support, partnership use or a combined package

11.5 Faith spaces and shared civic assets

11.5.1 Faith spaces form a major part of the community-facing asset network in Greater Cambridge. Mapped asset-location data records 207 faith-centre entries across the study area. Workshops also identified church halls and other faith spaces as part of the practical community infrastructure network where community use is active and welcomed.

11.5.2 Faith spaces can support a wide range of community activity, including youth work, food support, advice, older people's activity, cultural activity and informal neighbourly contact. They can also provide trusted routes into communities that may not engage with formal consultation or council-led spaces.

11.5.3 Planning and Community Plans should treat faith spaces carefully. A faith building should count as community infrastructure where access is genuine, affordable, reliable and suitable for the intended use. Community Plans should confirm the access offer before relying on a faith space as part of the wider community infrastructure response, including cost, governance, booking, volunteer capacity and suitability for different users.

11.5.4 Schools, libraries, scout and guide buildings, community pubs, cafés and other shared civic assets can also contribute to access and inclusion where community use is active and predictable. Community Plans should identify these assets, test their real availability, and explain how shared use will be secured and managed over time.

Table 11.2. Specialist infrastructure types and practical planning responses

Specialist infrastructure type	What this means in practice	What applicants should test	Possible planning response
Youth provision	Space that can support teenagers and young adults, including supervised sessions, informal social use, targeted support, creative or digital activity, and youth work.	Safe evening access, separation from adult-only activity where needed, safeguarding, toilets, storage, outdoor spill-out, active-use tolerance, affordability, transport, and whether youth work or community development capacity is needed.	On-site youth-capable space; fit-out of a local centre; contribution to an existing youth facility; youth-work, detached youth-work or activation funding; secured access to school, community or shared facilities where this is realistic.
Faith-sensitive community provision	Space that can support faith-linked community activity, cultural activity, prayer or reflection, shared meals, advice, youth work and wider community use where access is active and welcomed.	Flexible hall use, privacy, storage, kitchen arrangements, respectful scheduling, shared-use governance, comfort for different users, and washing or ablution considerations where relevant.	Shared community space designed to accommodate faith-linked use; contribution to a local faith/community asset; safeguarded space within a larger hub; community use agreement; off-site investment where a trusted faith/community facility serves the development catchment.
Women's and safe group spaces	Space for women, girls and other groups who may need privacy, confidence, safeguarding or trusted group-specific use. This may include support linked to domestic abuse,	Confidential rooms, privacy, safe access and egress, safeguarding, women-only sessions where needed, childcare-adjacent space, staff or steward awareness, and whether the location could expose users to risk or stigma.	Dedicated safe rooms within a community hub; fit-out of existing specialist provision; contribution to women's, advice or support space; management arrangements that protect privacy, safety and trusted access.

	trauma, isolation, childcare, advice or peer support.		
Advice and support spaces	Small rooms and associated waiting or reception space that allow advice, outreach, casework, digital support, health or welfare signposting and confidential conversations to take place.	Confidential interview rooms, digital access, waiting space, accessibility, non-stigmatising entrance, privacy, booking arrangements, safeguarding, co-location with community activity, and ability to host trusted providers.	Inclusion within community hubs; contribution to trusted local advice settings; fit-out of interview rooms; partnership use agreements; revenue or activation support for advice and outreach providers.
Food and community resilience infrastructure	Space and equipment that can support community meals, food projects, warm-space activity, food hubs, emergency response, mutual aid, social eating and community café activity.	Kitchen capability, storage, cold storage where relevant, delivery access, food safety, waste, community café potential, emergency or warm-space use, staffing, insurance and management capacity.	Kitchen and storage upgrades; fit-out of existing centres; contribution to food hubs or community kitchens; inclusion of food-capable space within new hubs; revenue or activation support for community food activity.
LGBTQIA+, new arrival, culturally specific and other trusted group use	Safe, affordable and welcoming space for groups who may need to meet separately, discreetly or in trusted settings, including groups facing stigma, exclusion, language barriers or low confidence using formal provision.	Privacy, affordability, clear booking routes, welcoming management, anti-harassment expectations, non-digital information, language or cultural access, discreet publicity where needed, and ability to meet without stigma.	Contribution to trusted existing provision; clear affordable booking arrangements; safe group-specific sessions within community hubs; Community Plan commitments on management, programming, outreach and review.

Disabled people, carers and sensory-access needs	Provision that works for people with physical, sensory, cognitive or mental health access needs, and for carers supporting them.	Step-free access, toilets, sensory conditions, lighting, acoustics, seating, parking or drop-off, safe routes, booking systems, quiet space, and whether activities can include carers without additional barriers.	Accessible design and fit-out; sensory-aware room specification; access improvements to existing facilities; contribution to trusted accessible provision; management and booking arrangements that support disabled users and carers.
Older people and intergenerational use	Local, familiar and accessible space for social connection, support, activity, lunch clubs, informal care networks and intergenerational use.	Daytime access, seating, toilets, warmth, transport, non-digital information, confidence entering the building, affordability, hosting, and links with health, care, faith and voluntary-sector activity.	Accessible local rooms; hosted activity; contribution to existing centres or village halls; community transport links; fit-out for kitchens, seating, storage and accessible toilets; revenue support where needed.

11.6 What Community Plans should demonstrate

11.6.1 Community Plans should show how access and inclusion will be addressed in practical terms. This should be proportionate to the scale of development, but it should be specific enough to inform masterplanning, planning obligations, CIL, management plans, stewardship arrangements and review points.

11.6.2 For major developments, Community Plans should include:

- the expected population profile, including age, household type, tenure, disability, student or worker population where relevant, and likely groups that may be less visible in standard consultation;
- how engagement has reached young people, older people, disabled people, carers, faith groups, LGBTQIA+ groups, women's groups, low-income households, new arrivals and people without access to a car, where those groups are relevant to the place;
- how the community infrastructure offer will provide youth-capable space, affordable activity, safe group-specific use, accessible toilets and routes, storage, kitchens and bookable rooms;
- how the community infrastructure offer will provide or fund youth-capable space, safe group use, faith-sensitive provision, advice and support space, food and community resilience infrastructure, accessible design, affordable activity, storage, kitchens, bookable rooms and any specialist management, safeguarding, privacy or trust-based arrangements needed;

- how revenue, staffing, community development or youth work capacity will support people to use the space, especially during early phases of development;
- how access will be reviewed after occupation, including whether groups are using the space and what changes are needed.

11.6.3 Where a development proposes off-site provision or a contribution to an existing facility, the same tests should apply. The receiving facility should be able to show that it can meet the relevant access, inclusion, affordability and management requirements for the population generated by the development.

11.6.4 Where provision relies on a school, faith space, privately owned venue or community organisation, the Community Plan should confirm the access agreement, booking arrangements, safeguarding, affordability, insurance requirements, opening times, governance and responsibilities for maintenance and renewal.

11.7 Implications for site schedules and recommendations

11.7.1 The strategic site schedules should carry forward access and inclusion requirements in the same practical terms as floorspace, cost and phasing. Each major site should identify how provision will work for young people, older people, disabled people, low-income households, new arrivals, faith communities and groups that may need safe group-specific activity.

11.7.2 Recommendations should avoid treating inclusion as a separate add-on. Access and inclusion should be built into Community Plans, phasing, design, management, funding, stewardship and review. This will help ensure that community infrastructure is usable by the people it is intended to serve.

12. Recommendations

12.1 Purpose of the recommendations

12.1.1 These recommendations set out how Greater Cambridge should use this study in planning policy, development management, infrastructure planning, site masterplanning and delivery review.

12.1.2 The recommendations are intended to make community infrastructure requirements clear, proportionate and deliverable. They should be read with the decision process in Section 2, the Community Plan requirements in Section 8, the delivery and funding approach in Section 9, the strategic site schedules in Section 10, and the decision checklist in Appendix A.

12.1.3 Draft Local Plan and draft IDP material is used as current planning context. These recommendations are intended to inform the Local Plan, IDP, site schedules, planning obligations, Community Plan requirements and later guidance.

12.2 Summary recommendations

Table 12.1. Priority actions after adoption of the study

Rec.	Recommendation	Where it should be carried forward
1	Use the study as the shared community infrastructure decision process.	Development management, pre-application advice, officer reports, Community Plans and planning obligations.
2	Use the 129 sqm per 1,000 residents benchmark as the quantified starting point, with local testing before requirements are agreed.	IDP, site schedules, Community Plans, planning obligations, CIL infrastructure monitoring and future guidance.
3	Require proportionate Community Plans for strategic sites, qualifying major sites and locally complex proposals.	Community Plan practice, masterplanning, site allocation requirements and planning applications
4	Carry the strategic site schedule requirements into site allocations, masterplans and planning obligations.	Strategic growth area planning, outline applications, reserved matters, phasing and infrastructure delivery.
5	Secure early usable provision on long build-out sites and new communities.	New settlements, strategic allocations, regeneration areas and major urban extensions.
6	Create and maintain area project pipelines for existing facilities and cumulative growth.	Infrastructure planning, CIL, Neighbourhood CIL, pooled planning obligations and local authority / parish project planning.
7	Secure stewardship, fit-out, revenue and management arrangements before handover.	Planning obligation heads of terms, management plans, leases, transfers, community use agreements and monitoring.

8	Use existing and shared assets where they are the right local response, after testing usability.	Community Plans, site schedules, planning obligations, CIL, asset protection, shared-use agreements and local project pipelines.
9	Build access, inclusion, youth provision, faith-space testing and safe group use into the core requirements.	Community Plans, specifications, management plans, access agreements, engagement and review.
10	Monitor, report and update the community infrastructure evidence and delivery programme.	Infrastructure Funding Statement, IDP updates, Local Plan monitoring, site reviews and public reporting.

12.3 Detailed recommendations

Recommendation 1: Use the study as the shared community infrastructure decision process

12.3.1 Greater Cambridge should use the decision process in Section 2 and Appendix A as the shared route for deciding what community infrastructure a development should provide or fund.

12.3.2 The process should be used at pre-application, application, planning obligations, CIL, condition discharge and review stages. It should help officers and applicants record the development scale, the evidence used, the existing provision tested, the agreed response, the planning mechanism, stewardship and review requirements.

12.3.3 Officer reports and heads of terms should show how the decision process has been applied, especially where the response is an off-site contribution, a shared-use arrangement, a project-pipeline contribution, or a change to an existing facility.

Recommendation 2: Use the 129 sqm per 1,000 residents benchmark as the quantified starting point

12.3.4 The South Cambridgeshire benchmark of 129 sqm per 1,000 population should remain the main local quantified starting point for community floorspace generated by residential growth.

12.3.5 The final planning response should be confirmed through local testing. This should cover existing provision, facility quality, access, affordability, booking, capacity, room mix, kitchens, storage, youth-capable space, shared use, phasing, stewardship and revenue.

12.3.6 For employment-led and campus locations, the resident-based benchmark should be applied where housing or tied accommodation generates population need. Wider worker, visitor and surrounding-community impacts should be assessed through a site-specific community infrastructure statement or Community Plan.

Recommendation 3: Require proportionate Community Plans for strategic sites, qualifying major sites and locally complex proposals

12.3.7 Community Plans should be required for strategic growth areas, new settlements, qualifying major residential development, larger employment development and other proposals where the scale or local context creates material community infrastructure issues.

12.3.8 The Community Needs Assessment should sit within the Community Plan. The plan should bring together the evidence, engagement, on-site provision, off-site contribution, early provision, phasing, stewardship, funding, review and monitoring requirements in one place.

12.3.9 Community Plans should be prepared early enough to influence masterplanning, local centre design, land safeguarding, building specification, phasing and legal agreements.

Recommendation 4: Carry the strategic site schedule requirements into site allocations, masterplans and planning obligations

12.3.10 The strategic site schedules in Section 10 should inform Local Plan site requirements, masterplans, pre-application advice, outline applications, reserved matters and planning obligation heads of terms.

12.3.11 Each strategic site should identify its plan-period and whole-site community infrastructure need, current and committed provision, on-site and off-site requirements, early provision, stewardship route, funding requirements and review points.

12.3.12 The schedules should be updated as site capacities, phasing, IDP assumptions, delivery agreements and local evidence change. Where a site continues beyond 2045, later-phase capacity should remain visible in the planning and delivery record.

Recommendation 5: Secure early usable provision on long build-out sites and new communities

12.3.13 Long build-out sites, new settlements, strategic allocations and major regeneration areas should provide early usable community space before permanent facilities are complete.

12.3.14 Early provision may include temporary rooms, meanwhile use, fitted-out ground-floor space, community development bases, community use of a school or faith space by agreement, outdoor gathering space with supporting facilities, or hosted activity in an existing nearby facility.

12.3.15 Legal agreements should secure the timing, minimum specification, access, affordability, operating responsibility, revenue support and transition from early provision to permanent facilities.

Recommendation 6: Create and maintain area project pipelines for existing facilities and cumulative growth

12.3.16 Greater Cambridge should maintain area project pipelines for Cambridge City, South Cambridgeshire and strategic growth areas. These pipelines should identify spendable projects that can receive planning obligation funding, CIL, Neighbourhood CIL, grant, local authority, parish or partnership funding.

12.3.17 Each project should record the facility or site, catchment, need addressed, proposed works, estimated cost, funding gap, delivery lead, status, dependencies, funding route and community benefit.

12.3.18 Project pipelines should support smaller sites and windfall development, where the right response is often improvement, extension, fit-out, accessibility works, kitchen or storage upgrades, youth-capable rooms, booking improvements or management support for an existing facility.

Recommendation 7: Secure stewardship, fit-out, revenue and management arrangements before handover

12.3.19 Planning obligations and Community Plans should secure the practical arrangements needed to keep facilities usable after delivery. This includes owner, leaseholder, operator, maintenance body, booking route, charging policy, affordable access, resident voice, review points and handover responsibilities.

12.3.20 Community infrastructure should be specified beyond shell floorspace. Requirements should cover fit-out, furniture, kitchen, storage, toilets, digital access, acoustic treatment, safeguarding, equipment, staffing or hosting, community development, start-up activity and maintenance where needed.

12.3.21 Community Asset Transfer, long leases, community ownership and shared-use agreements should be used where the receiving body has the capacity, terms, funding and support to manage the asset successfully.

Recommendation 8: Use existing and shared assets where they are the right local response

12.3.22 Existing facilities should be protected, enhanced and used where they provide the best local response. This includes community centres, village halls, parish rooms, faith spaces, libraries, schools, scout and guide buildings, youth spaces, specialist support spaces, community businesses and other community-serving assets.

12.3.23 Existing provision should pass the usability test before it is treated as meeting need. The test should cover reach, cost, booking, suitability, welcome, availability, capacity, quality, accessibility, management and long-term availability.

12.3.24 Shared-use arrangements should be secured through clear agreements covering opening hours, booking, safeguarding, insurance, costs, cleaning, storage, maintenance, privacy and inclusive use.

Recommendation 9: Build access, inclusion, youth provision, faith-space testing and safe group use into the core requirements

12.3.25 Community Plans, site schedules and facility specifications should show how provision will work for young people and teenagers, older people, disabled people, carers, low-income households, non-drivers, women and girls, LGBTQIA+ communities, faith communities, new arrivals and groups that may need safe or trusted meeting space.

12.3.26 Youth-capable provision should be included in major and strategic sites from the start. This should cover suitable rooms, informal space, safe access, storage, safeguarding, affordable programming, evening and weekend use, and any youth work or community development resource needed to activate the space.

12.3.27 Strategic sites should test faith-space need through Community Plans. This may lead to dedicated land, shared community space, early premises, enhancement of other meeting spaces, or access agreements, depending on local evidence and the scale of development.

Recommendation 10: Monitor, report and update the community infrastructure evidence and delivery programme

12.3.28 Greater Cambridge should monitor community infrastructure delivery, funding, access, affordability, use and stewardship as part of Local Plan, IDP and infrastructure monitoring.

12.3.29 Monitoring should record what has been secured, what has been received, what has been spent, what has opened, who manages it, whether it is affordable and accessible, and what review actions are needed.

12.3.30 The mapped asset baseline, site schedules, area project pipelines and appendix evidence should be reviewed as permissions, costs, population assumptions, facility condition and local priorities change. A light annual review linked to infrastructure monitoring would help keep the study usable.

12.4 Priority actions after adoption of the study

Table 12.2. First actions to make the recommendations usable in day-to-day planning and infrastructure work

Priority	Action	Main users
1	Prepare a short officer template for applying the decision process in pre-application advice, officer reports and planning obligation instructions.	Development management and infrastructure planning.
2	Agree a Community Plan template that embeds the Community Needs Assessment and the access, delivery, funding and stewardship checks from this study.	Policy, development management and community services.
3	Create initial area project pipelines for Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire, using existing facilities evidence, mapped assets, site schedules, known planning obligation and CIL priorities and local authority, parish and facility-owner input. The first version should identify spendable projects, catchments, costs, delivery leads, funding gaps and review dates.	Infrastructure planning, Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council, parish/town councils and relevant facility owners or operators.
4	Review the strategic site schedules against the latest Local Plan, IDP and site capacity	Policy, infrastructure planning and site leads.

	assumptions before they are used in final site requirements.	
5	Set up a review process for monitoring delivery, spend, access, affordability and stewardship of community infrastructure secured through growth.	Infrastructure monitoring and delivery review.

Appendices

Appendix A | Community infrastructure decision checklist for new developments

A.1 Purpose and status

A.1.1 This appendix expands the decision process in Figure 2.1. It is for use at pre-application, application, planning obligation, discharge and review stages. It helps officers and applicants agree a proportionate community infrastructure response for new development.

A.1.2 The checklist should be used with Section 2, Section 3, Section 4, the needs analysis, the place context sections, the strategic site schedules, Section 9 and the Community Plan requirements. It supports local judgement by setting out the questions that should be answered before a planning response is agreed.

A.1.3 The output should be a clear record of what the development will provide or fund, why that response is justified, how it will be secured, who will manage it, and when it will be reviewed.

Table A.1. Decision output

Decision output	What should be recorded
Development route	Whether the proposal is a small or windfall development, a medium site, a major site, a strategic site or new settlement, an employment-led or mixed-use area, or a proposal affecting an existing community facility.
Evidence used	The mapped asset-location data, community facilities evidence, existing resident survey evidence, local engagement, officer evidence, standards, comparator evidence, growth assumptions and draft planning context used to inform the decision.
Infrastructure response	Whether the response is on-site provision, off-site investment, improvement of existing provision, early temporary space, shared-use provision, land safeguarding, a financial contribution, or a mix of routes.
Planning mechanism	The route for securing the response, such as planning obligations, CIL, Neighbourhood CIL, planning condition, Community Plan, management plan, community use agreement, land transfer, lease, or later review mechanism.
Stewardship and funding	Who will own, manage, maintain and programme the provision, how affordability and community access will be protected, and what revenue, start-up or maintenance support is needed.

A.2 Decision tree checklist

A.2.1 The decision tree should be worked through in order. The questions are cumulative. A development may require more than one response, especially where it generates both local need and wider pressure on existing facilities.

Table A.2. Built-out decision tree

Step	Question	How to use the answer
1. Identify the development route	What scale and type of development is proposed?	Class the proposal as small or windfall, medium, major, strategic site or new settlement, employment-led, mixed-use, or a proposal affecting an existing community facility. Use Table A.3 to identify the expected level of evidence.
2. Confirm whether the proposal generates need	Will the development add residents, workers, visitors or pressure on local facilities?	Most residential, mixed-use and employment-led development will generate some need. The response should be proportionate to scale, location, cumulative growth and the role of nearby assets.
3. Establish the starting point	What do the relevant standards, benchmarks and site evidence suggest?	Use the 129 sqm per 1,000 population benchmark as the local community floorspace starting point where residential growth generates demand. Use standards and comparator evidence to test scale, type, phasing and ambition. Treat draft IDP and draft Local Plan material as current planning context.
4. Check existing provision nearby	Is there existing community infrastructure close enough to serve the development?	Use mapped asset-location data and local facilities evidence. Include community centres, village halls, faith spaces with active community use, libraries, schools with real community access, youth spaces, women's and specialist support spaces, and other community-serving assets.
5. Test whether existing provision works in practice	Can people reach, afford, book and use the existing provision, and does it have capacity?	Use the usability test in Table A.4. Existing provision should count only where access, affordability, availability, quality, fit-out, welcome, safeguarding, management and long-term availability are realistic.

6. Decide whether existing provision can be improved	Could the need be met through extension, refurbishment, access improvements, fit-out, equipment, kitchen upgrades, storage, community use agreements or management support?	Where improvement is the right route, identify the project, cost, delivery body, timing, funding route and how the development contribution will be spent.
7. Decide whether new on-site provision is needed	Does the development need its own community space, land, building, early temporary space or shared-use facility?	On-site provision is more likely for major developments, strategic sites, new settlements, long build-outs and places where existing provision cannot meet the additional need. Define land, floorspace, specification, phasing, fit-out and handover arrangements.
8. Identify the scale of need	Is the need local, settlement-wide, area-wide, district-wide or wider?	Local need will usually require on-site or nearby provision. Wider need may justify pooled contributions, CIL, enhancement of existing assets or investment in a facility serving a broader catchment.
9. Test early provision	Will residents, workers or community groups arrive before permanent facilities are ready?	Long build-outs, new settlements and major regeneration areas should include early temporary space, access to existing facilities, community development capacity or meanwhile use where needed.
10. Test stewardship and revenue	Who will own, manage, maintain, staff, programme and review the provision?	Identify the management body, operator route, revenue support, maintenance funding, affordable hire approach, community access arrangements and review points before the planning response is agreed.
11. Secure the planning response	What needs to be secured through planning?	Use Table A.6 to identify the right mechanism: land, building, shell and core, completed facility, fit-out, financial contribution, early provision, community development resource, management plan, community use agreement, monitoring or review.
12. Record the decision	Has the reason for the response been recorded clearly?	Use the officer record in Table A.8. The decision should show the evidence used, the response agreed, the planning mechanism, delivery responsibilities, funding route,

		stewardship arrangements and review requirements.
--	--	---

A.3 Development scale routes

A.3.1 The level of evidence and delivery commitment should match the scale, type and local effect of the development. Draft Policy WS/NC Meeting the needs of new and growing communities in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan provides the main policy trigger for detailed assessment and strategy, including proposals of at least 200 residential units, cumulative residential development of at least 200 units, or at least 5,000 sqm of employment floorspace. For community infrastructure, this study uses the Community Plan as the practical route for bringing the Community Needs Assessment, engagement, provision, funding, phasing, stewardship and review requirements together.

A.3.2 Sites below those thresholds may still need a lighter-touch Community Infrastructure Statement, or a clear officer-recorded assessment, where local evidence shows a material community infrastructure issue. This may include cumulative windfall growth, estate renewal, regeneration, loss or replacement of an existing community facility, pressure on an identified local centre or village hall, weak local access, reliance on specialist or trusted provision, or the need for an off-site contribution to a project pipeline.

A.3.3 The routes in Table A.3 should be applied proportionately. A smaller site should not be asked for a full Community Plan unless its scale, context or impact justifies it. Equally, a below-threshold site should not be treated as having no community infrastructure impact where the evidence shows that it will add pressure to a defined local need or facility.

Table A.3. Expected route by development type

Development type	Evidence expected	Typical response
Small or windfall development	Basic community infrastructure statement or planning officer note. Identify relevant mapped assets, nearby projects, cumulative growth and any local access issues.	Usually a proportionate financial contribution to existing or planned provision, where a clear spend route exists. May include Neighbourhood CIL or pooled funding where appropriate.
Medium site below Community Plan threshold	Shorter assessment of existing provision, access, capacity and known local projects. Check whether several nearby sites together create cumulative need. This route applies below the Policy WS/NC Community Plan trigger of 200 homes or 5,000 sqm of employment floorspace.	Contribution to improvement or expansion of nearby provision, or targeted on-site space where the local context supports it.

Major residential development	Community Plan route where the Policy WS/NC threshold applies, including residential schemes of 200 or more homes. Evidence should include a Community Needs Assessment, mapped baseline, local engagement, benchmark calculation, existing provision test, phasing and stewardship plan.	On-site provision, off-site investment, early provision or a mix. The response should be secured through planning obligations, conditions and management arrangements as appropriate.
Strategic site or new settlement	Full Community Plan and site schedule approach. Include plan-period and whole-site growth, early provision, permanent provision, land safeguarding, benchmark need, local evidence, wider catchments and review points. Strategic sites will normally exceed the Policy WS/NC Community Plan trigger, but this should be checked early where site boundaries, phasing, housing numbers or employment floorspace are still uncertain	On-site provision is likely. Requirements may include land, completed building, shell/core, fit-out, temporary space, community development capacity, operator route, maintenance and long-term stewardship.
Employment-led or mixed-use area	Community Plan route where the Policy WS/NC threshold applies, including employment schemes of more than 5,000 sqm. Evidence should assess worker, visitor and resident populations, local centres, public access, working patterns, surrounding communities and pressure on existing community-facing assets.	Community space, public-facing shared space, local centre provision, off-site contributions, community access agreements, meanwhile use or support for nearby assets serving the development population.
Proposal involving loss, change or replacement of a community facility	Evidence on current use, future need, accessibility, replacement quality, community role, alternative provision and whether the facility can be viably retained or adapted.	Protect, replace or enhance provision where loss would reduce the quality, range or accessibility of local community infrastructure. Replacement should be at least as usable for the relevant community role.

A.4 Existing provision usability test

A.4.1 A mapped asset should be tested before it is treated as meeting need. This test applies to community centres, village halls, faith spaces, libraries, schools, youth spaces, specialist support spaces, community businesses and other community-serving assets.

Table A.4. Existing provision test

Test	Questions to answer	Possible planning response
Location and movement	Can residents or workers reach the facility safely and conveniently by walking, cycling, public transport and accessible transport? Are severance, distance, travel cost or evening travel a barrier?	On-site or nearer provision, safer routes, transport links, contribution to a better-located asset, or early local space.
Capacity	Can the facility absorb additional use without displacing current users? Are rooms the right size for likely activities?	Extension, additional rooms, new provision, booking reform, or funding for another facility serving the catchment.
Availability and booking	Can groups book it at the times they need, including evenings and weekends? Is the booking process clear and realistic for informal or volunteer-led groups?	Community use agreement, booking commitments, management support, opening-hour requirements, or alternative provision.
Affordability	Are hire costs affordable for local groups, young people, low-income residents and small community organisations?	Affordable hire commitments, revenue support, tiered pricing, subsidy, operator support or dedicated low-cost space.
Suitability and fit-out	Does the facility have the right rooms, toilets, kitchen, storage, digital access, floor finish, safeguarding arrangements, accessibility features and acoustic/noise conditions? Can it support normal community-centre uses such as celebrations, exercise classes, youth activity, music, choirs, faith activity and larger group gatherings?	Fit-out contribution, kitchen or storage upgrade, acoustic treatment, ventilation improvements, active-use specification, changes to booking or management arrangements, or new space where the existing facility cannot realistically support the required uses.
Safety and welcome	Will different users feel safe and welcome? Can young people, older people, disabled people, women, LGBTQIA+ communities, faith groups and other groups who may need a trusted setting use the space?	Design, staffing, privacy, safeguarding, codes of use, group booking arrangements, targeted engagement, or specific safe meeting arrangements.
Governance and management	Is there a body able to manage bookings, maintenance, safeguarding, conflict, affordability, volunteers and community access?	Management plan, operator selection, trustee or parish capacity support, service-level

		agreement, or alternative stewardship route.
Long-term availability	Is the community use secure over time? Are there risks from lease terms, school access, volunteer fatigue, building condition, running costs or redevelopment?	Longer-term agreement, asset transfer, lease, maintenance sum, revenue support, review mechanism, or replacement provision.

A.5 Choosing the infrastructure response

A.5.1 The response should follow from the evidence. The same population benchmark can lead to different planning responses in different places, depending on existing provision, growth scale, timing, site role, local access and stewardship.

Table A.5. Choosing between on-site, off-site and improvement routes

Response route	Use this route where	What to specify
Improve or expand existing provision	A nearby facility is accessible, trusted and well located, and can meet additional need with investment or management support.	Project scope, cost, delivery body, timing, contribution route, community access, maintenance and review.
Off-site contribution	The need is generated by the development but is best met through a facility serving a wider catchment, or a smaller site cannot reasonably provide space on site.	Facility or project receiving funding, contribution amount, trigger, spend deadline, relationship to development, and monitoring route.
Pooled or CIL-funded investment	Several developments contribute to the same wider need, or the facility has an area-wide or strategic role.	Project list, prioritisation route, relationship to site schedules, governance, funding gap and delivery programme.
On-site provision	The development is large enough to generate a local community infrastructure requirement, or existing provision cannot meet the need.	Land, location, floorspace, specification, fit-out, access, phasing, trigger, operator route, management and handover.

Early temporary provision	People will move in or start using the area before permanent facilities are ready.	Temporary rooms, meanwhile use, access to nearby space, community development resource, activity budget, opening date, review and transition route.
Shared-use provision	A school, faith space, library, sports pavilion, civic building or other shared asset can genuinely support community use.	Community use agreement, hours, booking, pricing, safeguarding, access, storage, maintenance, governance and dispute route.
Land safeguarding or serviced land	The site is a major growth area or new settlement where future provision needs land before the operator, specification or timing is fixed.	Plot size, location, servicing, trigger, transfer terms, interim use, review and fallback arrangements.
No additional physical provision	Existing provision clearly has capacity, access, affordability, suitability and long-term availability, and the development does not create a material additional requirement.	Record the evidence, any monitoring requirement, and any small-scale contribution or engagement action still needed.

A.6 What planning should secure

A.6.1 The planning response should be specific enough to be enforceable and usable. The heads of terms should identify the physical, financial, operational and review requirements needed to make the provision work.

Table A.6. Planning requirements checklist

Requirement	When relevant	Detail to secure
Land	Strategic sites, new settlements, major extensions, or faith/community provision requiring a dedicated site.	Location, area, servicing, access, transfer terms, timing, interim use and fallback route.
Shell and core space	Mixed-use schemes, centres, employment-led development or sites where fit-out will follow operator selection.	Floorspace, location, access, servicing, ceiling heights, utilities, frontage, storage, ventilation, acoustic separation, active-use capability, residential adjacency and fit-out responsibilities. The base specification should not lock the space into quiet meeting-room use if it is intended to meet a wider community-centre requirement.

Completed building	Where a defined community facility is required and the delivery body is clear.	Specification, room schedule, kitchen, toilets, storage, accessibility, sustainability, digital access, acoustic separation, ventilation, active-use capability, handover standard and opening trigger.
Fit-out and equipment	Where space will be unusable without investment beyond the base building.	Furniture, kitchen, AV, IT, storage, safeguarding, acoustic treatment, event equipment and maintenance responsibilities.
Acoustic tolerance and active use	Where community space is intended to operate as a community centre, hub, hall, youth-capable space or larger shared community room, especially where it is within, next to or below housing or other sensitive uses.	Expected use profile, acoustic design, ventilation, entrances, servicing, hours of use, management arrangements and any noise-related planning conditions. The secured specification should allow normal community-centre uses, including celebrations, exercise classes, youth activity, music, choirs, faith activity and larger group gatherings.
Financial contribution	Where off-site investment, pooled funding, enhancement or later delivery is the right response.	Amount, indexation, trigger, spend purpose, eligible projects, legal or funding route, repayment rules, monitoring and delivery responsibilities.
Early temporary space	Long build-outs, strategic sites, meanwhile phases, regeneration areas and places where first residents arrive before permanent provision.	Location, opening date, minimum specification, operator, revenue support, activity programme, transition route and review date.
Community development resource	Major and strategic sites where community formation, use of space and local governance need active support.	Role, duration, funding, host body, reporting, handover and link to Community Plan actions.
Community use agreement	Schools, faith spaces, libraries, sports pavilions, private buildings or other shared assets.	Hours, charges, booking process, safeguarding, access, storage, insurance, maintenance, review and dispute resolution.
Management and stewardship plan	All major on-site provision and any facility that depends on shared use, transfer, lease or community management.	Ownership, operator, governance, business plan, affordable hire, maintenance, lifecycle costs, risk, reporting and review.

Monitoring and review	Major developments, phased sites, new settlements and places where provision depends on changing population or operator arrangements.	Review triggers, occupancy thresholds, evidence to be updated, responsible officers, developer role and actions if provision is not working.
-----------------------	---	--

A.7 Community Plan checklist

A.7.1 Where a Community Plan is required or agreed, it should answer the decision tree questions in one place. It should be prepared early enough to influence site layout, local centre design, land safeguarding, phasing, planning obligations and stewardship arrangements.

Table A.7. Community Plan content checklist

Community Plan item	Minimum content
Local context	Description of the site, surrounding settlements or neighbourhoods, nearby facilities, movement routes, local centres, schools, faith spaces, youth provision and community-facing assets.
Mapped provision and local testing	Mapped asset-location data checked against access, capacity, affordability, booking, quality, fit-out, management and long-term availability.
Growth and need	Resident, worker and visitor populations, plan-period and whole-site growth where relevant, benchmark calculation, faith-space prompt where relevant, and any site schedule requirements.
Engagement	Evidence from existing and emerging communities, community organisations, parish/town councils, faith groups, youth voices, groups who may face barriers, council services and relevant operators.
Infrastructure response	What will be provided on site, funded off site, improved, shared, delivered early, safeguarded for later, or reviewed as the site grows.
Relationship with related infrastructure	How community infrastructure will connect with sport and leisure provision, green infrastructure, play, active travel, health and wellbeing provision, education, libraries and cultural infrastructure where this affects access, co-location, shared use, phasing, stewardship or planning obligations. Identify any dependencies,

	shared-use agreements, movement links, management arrangements or contributions needed.
Access and inclusion	How provision will work for children and young people, older people, disabled people, low-income households, non-drivers, women, LGBTQIA+ communities, faith groups, new arrivals and other groups needing safe or trusted meeting space.
Phasing	Temporary and permanent provision, triggers, first occupation arrangements, meanwhile use, transition from early space to permanent provision, and review points.
Funding and delivery	Capital, fit-out, revenue, start-up, maintenance, community development resource, planning obligations, CIL, grants, partnership funding and responsible delivery bodies.
Stewardship	Ownership, management, operator route, hire policy, maintenance, lifecycle costs, governance, community access and monitoring.

A.8 Officer record template

A.8.1 Officers can use the following template to record the conclusion from the decision tree. It can be used in pre-application notes, committee reporting, planning obligation instructions, Community Plan review, or monitoring.

Table A.8. Decision record template

Decision point	Conclusion to record
Development route and scale	
Relevant evidence checked	
Benchmark or standard used as starting point	
Existing provision considered	
Usability test conclusion	
Local, settlement, area-wide or strategic need	
Agreed infrastructure response	
Planning mechanism	

Early provision requirement	
Stewardship, revenue and management arrangements	
Monitoring and review requirement	

A.9 Quick check before agreeing heads of terms

A.9.1 Before heads of terms are agreed, the following questions should have clear answers:

- What need is generated by the development, and what evidence supports that conclusion?
- Which existing facilities have been tested, and what is the conclusion on access, capacity, affordability and quality?
- What will be provided on site, funded off site, improved, shared or delivered early?
- How does the response relate to the needs analysis, place context, site schedule and Community Plan requirements?
- What will be secured through planning obligations, CIL, condition, land transfer, lease, community use agreement or management plan?
- Who will own, manage, maintain and programme the provision?
- What revenue, start-up, maintenance or community development support is needed?
- What review points are needed as the population grows or the site changes?

Appendix B | Asset scope and typology

This records the working asset scope used in the study. It should be read with Section 3 and with the decision checklist in Appendix A. The categories provide a consistent basis for mapping, needs analysis, Community Plans, site schedules and planning obligations.

The scope is practical. It focuses on spaces, facilities and local assets that help people meet, organise, access support and take part in community life. Related provision such as formal sports, healthcare, green space, play, allotments and burial space is important context and is handled mainly through the evidence and strategies that cover those areas directly.

B.1 Asset scope and typology

Appendix Table B.1. Asset scope and typology used in this study

Category	Status in this study	What it covers	How it should be used
Core community facilities	Core	Community centres, community hubs, village halls, parish halls, public halls and meeting rooms.	Use as the main baseline for existing provision, new provision and developer contributions. Test room mix, access, cost, booking, fit-out, management and long-term availability.
Community-facing shared assets	Core where access is real	Libraries, faith spaces with active community use, schools with genuine community use, scout and guide buildings and similar shared civic assets.	Use where public or community access is workable and dependable. Confirm booking, safeguarding, opening times, cost, insurance and who can use the space.
Faith spaces and attached halls	Core where materially community-facing	Places of worship, halls and associated rooms that host community activity, food support, youth work, advice, older people's activity, cultural activity or local groups.	Recognise their community role where access is active and welcomed. Test governance, privacy, religious use, safeguarding, comfort for different users and availability.
Youth spaces	Core	Dedicated youth buildings, youth-oriented rooms and spaces that can support supervised	Use to test whether young people and teenagers have somewhere safe and suitable to go. Consider evenings, weekends, storage,

		or informal youth activity.	safeguarding, outdoor spill-out and transport.
Women's and specialist support spaces	Core where spatially identifiable	Spaces tied to women's provision, specialist support, safe group meeting space or services where privacy, safeguarding or trust are central.	Use to identify needs that general hall space may miss. Keep public-facing detail proportionate where confidentiality and safety matter.
Schools with community use	Contextual core	School halls, studios, rooms or facilities available for community use outside the school day.	Use where access is secured and practical. Check safeguarding, supervision, cleaning, storage, insurance, booking, costs, parking and opening hours.
Community-owned and community-serving assets	Contextual	Community pubs, shops, co-operative spaces, CLT-held spaces, social enterprises, community businesses and other stable assets with a local community role.	Use as evidence of local resilience and stewardship potential. Test whether they can host community activity without spending expectations excluding people.
Commercial and informal social spaces	Contextual	Cafes, pubs, shops, social clubs, private venues and other informal meeting places that contribute to everyday social life.	Use as part of the local picture where they are genuinely accessible. Test affordability, opening times, welcome, booking, governance and long-term availability.
Related provision handled mainly elsewhere	Contextual cross-reference	Sports and leisure facilities, healthcare, parks, green space, play, allotments, community growing, cemeteries and burial space.	Cross-reference where they affect community life, movement, co-location or shared use. Keep the main community infrastructure baseline focused on community-facing spaces and facilities.

B.2 Usability checks for mapped and proposed assets

Mapped assets and proposed facilities should be tested before they are treated as meeting need. The same test applies to community centres, village halls, faith spaces, schools, libraries, youth spaces, specialist provision and community-serving assets.

Appendix Table B.2. Usability checks for community infrastructure assets

Check	What to test
Asset presence	The record shows that a facility exists or is known. It should be tested before it is treated as meeting need.
Access	Check walking, wheeling, cycling, public transport, accessible transport, safe routes, opening hours and evening or weekend access.
Affordability	Check hire cost, deposits, insurance, minimum spend expectations, free or subsidised use and support for informal groups.
Availability	Check booking routes, times available, restrictions, regular users, capacity and whether additional use would displace existing activity.
Suitability	Check room sizes, toilets, kitchen or catering capability, storage, digital access, floor finish, safeguarding, accessibility and acoustic/noise conditions. Community spaces should be able to support normal active uses, including celebrations, exercise, youth activity, music, choirs, faith activity and larger group gatherings, unless there is a clear reason why a quieter room type is being provided for a different function.
Welcome and safety	Check whether different groups are likely to feel expected, respected and safe using the space.
Management and longevity	Check owner, operator, lease, maintenance, budget, staffing or volunteer capacity, charging policy and review arrangements.

Appendix C | Mapped asset baseline and area summary tables

This summarises the mapped asset-location baseline and the area-based planning implications carried through Sections 5 and 6. The mapping records known locations. It should be used with local evidence before conclusions are drawn about access, quality, capacity or long-term availability.

The mapped baseline records 223 geolocated community-facing or contextual entries in Cambridge City and 517 geolocated entries in South Cambridgeshire. These figures describe the mapped dataset used for this study and should be read with the agreed scope in Appendix B.

C.1 Mapped asset baseline by type

Appendix Table C.1. Cambridge City mapped asset-location baseline by type

Asset type	Mapped entries
Community centres	21
Village halls	2
Faith spaces	63
Schools and school-linked community spaces	52
Libraries	8
Youth spaces	8
Women's spaces	6
Food aid and food support	22
Scout and guide buildings	13
Other community-facing assets	12
Sports pavilions	4
Leisure/sport context entries	12
Total mapped entries	223

Appendix Table C.2. South Cambridgeshire mapped asset-location baseline by type

Asset type	Mapped entries
Community centres	32
Village halls	76
Faith spaces	144

Schools and school-linked community spaces	79
Libraries	19
Youth spaces	18
Women's spaces	36
Food aid and food support	24
Scout and guide buildings	33
Other community-facing assets	12
Sports pavilions	35
Leisure/sport context entries	9
Total Mapped Entries	517

C.2 Area-based planning summary

The area summaries below bring the current mapped baseline together with facilities evidence, workshop evidence, officer feedback and current draft infrastructure planning evidence. They are planning prompts for Community Plans, site schedules, planning obligation and CIL discussions and area project pipelines.

Appendix Table C.3. Area-based asset and pressure summary

Area	Current provision and character	Growth and pressure points	Least well served groups or places	Practical implications
Cambridge City West / Central	Institutionally dense area with civic buildings, libraries, major venues and community-facing assets. Access and affordability still matter.	Intensification, student and worker populations, city-centre uses and demand on civic assets.	Smaller community groups needing affordable rooms; people who need clear information about what can be booked or used.	Improve access to existing civic and community assets, protect social and civic venues, and add targeted flexible provision where growth creates local gaps.
Cambridge City North	Established neighbourhoods, regeneration areas and major future change. Important existing centres	North East Cambridge and surrounding northern neighbourhoods needing visible local	East Chesterton, high-need neighbourhoods close to NEC, young people and	Secure substantial provision in NEC; strengthen existing northern assets; make Brown's Field, The Meadows and

	include The Meadows, Campkin Road, Brown's Field, Akeman Street, Arbury Community Centre, Storey's Field and Darwin Green.	anchors and better links between existing and future provision.	communities with limited easy access to local community space.	Campkin Road visible in local planning.
Cambridge City East	Established neighbourhoods sit alongside newer growth areas and eastern fringe development. Abbey, East Barnwell and Cherry Hinton remain important gap and priority areas.	Cambridge East, Marleigh / Springstead, East Barnwell, Cherry Hinton and the surrounding fringe.	East Barnwell / Abbey, Cherry Hinton fringe areas, young people and people needing informal, affordable and safe places to meet.	Combine new growth-area provision with stronger neighbourhood assets, including The Nest, Springstead Hall, East Barnwell and Cherry Hinton provision.
Cambridge City South	Important community assets alongside major institutional and growth areas, including Clay Farm, Trumpington, Queen Edith's and the Biomedical Campus area.	Interaction between residential growth, institutional growth, worker populations, transport corridors and neighbourhood needs.	Residents living next to major institutional sites and people needing accessible local rooms rather than institutional space that feels closed.	Strengthen realistic shared use, protect southern community anchors, and make community-facing provision clearer around major institutions and southern growth areas.
South Cambridgeshire North	Broad rural and small-town network of village halls, faith spaces, schools and parish-scale	Northstowe, Waterbeach and the wider northern growth corridor.	Residents in new settlements where social infrastructure is still forming; existing	Secure town- and settlement-scale anchors, strengthen village assets and plan early usable space linking existing and new communities.

	assets, with larger growth locations needing a clearer planned response.		villages where provision is clustered away from growth.	
South Cambridgeshire South East	Mixed geography of villages, heritage assets, eastern fringe locations and strategic employment or growth areas.	Grange Farm, Wellcome Genome Campus, the eastern Cambridge fringe, Fen Ditton, Teversham and links with Marleigh / Springstead.	Teversham, eastern fringe communities, young people and places where village and growth-site provision could develop separately.	Plan shared anchors, address the Teversham gap, and provide welcoming, informal, affordable and easy-to-access space alongside larger growth-site provision.
South Cambridgeshire South West	Strong parish-based geography with village-scale assets, dispersed settlements and rural access issues.	Cambourne North, the wider Cambourne area and Bourn Airfield.	Growth locations around Cambourne and Bourn Airfield; smaller rural settlements with fragile or volunteer-dependent assets.	Combine new provision in Cambourne and Bourn growth areas with enhancement and protection of village-scale assets. Use pooled contributions where smaller growth adds pressure.

Appendix Table C.4. Area summary: provide, enhance and protect

Area	New provision to plan for	Existing provision to enhance	Provision to protect
Cambridge City West / Central	Targeted small-scale provision where intensification or mixed-use growth creates a clear local requirement.	Libraries, civic rooms and community venues where clearer access, programming, affordability or fit-out would increase community use.	City-centre and west/central assets that already support everyday civic and community life.

Cambridge City North	Substantial new community infrastructure in North East Cambridge, serving the new district and surrounding neighbourhoods.	Brown's Field, The Meadows, Campkin Road, Akeman Street, Arbury Community Centre, Storey's Field, Darwin Green, scout and guide buildings, faith/community venues and other northern assets.	Existing community anchors in high-need northern neighbourhoods, especially where redevelopment or intensification could weaken access.
Cambridge City East	New or expanded provision linked to Cambridge East and eastern growth areas, with early usable space and clear permanent provision.	The Nest, East Barnwell provision, Cherry Hinton provision, Springstead Hall, local faith/community venues and community rooms.	Existing eastern assets supporting everyday community life and specialist support, especially in Abbey, Cherry Hinton and fringe neighbourhoods.
Cambridge City South	New or expanded community-facing provision where southern growth or institutional expansion creates demand the current network cannot absorb.	Clay Farm, Trumpington and other southern hubs, community rooms and dual-use spaces where access, booking, storage, kitchens or programming can be improved.	Existing southern community anchors that provide accessible local space and should remain community-facing as growth continues.
South Cambridgeshire North	New and growing settlement hubs in Northstowe and Waterbeach, with early usable space before permanent build-out is complete.	Existing civic and community assets in and around Northstowe, Waterbeach and northern villages, especially where fit-out, storage, booking, kitchens, accessibility or shared use would help.	Village-scale and neighbourhood-scale assets that already act as local anchors and would be difficult to replace if weakened or lost.
South Cambridgeshire South East	New local provision in and around major growth locations where current	Local halls, school-linked spaces, faith/community venues, pavilions and	Community-facing assets in villages and neighbourhoods that support everyday social life

	community infrastructure is weak or growth changes demand, including Teversham and the eastern fringe.	other mapped assets that could play a stronger role if upgraded or better connected to growth.	and may come under greater pressure as growth proceeds.
South Cambridgeshire South West	Multi-use community infrastructure in the Cambourne growth area and Bourn Airfield, distributed so provision is visible and usable across neighbourhoods.	Village halls, community buildings, pavilions and other local assets where refurbishment, extension, energy efficiency, kitchens, storage or shared use would increase capacity.	Village-scale assets that carry local community life in smaller settlements and may become more important as surrounding growth increases pressure.

Appendix D | Strategic growth area schedule summary

This provides a compact summary of the strategic growth area requirements in Section 10. It should be used as a reference alongside the full site schedules, Community Plan requirements and delivery/funding section.

The community space figures use the 129 sqm per 1,000 additional population benchmark as a starting point. They are rounded for planning use and should be reviewed as draft Local Plan, draft IDP, site capacity, delivery, reserved matters and phasing evidence are updated.

D.1 Strategic growth area schedule summary

Appendix Table D.1. Strategic growth area schedule summary

Strategic location	Community space starting point	Current and committed provision	Likely planning response	Further testing
North East Cambridge	2,200 sqm whole-site and 1,200 sqm by 2045 if comprehensive redevelopment comes forward. Recalculate in the current employment-led scenario.	No dedicated facility within NEC identified. Brown's Field is the nearest City community centre; The Meadows and Campkin Road sit on the wider fringe. Campus, science-park and outreach provision should be tested for public/community access in the employment-led scenario.	Major on-site multifunctional hub if comprehensive redevelopment comes forward. In the employment-led scenario, secure proportionate public-facing space, outreach, shared-use provision and links to northern assets.	Confirm development scenario, resident/worker/visitor populations, hub/library relationship, campus access, early provision, operator route, revenue support and surrounding-centre role.
Cambridge East	3,700 sqm whole-site; 2,100 sqm by 2045. Confirm the remaining requirement after committed provision and eastern-network assets have been tested.	Marleigh and Springstead include committed community space, Park Pavilion and mixed-use provision, meanwhile provision, and secured community-development / activation contributions. The Nest, Cherry Hinton Hub, East Barnwell/Abbey provision, Teversham and eastern-fringe assets form part of the wider network.	Stronger eastern network, with substantial airport-area provision, flexibility for meanwhile provision, and tested links to East Barnwell, Abbey, Cherry Hinton, Teversham and the eastern fringe.	Confirm main hub role, committed provision that counts towards the requirement, Teversham/eastern-fringe relationship, early space, stewardship and off-site enhancement package.
North West Cambridge / Eddington, with Darwin	1,500 sqm whole-site; 1,200 sqm by 2045 for Eddington.	Storey's Field is a strong existing anchor. Darwin Green has community rooms and library provision in a more constrained mixed-use setting, alongside secured community-support,	Review capacity against densification, Eddington Phase 2 and later phases. Secure additional provision, fit-out, activation support or investment if existing anchors	Test Storey's Field capacity, Darwin Green access and management, Phase 2 assumptions,

Green context		youth, sport development and grant funding.	cannot absorb growth while remaining accessible and affordable.	youth/family/food uses, active-use capability and review triggers.
Expanded Cambourne	5,700 sqm whole-site; 1,700 sqm by 2045. Figures are indicative and should be tested through integration with existing Cambourne town facilities, committed provision and secured contributions.	Cambourne Hub, Cambourne West commitments and known investment in community and youth facilities provide a base, but Cambourne North changes the town-scale requirement.	Larger town network with neighbourhood provision, a stronger central or gateway anchor, youth-capable space and investment in existing facilities where they will serve growth.	Confirm Cambourne North role, relationship to existing town facilities and commitments, railway/public transport catchments, youth provision, stewardship and pooled investment route.
Northstowe	3,100 sqm whole-settlement based on an eventual population of 24,000; 2,300 sqm by 2045. Read against substantial secured provision.	Unity Centre is operational. Secured provision includes Phase 1 and Phase 3A community buildings, a Phase 2 Community Hub, a Health and Library Facility, faith/community land in later phases, about £300,000 for community support workers and about £100,000 for community projects and grant funding.	Multi-hub town model with review points, revenue, activation and stewardship checks. The main task is to ensure secured provision and community development support work as phases come forward.	Maintain settlement-wide Community Plan; review timing of later hubs, shared/specialist provision, community support worker and grant activity, revenue, staffing, resident feedback and steward capacity.
Waterbeach New Town	4,000 sqm whole-site; 2,100 sqm by 2045.	Interim community space and four permanent facilities are scheduled in the western consented area. The	Whole-new-town Community Plan covering village interface, east-west coordination, early provision,	Confirm how western and eastern provision work together, village/new-town links,

		consented eastern area has provision for a further two community buildings.	permanent hubs, library relationship and stewardship.	permanent hub timing, youth/teen provision, affordability, operating costs and governance.
Grange Farm New Settlement	2,200 sqm whole-site; 900 sqm by 2045.	No operational provision yet. Draft policy evidence identifies a local centre and community uses.	Early local-centre community anchor, with whole-site safeguarding, links to nearby villages and employment areas, and clear stewardship from the first phases.	Confirm local-centre location, early provision, safeguarded capacity, links to nearby villages and employment sites, non-driver access and stewardship route.
Cambridge Biomedical Campus	200 sqm linked to planned homes. Other facilities are required to serve workers and visitors and support the wider campus role.	Campus amenities and mixed-use facilities already provide some community-facing functions.	Enhance and secure genuinely accessible shared-use space for residents, workers, patients, visitors and nearby communities.	Confirm resident benchmark, worker/visitor/patient needs, public access, evening/weekend use, affordability, booking, nearby-community links and campus stewardship.
Wellcome Genome Campus	At least 1,100 sqm as a minimum testing figure, combining the resident-based component and a worker/community-facing allowance. Wider visitor,	Outline permission includes up to 22,750 sqm GEA of non-residential institutions, community and leisure uses, with the community-facing element still to be specified. The permission also secured funding towards Hinxtton Village Hall and in-	Make the full community-facing package explicit, including resident, worker, visitor and nearby-community access, early or meanwhile provision, affordability, shared use, stewardship and links to Hinxtton and nearby villages.	Confirm resident population yield, worker/visitor-related requirement, reserved matters detail, community-facing floorspace, Hinxtton Village Hall contribution,

	education, conference, nursery, leisure, public-access and nearby-village effects should be assessed separately.	kind community development funds or initiatives.		in-kind community development funding and stewardship model.
Babraham Research Campus and Rural Southern Cluster	No cluster-wide residential benchmark applied. Apply the benchmark where housing, tied accommodation or key-worker housing generates a resident population; assess employment-led and campus impacts locally.	Rural Southern Cluster growth sits close to villages with varied community capacity. Planning permission 25/04634/OUT includes 850 sqm of nursery space and up to 500 sqm of retail and community facilities; the community-facing role of this provision should be tested.	Assess employment-led and key-worker housing impacts locally. Contributions may be needed to strengthen nearby village and cluster facilities where campus-only rooms, nursery, retail or staff-focused provision would provide limited public community benefit.	Confirm public/community access to permitted retail/community floorspace, worker and resident populations, village impacts, lunch/evening use, off-site contribution route and stewardship.

D.2 Common requirements across strategic growth areas

The following requirements should be carried into Community Plans, masterplans, planning applications, reserved matters, legal agreements and delivery reviews for major growth areas.

Appendix Table D.2. Common strategic-site requirements

Requirement	How it should be applied
Community Plan	Prepare alongside masterplanning or outline application and update as phases come forward. The plan should show how community infrastructure will integrate with related sport and leisure provision, green infrastructure, play, active travel, health and wellbeing provision, education, library and cultural infrastructure where this affects co-location, shared use, access, phasing, stewardship or delivery.
Safeguarded capacity	Safeguard land, floorspace or adaptable building capacity for the whole place, including later phases beyond the plan period where relevant.
Early provision	Provide usable community space before permanent buildings are complete, through meanwhile, temporary, shared-use or fitted-out early spaces.
Practical specification	Include flexible rooms, storage, kitchens, toilets, accessible entrances, simple booking, affordable hire, acoustic separation, suitable noise conditions, active-use capability and clear management responsibilities. Community spaces should be specified so they can support normal community-centre uses, not only quiet meetings.
Youth and teen use	Design youth-capable provision into the requirement from the start, with indoor arrangements where general room hire or outdoor space would leave a gap.
Stewardship and revenue	Agree ownership, operator route, maintenance, revenue support, affordable hire and review arrangements before handover.
Existing assets	Protect and enhance nearby facilities where they will serve growth, while also securing necessary on-site provision on large sites.
Review points	Link review to occupation, population mix, use, booking demand, affordability, resident feedback, noise-related operating issues and delivery of later phases. Where community space is within, next to or below housing, review should check whether the agreed design and conditions are allowing the intended range of community uses.

Appendix E | Standards, benchmarks and comparator evidence

E.1 Purpose

E.1.1 This appendix sets out the standards and comparator examples used to test the community infrastructure approach for Greater Cambridge. It focuses on community centres, village halls, shared community buildings, faith-space requirements, new-settlement phasing and stewardship.

E.1.2 The appendix supports Section 4, Section 9 and the strategic site schedules. It helps officers and applicants understand how the 129 square metres per 1,000 population benchmark sits alongside other local and comparator approaches.

E.1.3 Comparator evidence provides a practical check on scale, hierarchy, timing and delivery. Final requirements should be set through local evidence, Community Plans, site schedules, development scale, existing provision, access, affordability, facility quality and stewardship arrangements.

E.1.4 The faith-space entry uses current public documents that reproduce the key Cambridgeshire Horizons recommendation, because the original 2008 report was unavailable for direct review.

Table E.1. Evidence reviewed for this appendix

Source	Status	What it contributes	Use in this study
South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Study 2025	Local evidence	Audited local evidence on quantity, quality, accessibility, management and developer contributions for indoor community facilities.	Provides the main local benchmark of 129 sqm per 1,000 population and supports local testing by settlement and facility.
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2025	Draft planning context	Uses the 129 sqm benchmark to estimate community-facility need, capital cost and start-up operating and management allowance for planned growth.	Provides current draft infrastructure planning assumptions that this study helps refine and apply.
Waterbeach New Town SPD 2019	Local new-settlement precedent	Uses a 111 sqm per 1,000 population community-space requirement, multipurpose community centres and delivery triggers across a long build-out site.	Shows how standards can be translated into phased on-site provision, access agreements and coordination between landowners.
South Gloucestershire Infrastructure Position	External comparator	Uses 0.14 sqm per person for dedicated community centres, an 800m accessibility standard, planning obligations for	Tests the Greater Cambridge benchmark against another growth authority and supports inclusion of access, youth

Statement Topic Paper 2023		expansion or enhancement, and early consideration of stewardship and revenue.	use, operator and revenue checks.
North Hertfordshire Community Halls Strategy	External comparator	Uses 0.10 sqm per person as a negotiation benchmark, compares other local authority standards and identifies when growth may justify a new centre.	Supports a proportionate route between new on-site provision and investment in existing halls.
Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 appendices	External comparator	Sets community and village hall standards of 120 sqm per 1,000 population for larger settlements and 225 sqm per 1,000 elsewhere, with quality and accessibility standards.	Shows that rural and dispersed areas may need a different response from larger settlements where access to shared facilities is easier.
Space in the Place, Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	New-community comparator	Sets a wider whole-place model of 311 sqm per 1,000 residents across flexible community space, arts and culture, sports and leisure, libraries, park-related facilities and touchdown workspace, with a hierarchy of building types.	Provides a comparator for strategic sites, whole-place planning, typology hierarchy, gap analysis, early provision and long-term stewardship.
Faith in New Developments, East of England Faiths Council 2012	Faith-space comparator	Summarises the Cambridgeshire Horizons faith-space recommendation, including 0.5 hectares of land per 3,000 dwellings with a trigger point of 2,000 dwellings.	Provides a prompt for Community Plans and strategic site schedules where faith-space need may arise.

E.2 Comparator standards and what they show

E.2.1 The standards below cover different definitions of community infrastructure, different geographies, different settlement patterns and different delivery routes. They are useful because they show the range of practice and the decisions that sit behind a headline figure.

E.2.2 The main comparison is between core community hall or community centre standards, wider whole-place community infrastructure models, and land-based faith-space

requirements. This distinction matters when applying the standard to strategic sites and new settlements.

Table E.2. Comparator standards and planning approaches

Place / source	Standard or approach	What is covered	Implication for Greater Cambridge
South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Study 2025	129 sqm per 1,000 population.	Functional indoor community facilities, including primary, secondary and indoor ancillary space in audited facilities.	Use as the main local quantified starting point. Apply with evidence on quality, accessibility, place type and facility function.
Draft Greater Cambridge IDP 2025	129 sqm per 1,000 new residents. Applied to 44,857 additional residents from new allocations and windfall development, generating 5,787 sqm, £23.2m capital cost and £680,000 start-up operating and management allowance.	Community centres / community space in draft infrastructure planning evidence.	Use as current draft planning context. Site schedules and Community Plans should refine how the figure is applied locally.
Waterbeach New Town SPD 2019	111 sqm per 1,000 population, with multipurpose community centres incorporating library and potential sports facilities. Delivery triggers include 1,000, 2,500, 4,000 and 5,500 homes.	New-town multipurpose community centres, with community, library and potential sports relationships.	Use as a local precedent for phased delivery, early triggers, co-location, access agreements and whole-site coordination.
South Gloucestershire Infrastructure Position Statement 2023	0.14 sqm per person, equivalent to 140 sqm per 1,000 people. Dedicated community centres are assessed with an 800m accessibility standard.	Dedicated community centres and village halls, with youth, cultural and heritage infrastructure considered in the same topic paper.	Supports the reasonableness of the 129 sqm benchmark and strengthens the case for access, stewardship, youth and revenue checks.

North Hertfordshire Community Halls Strategy	0.10 sqm per person, equivalent to 100 sqm per 1,000 people. The strategy suggests that about 5,000 people, or around 2,100 dwellings, may be needed to justify a new centre of about 519 sqm.	Community halls, community centres and village halls, with other facilities recognised separately.	Supports a proportionate approach. Smaller growth may contribute to existing provision, while larger new neighbourhoods may need their own facility.
Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 appendices	120 sqm per 1,000 population for Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Larger Villages; 225 sqm per 1,000 population elsewhere.	Community and village halls as local resources for sport, active recreation and wider community activity.	Highlights the effect of settlement pattern. Rural and dispersed areas may need more local capacity or investment in existing halls because residents cannot rely on a dense urban network.
Space in the Place, Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	311 sqm per 1,000 residents across a wider community infrastructure model.	Flexible community space, arts and culture, sports and leisure, libraries, park-related facilities and touchdown workspace.	Use as a strategic-site comparator for whole-place ambition, typology hierarchy and gap testing. It is broader than the community facilities scope used for Greater Cambridge.
Cambridgeshire Horizons faith-space recommendation, reproduced in Faith in New Developments	0.5 hectares of land per 3,000 dwellings, with a trigger point of 2,000 dwellings.	Land for faith communities in new developments, with related recommendations on D1/community-use land and embedded faith workers.	Use as a prompt for strategic site schedules and Community Plans. Test whether need is best met through land, shared space, early premises or enhancement of other community meeting space.

E.3 Lessons from comparator places

Table E.3. Practical lessons for Greater Cambridge

Comparator lesson	Evidence basis	How it should be reflected in this study
The Greater Cambridge benchmark sits within the range of core community hall and community centre standards.	South Cambridgeshire uses 129 sqm per 1,000; South Gloucestershire uses 140 sqm per 1,000; North Hertfordshire uses 100 sqm per 1,000; Vale of White Horse uses 120 sqm per 1,000 for larger settlements.	Use 129 sqm per 1,000 as the main local quantified starting point. Add local tests on access, facility quality, room mix, phasing and stewardship before agreeing the final response.
Rural and dispersed settlement patterns can require a different response from dense urban areas.	Vale of White Horse applies a higher standard of 225 sqm per 1,000 population outside larger settlements. South Cambridgeshire evidence also shows the importance of village and parish facilities.	Use area project pipelines and parish/village facility evidence for smaller settlements. Contributions may need to improve existing halls, access, kitchens, storage, energy and management capacity.
Large growth sites need a hierarchy of provision rather than one generic community room.	Space in the Place uses neighbourhood house, community hub, beacon building and landmark building typologies. Waterbeach plans multipurpose community centres across the new town with staged triggers.	Strategic site schedules should identify local, settlement and wider provision; early provision; permanent hubs; and review points for later phases.
Existing provision should be tested before it is treated as sufficient.	South Gloucestershire uses contributions to expand or enhance nearby dedicated community centres where they cannot meet development demand. South Cambridgeshire tests quantity, quality and accessibility. North Hertfordshire examines current and future deficits against benchmark provision.	Apply the Section 2 usability test: reach, cost, booking, suitability, welcome, availability, capacity, quality, management and long-term availability.
Small and medium developments need a spendable contribution route.	South Gloucestershire uses planning obligations for proposals above 50 dwellings where the nearest dedicated community centre cannot meet demand. North Hertfordshire distinguishes sites large	Use project pipelines, named facilities, defined catchments and broad eligible spend categories so contributions can support extensions, refurbishment, access, fit-out and management support.

	enough to justify a new centre from smaller growth that should support existing provision.	
Youth needs should be designed into community infrastructure from the start.	South Gloucestershire records planned or secured youth space within community-centre obligations and highlights the risk that young people cannot afford hire space when revenue planning is weak.	Community Plans and site schedules should identify youth-capable rooms, safe access, storage, opening times, affordability and any youth work or community development resource.
Faith-space need needs early testing on strategic sites.	Faith in New Developments reproduces the Cambridgeshire Horizons land recommendation and identifies early premises, affordable land access and embedded faith workers as considerations.	Community Plans should test whether faith needs require serviced land, shared community space, early premises, a faith/community hall relationship, or off-site enhancement.
Stewardship and revenue are part of the infrastructure requirement.	South Gloucestershire identifies operator selection, cost recovery, pump-prime funding and early-years revenue support. Ebbsfleet links provision to Ebbsfleet Garden City Trust. Waterbeach requires coordination and management/governance arrangements.	Section 9 and Appendix A should require owner, operator, lease, handover, revenue, maintenance, booking, affordable hire, resident voice and review arrangements.

E.4 How the comparator evidence should be used in site schedules

E.4.1 Comparator evidence should help site schedules make planning judgements that are clear, proportionate and locally grounded. The evidence should support the following checks.

Table E.4. Applying comparator evidence in strategic site schedules

Site schedule question	Comparator evidence to use	What the schedule should specify
What quantified starting point applies?	Use 129 sqm per 1,000 population from South Cambridgeshire and draft Greater Cambridge infrastructure planning evidence.	Plan-period and whole-site community-space starting points, with explanation of existing or committed provision.

Does the site need a hierarchy of provision?	Use Space in the Place and Waterbeach as comparators for large new communities and long build-out sites.	Neighbourhood-scale space, main hub, possible wider facility, early provision, permanent provision and review points.
Can existing provision absorb the need?	Use South Cambridgeshire, South Gloucestershire and North Hertfordshire approaches to quantity, quality, accessibility and local deficit testing.	Named existing facilities, access and usability checks, improvement works, contribution route and project pipeline entry.
Should provision be on site, off site or both?	Use North Hertfordshire and South Gloucestershire for proportionality; use Waterbeach and Ebbsfleet for strategic-site on-site provision.	The on-site/off-site split, catchment, reasoning, contribution purpose and delivery route.
Is early or temporary provision needed?	Use Waterbeach phased triggers and Space in the Place delivery planning, alongside local workshop and officer evidence.	Temporary or meanwhile space, first-phase access, community development support, transition to permanent provision and occupation triggers.
What faith-space response is needed?	Use the faith-space land standard and shared-space evidence as prompts rather than automatic land requirements.	Faith-space assessment, engagement with faith communities, shared-use options, land or premises requirement, and timing.
What stewardship route is realistic?	Use South Gloucestershire operator and revenue evidence, Ebbsfleet trust model and Waterbeach governance requirements.	Owner, operator, management route, revenue support, maintenance, affordable hire, handover terms and review arrangements.

E.5 Summary position for Greater Cambridge

E.5.1 The comparator evidence supports the use of 129 sqm per 1,000 population as the main local quantified starting point for community facilities in Greater Cambridge. It sits within the range used by several other authorities for core community hall and community centre provision.

E.5.2 The benchmark should be used with a practical decision process. Site schedules and Community Plans should test existing provision, local access, building quality, facility specification, affordability, early provision, faith-space need, youth-capable space, revenue and long-term stewardship.

E.5.3 Larger strategic sites should be planned as community infrastructure networks. The most useful comparator lessons are about hierarchy, phasing, gap testing and stewardship:

local rooms, main hubs, possible wider facilities, temporary provision, shared-use arrangements and long-term management all need to be considered together.

E.5.4 Smaller sites and cumulative growth should be linked to spendable area project pipelines. Comparator practice supports contributions to existing facilities where they serve the development catchment and can be improved in ways that increase usable capacity.

E.5.5 Faith-space need should be tested early on new settlements and major growth sites. The planning response may be dedicated land, discounted or serviced land, early premises, shared community space, faith/community hall use, or enhancement of other accessible meeting space, depending on local evidence and the faith communities likely to be served.

E.5.6 The final planning requirement should be specific enough to secure delivery and flexible enough to respond to local evidence. Legal agreements and Community Plans should identify the need, catchment, delivery route, timing, fit-out, operator, revenue and review arrangements.

Appendix F | Costing and funding assumptions

This appendix records the cost and funding assumptions used to support the strategic site schedules and delivery discussion. The figures are broad planning assumptions for testing scale, not cost plans or final developer contribution requirements. Project costs should be updated through feasibility, design, specification, procurement, indexation and site-specific delivery work.

F.1 Costing and funding notes and assumptions

Appendix Table F.1. Costing and funding notes and assumptions

Assumption or note	Value or approach used	Main source	What it is used for
Indoor community infrastructure benchmark	129 sqm per 1,000 additional population	South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Study 2025 and draft Policy WS/NC	Baseline scale measure for community infrastructure need and site schedules.
Draft IDP plan-period package	5,787 sqm additional community space; £23.2m capital; £680,000 start-up operating and management costs	Draft Greater Cambridge IDP community and culture evidence	Used as current draft infrastructure planning context for floorspace, capital and start-up allowance.
General new-build capital benchmark	About £4,010 per sqm	Derived from draft IDP package of £23.2m / 5,787 sqm	Used for standard community-facility capital ranges in site schedules.
Larger or more complex hub benchmark	About £5,100-£5,300 per sqm	North East Cambridge IDP comparators including Storey's Field and Meadows-related benchmarks	Used where a larger, more complex or civic-scale hub is likely.
Start-up operating allowance	About £117 per sqm equivalent across the draft IDP package	Derived from £680,000 alongside 5,787 sqm in draft IDP evidence	Used to keep opening, activation and early management costs visible alongside capital costs.

Existing-building running-cost evidence	69 of 89 facilities above £5,000 annual running cost; 22 above £20,000	South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Study 2025	Shows that revenue and upkeep are live delivery issues for existing community buildings.
Staffing and volunteer context	58% of facilities with no paid staff	South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Study 2025	Supports early consideration of stewardship, management capacity and volunteer pressure.
Long-term community asset cost evidence	Average £81,000 annual revenue cost and £32,000 annual capital cost across a ten-year period	Power to Change, Our Assets Our Future	Broad comparator for lifetime asset costs and upkeep planning.
Blended finance evidence	Trading income around 48% on average; grants remain a major part of the funding mix; social investment around 2% of income	Power to Change, Community Business Market 2024	Supports the need for blended finance and realistic operating assumptions.
CIL near-term estimate	Around £25m-£50m over five years	Greater Cambridge CIL draft charging schedule evidence used in v7	Used as a broad scale indicator for potential area-wide infrastructure funding.
Section 106 working indicator	Around £12k-£15k per dwelling overall; smaller schemes often £8k-£12k	Greater Cambridge CIL supporting material used in v7	Used only as broad all-purpose Section 106 capacity context, not as a community infrastructure tariff.
BID local comparator	Around £6.5m over five years in Cambridge city centre	Cambridge BID third-term ballot report / business plan used in v7	Used as a local comparator for recurring place-based revenue in town-centre or mixed-use contexts.

F.2 Indicative capital ranges for strategic growth areas

The ranges below use rounded strategic-site testing figures from Section 10. They apply the broad new-build benchmark of about £4,010 per sqm and a higher comparison rate of about £5,300 per sqm for larger or more complex hubs. They exclude land, abnormal costs,

specialist fit-out, detailed technical specifications, VAT treatment, optimism bias and long-term revenue unless stated. They are broad planning assumptions for testing scale, not cost plans or final developer contribution requirements.

Appendix Table F.2. Indicative capital ranges from current strategic site schedules

Strategic location	Whole-site starting point	Plan-period starting point	Indicative full capital range	Indicative plan-period range	Notes
North East Cambridge	2,200 sqm	1,200 sqm	£8.8m-£11.7m	£4.8m-£6.4m	Applies only if comprehensive redevelopment comes forward; in the employment-led scenario, recalculate from the final resident population and assess worker/visitor impacts separately.
Cambridge East	3,700 sqm	2,100 sqm	£14.8m-£19.6m	£8.4m-£11.1m	Before accounting for committed in-scope provision, existing assets and the airport-area delivery model.
North West Cambridge / Eddington	1,500 sqm	1,200 sqm	£6.0m-£8.0m	£4.8m-£6.4m	Before taking Storey's Field, Darwin Green provision and secured community-support / grant funding into account.
Expanded Cambourne	5,700 sqm	1,700 sqm	£22.9m-£30.2m	£6.8m-£9.0m	Indicative only; to be tested through integration with existing Cambourne town facilities, committed provision and secured contributions.
Northstowe	3,100 sqm	2,300 sqm	£12.4m-£16.4m	£9.2m-£12.2m	Before accounting for substantial secured buildings, land, community support worker funding and community projects/grants. Not a new capital requirement unless review shows the secured package does not meet need in practice.
Waterbeach New Town	4,000 sqm	2,100 sqm	£16.0m-£21.2m	£8.4m-£11.1m	Before accounting for scheduled western-area interim and permanent facilities and eastern-area secured provision.

Grange Farm New Settlement	2,200 sqm	900 sqm	£8.8m-£11.7m	£3.6m-£4.8m	Requires early local-centre anchor and whole-site safeguarding.
Cambridge Biomedical Campus	200 sqm resident benchmark	200 sqm	£0.8m-£1.1m	£0.8m-£1.1m	Resident benchmark only; final package should also reflect campus scale, workers, patients, visitors and nearby communities.
Wellcome Genome Campus	1,100 sqm minimum testing figure	1,100 sqm	£4.4m-£5.8m	£4.4m-£5.8m	Minimum testing figure only; final package should reflect resident population yield, worker/visitor-related need, community-facing permitted floorspace, off-site village investment and stewardship.
Babraham Research Campus and Rural Southern Cluster	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	To be confirmed	Apply benchmark where housing or tied accommodation generates a resident population; assess employment-led impacts and community-facing role of permitted nursery/retail/community floorspace separately.

F.3 Funding interpretation

Costs and funding routes should be interpreted through the decision process in Section 2 and Appendix A. On large sites, the response may include land, completed buildings, fit-out, early temporary space, revenue support, community development capacity, stewardship and review. On smaller sites, the response will often be a spendable contribution to an existing facility or area project pipeline.

Funding agreements should state the purpose, catchment, eligible spend, trigger, indexation, spend period, fallback route, delivery lead and monitoring route. Eligible spend should cover practical works such as extension, refurbishment, access, kitchens, storage, fit-out, youth-capable rooms, energy measures, early activity and management support.

Appendix G | Bibliography and evidence source list

This bibliography records the main sources used to prepare the study and shows how each source was handled in the analysis. Draft Local Plan and draft IDP material is treated as current planning context and as evidence this study is intended to inform.

Appendix Table G.1. Bibliography and evidence source list

Evidence group	Source / evidence	Evidence role and status	How the evidence was used and handled	Study section(s) this informed
Core study inputs	CIS agreed scope of community assets	Study input / scope control	Defined the asset categories, boundary cases and related provision used in the study. Used to keep the report focused on community-facing spaces and to avoid moving into areas covered by sports, health, green space, play, allotment or burial evidence.	3 What community infrastructure means; Appendix B Asset scope
	CIS WP1 Data Report	Study input / mapping method	Explained the mapped asset baseline, data structure, limitations and validation issues. Used to show that asset-location data is a starting point for local testing, not evidence that provision is sufficient.	2 How to use; 3 Scope; 4 Evidence; 5 City; 6 South Cambridgeshire; 7 Needs; 10 Site schedules; Appendix C
	CIS community infrastructure asset-location data	Mapped asset baseline	Provided geolocated records of community-facing and contextual assets across Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire. Used to identify distribution, clusters, apparent gaps and places requiring local testing, then read with facility evidence, workshops and officer evidence.	2 How to use; 3 Scope; 4 Evidence; 5 City; 6 South Cambridgeshire; 7 Needs; 10 Site schedules; Appendix C
	Greater Cambridge CIS	Workshop evidence	Provided qualitative evidence on how community infrastructure is experienced and what makes spaces work, including welcome, youth provision,	4 Evidence; 5 City; 6 South Cambridgeshire; 7 Needs; 8 Community Plans; 9 Delivery; 10

	Workshop Synthesis Report		early space, kitchens, storage, affordability, connectors and stewardship. Used as practical evidence, not as a statistically representative survey.	Site schedules; 11 Access; 12 Recommendations
	Greater Cambs Planning Officers: Community Needs Assessment Interviews	Officer interview evidence	Provided planning and community officer insight on recent sites, delivery problems, planning obligations, stewardship, phasing and Community Plan expectations. Used to test whether recommendations are deliverable and specific enough for planning practice.	4 Evidence; 5 City; 6 South Cambridgeshire; 7 Needs; 8 Community Plans; 9 Delivery; 10 Site schedules; 12 Recommendations
	Council officer feedback and review comments on CIS drafts	Council officer review input	Used to update local context, named facilities, City strategy alignment, South Cambridgeshire facility issues, Community Plan requirements and drafting priorities. Treated as operational local intelligence and review feedback rather than a separate published evidence base.	5 City; 6 South Cambridgeshire; 8 Community Plans; 9 Delivery; 10 Site schedules; 11 Access; 12 Recommendations
Local facilities, survey and demographic evidence	Building Stronger Communities: Community Centres Strategy / Cambridge City community-centres evidence	Local facilities evidence	Used to understand the role of Council-supported centres, catchments, access gaps, investment choices and operating model context in Cambridge City. Applied with current officer feedback and mapped asset-location data.	4 Evidence; 5 City; 9 Delivery; 11 Access; 12 Recommendations
	South Cambridgeshire Community Facilities Study 2025	Local facilities evidence / benchmark	Provided audited evidence on quantity, quality, accessibility, running costs, volunteer capacity, settlement shortfalls and developer contribution approach. The 129 sqm per 1,000 population figure	4 Evidence; 6 South Cambridgeshire; 7 Needs; 8 Community Plans; 9 Delivery; 10 Site schedules; 11 Access; 12

Draft planning, growth and policy context			is used as the main quantified starting point and tested with local evidence.	Recommendations; Appendix E; Appendix F
	Community Survey and Engagement Report for the Healthy Places JSNA	Existing resident survey evidence	Used as a supporting indicator for access and inclusion questions, especially community buildings, sense of community and local decision-making. The unmet need score is used as a prompt for local testing, not as a ranking, formula or standalone needs measure.	4 Evidence; 7 Needs; 8 Community Plans; 11 Access; 12 Recommendations
	Chapter 5: Communities and Social Cohesion, Healthy Places JSNA	Contextual local evidence	Used as supporting context on social cohesion, community connection and built-environment factors affecting belonging. Applied alongside more specific CIS evidence on facilities, access and delivery.	7 Needs; 11 Access; 12 Recommendations
	Housing Needs of Specific Groups in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (2025)	Demographic and housing evidence	Used to understand groups likely to need accessible, flexible and inclusive provision, including older people, disabled people and people with specialist housing needs. Supports access and inclusion requirements rather than setting a facility standard.	7 Needs; 11 Access; 12 Recommendations
	Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Strategy Topic Paper (2025)	Draft planning context	Used as current planning context for growth geography and the planned pattern of development. The CIS findings are intended to inform Local Plan and IDP work rather than be led by this draft evidence.	2 How to use; 4 Evidence; 5 City; 6 South Cambridgeshire; 7 Needs; 10 Site schedules; 12 Recommendations
	Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Site	Draft planning context	Used to understand proposed strategic allocations and major site context. Treated as draft planning	4 Evidence; 7 Needs; 10 Site schedules; 12 Recommendations

Allocations Topic Paper (2025)		context and tested through local community infrastructure evidence.	
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2025)	Draft infrastructure planning context	Used for current draft infrastructure assumptions, including the 129 sqm per 1,000 residents application, indicative floorspace, capital cost and start-up allowance. This study tests and refines how those assumptions should be applied locally.	2 How to use; 4 Evidence; 7 Needs; 8 Community Plans; 9 Delivery; 10 Site schedules; 12 Recommendations; Appendix E; Appendix F
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Infrastructure Topic Paper (2025)	Draft planning context	Used to align the delivery recommendations with infrastructure planning and future IDP work. Read as draft context rather than final policy.	2 How to use; 4 Evidence; 9 Delivery; 12 Recommendations
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Wellbeing and Social Inclusion Topic Paper (2025)	Draft planning context	Used to link Community Plans, access, early provision and inclusion to draft policy. Applied with local CIS evidence so the report does not rely on policy text alone.	2 How to use; 8 Community Plans; 9 Delivery; 11 Access; 12 Recommendations
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Equalities Impact Assessment (2025)	Draft equalities context	Used to support practical access and inclusion tests for groups likely to face barriers. It informs who provision needs to work for rather than creating separate mapped facility categories.	11 Access; 12 Recommendations

Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Homes Topic Paper (2025)	Draft planning context	Used as supporting context on housing need, mix, affordability and specialist housing. Applied alongside more specific demographic and access evidence.	7 Needs; 11 Access
Draft Greater Cambridge Employment and Housing Needs Evidence Update (2025)	Growth and demand evidence	Used to understand the scale and character of growth that will create additional community infrastructure demand, including residential and employment-led pressure.	7 Needs; 10 Site schedules; 11 Access
Draft Greater Cambridge Housing Delivery Study Addendum (2025)	Growth and phasing evidence	Used to understand timing and phasing of community infrastructure need, especially where long build-out sites require early and later-phase provision.	7 Needs; 10 Site schedules
Draft Greater Cambridge Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment Addendum Report (2025)	Site availability / capacity evidence	Used as supporting evidence for strategic site schedules and growth assumptions. Treated as draft development-capacity evidence.	7 Needs; 10 Site schedules
Greater Cambridge Draft Local Plan Viability	Draft viability evidence	Used to keep recommendations and funding routes realistic. It informs contribution and delivery caveats without weakening the evidence of need.	9 Delivery; 10 Site schedules; 12 Recommendations

Assessment (2025)			
Draft Greater Cambridge Transport Evidence Report (2025)	Transport and access evidence	Used where access to community infrastructure depends on walking, cycling, public transport, severance or links between settlements and growth areas.	5 City; 6 South Cambridgeshire; 7 Needs; 10 Site schedules; 11 Access
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan: New Strategic Allocations Assessment - Transport Mitigation Measures (2025)	Strategic site access evidence	Used as supporting evidence for strategic site schedules and access considerations around new allocations.	10 Site schedules; 11 Access
Greater Cambridge draft Local Plan Residential Development Strategy figures	Growth assumptions	Used to estimate plan-period and whole-site demand, including benchmark starting points in the strategic site schedules and costing assumptions.	4 Evidence; 7 Needs; 10 Site schedules; Appendix F
Greater Cambridge draft Local Plan Residential Development	Growth assumptions / method note	Used to check how residential growth and trajectory assumptions should be interpreted before carrying them into site schedules.	4 Evidence; 10 Site schedules; Appendix F

Strategy figures notes			
Defined Development Extents Cambs	Spatial context	Used to check growth geography and settlement context. Supports spatial interpretation rather than defining community infrastructure need.	5 City; 6 South Cambridgeshire; 10 Site schedules
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan: Policies Map and relevant inset maps	Spatial planning context	Used as a geography check for strategic sites, growth areas and surrounding settlements.	5 City; 6 South Cambridgeshire; 10 Site schedules
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan Policy S/DS: Development Strategy	Draft policy context	Used to understand the planned pattern of growth and strategic site geography. Treated as draft context.	2 How to use; 10 Site schedules; 12 Recommendations
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and Delivery	Draft policy context	Used to align delivery recommendations with planning mechanisms for infrastructure delivery, obligations, phasing, maintenance and review.	2 How to use; 9 Delivery; 12 Recommendations
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan Policy WS/NC: Meeting the Needs of New	Draft policy context	Used as an implementation route for Community Plans and development-scale requirements. The study defines the practical evidence-led requirements that this route can help secure	2 How to use; 8 Community Plans; 9 Delivery; 10 Site schedules; 11 Access; 12 Recommendations

and Growing Communities			
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan Policy WS/CF: Community, Sports and Leisure Facilities	Draft policy context	Used to support protection and enhancement of existing facilities and to distinguish community infrastructure from adjacent sports and leisure evidence.	3 Scope; 9 Delivery; 12 Recommendations
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan Policy WS/MU: Meanwhile Uses During Long-Term Redevelopments	Draft policy context	Used to support early temporary space and meanwhile provision where permanent community infrastructure comes later.	8 Community Plans; 9 Delivery; 10 Site schedules; 12 Recommendations
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan Policy WS/HD: Creating Healthy New Developments	Draft policy context	Used to support access, inclusion, youth, older people, disabled people and wellbeing-related requirements.	2 How to use; 11 Access; 12 Recommendations
Draft Greater Cambridge Local Plan Policy GP/PP: People and Place	Draft design and place context	Used to support expectations on location, visibility, public realm, accessibility and quality of community-facing space.	2 How to use; 5 City; 11 Access

Strategic site and local precedent evidence	responsive design and Policy GP/QP: Establishing High Quality Landscape and Public Realm			
	Draft North East Cambridge Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2025)	Strategic site evidence	Used for the North East Cambridge site schedule, including hub and library logic, phasing and indicative cost comparisons.	10 Site schedules; Appendix F
	North East Cambridge Transport Position Statement (2025)	Strategic site access evidence	Used as supporting context for North East Cambridge access, movement and relationship to surrounding communities.	10 Site schedules; 11 Access
	Cambridge East Delivery Rates Addendum (January 2025)	Strategic site phasing evidence	Used to understand timing of need and plan-period / whole-site implications at Cambridge East.	10 Site schedules
	Cambridge East Site Capacity Considerations (May 2025)	Strategic site capacity evidence	Used to understand the potential whole-site community infrastructure requirement for Cambridge East.	10 Site schedules

Standards and comparator evidence	Cambridge East Transport Approach (March 2025)	Strategic site access evidence	Used to understand movement, access and relationship to existing eastern neighbourhoods.	10 Site schedules; 11 Access
	Cambridge Biomedical Campus Early Assessment of Need for Amenity on Campus (2023)	Campus-specific evidence	Used to test campus community-facing space, worker, visitor and resident needs, and the limits of relying on commercial or institutional amenity.	10 Site schedules
	Marleigh Social Sustainability Report	Local precedent evidence	Used as local learning on growth-area provision, community formation, early provision and links between new development and existing neighbourhoods.	5 City; 7 Needs; 10 Site schedules; 11 Access; 12 Recommendations
	Waterbeach New Town Supplementary Planning Document (2019)	Local new-settlement precedent	Used as a local comparator for translating standards into phased on-site provision, access agreements, delivery triggers and whole-site coordination.	4 Evidence; 10 Site schedules; Appendix E
	Space in the Place, Ebbsfleet Development Corporation	New-community comparator	Used as a comparator for strategic sites, hierarchy, gap testing, early provision and long-term stewardship. It covers a broader whole-place model than the Greater Cambridge community facilities scope, so it is not used as a local tariff.	4 Evidence; 10 Site schedules; Appendix E

South Gloucestershire Infrastructure Position Statement Topic Paper: Community Centres and Village Halls, Youth Facilities and Cultural Infrastructure (2023)	External comparator	Used to test the Greater Cambridge benchmark against another growth authority and to strengthen access, revenue, youth and operator checks.	4 Evidence; 9 Delivery; Appendix E
North Hertfordshire Community Halls Strategy	External comparator	Used as a comparator for proportionality between new provision and investment in existing halls, including how growth thresholds relate to new facilities.	4 Evidence; 9 Delivery; Appendix E
Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 2 Appendices	External comparator	Used to show how settlement pattern can affect community-space expectations and access standards, especially in rural and dispersed areas.	4 Evidence; 6 South Cambridgeshire; 7 Needs; 9 Delivery; Appendix E
Faith in New Developments: Partnerships, People and Places, East of England Faiths Council (2012)	Faith-space comparator	Used as a secondary source for the Cambridgeshire Horizons faith-space recommendation and wider learning on faith provision in new communities. The original Cambridgeshire Horizons report was not directly available, so this is handled transparently as a secondary source.	4 Evidence; 8 Community Plans; 10 Site schedules; 11 Access; Appendix E

Funding, stewardship and wider delivery evidence	Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations SPD, Chapter 7: Community Facilities	Planning obligations and faith-space guidance	Used to support faith-space prompts, planning obligation routes and the distinction between dedicated provision, shared space and enhanced community meeting space.	4 Evidence; 8 Community Plans; 9 Delivery; 10 Site schedules; 11 Access; Appendix E
	National planning policy and planning obligations guidance	National policy / guidance	Used as a framing test for Community Plan requirements, Planning obligation and CIL contributions and off-site funding routes. It keeps recommendations proportionate, lawful and linked to development impact rather than acting as local need evidence.	4 Evidence; 9 Delivery; 12 Recommendations
	Power to Change, Our Assets Our Future	Community asset evidence	Used as a broad comparator for lifetime asset costs, stewardship and the need for realistic operating models for community-owned or community-managed assets.	9 Delivery; 12 Recommendations; Appendix F
	Power to Change, Community Business Market Report 2024	Community business evidence	Used to support the blended-finance and stewardship argument. Applied as context rather than as a tariff or local cost benchmark.	9 Delivery; 12 Recommendations; Appendix F
	The £9bn Opportunity: S106 and CIL White Paper	Developer contributions evidence	Used to support recommendations on spendable contribution wording, project pipelines, public reporting and monitoring.	9 Delivery; 12 Recommendations; Appendix F

Boundary and adjacent infrastructure context	Greater Cambridge CIL draft charging schedule evidence	Funding context	Used only as broad context for potential area-wide infrastructure funding. It is not used as a community infrastructure tariff.	9 Delivery; Appendix F
	Greater Cambridge CIL supporting material	Funding context	Used only as broad funding-context evidence for planning obligations and CIL It is not used to calculate community infrastructure contributions.	9 Delivery; Appendix F
	Cambridge BID third-term ballot report / business plan	Place-management comparator	Used as a local comparator for recurring place-management revenue in mixed-use, employment and city-centre contexts.	9 Delivery; Appendix F
	Greater Cambridge Green Infrastructure Strategy Vol 1 and Vol 2 (2025)	Adjacent infrastructure context	Used for boundary-setting and cross-reference where community infrastructure interacts with green space, movement and public realm. It does not define the community infrastructure standard.	3 Scope; 4 Evidence; 11 Access
	Draft Greater Cambridge Retail and Leisure Study (2025)	Adjacent infrastructure context	Used where local centres, cafes, commercial leisure and informal social infrastructure overlap with community access. Commercial space is tested rather than treated as an automatic substitute for community provision.	3 Scope; 7 Needs; 9 Delivery; 11 Access
	SCDC Sports Areas Map / sports	Adjacent infrastructure context	Used only to support boundary-setting with sports provision and avoid double-counting provision covered by other evidence.	3 Scope; Appendix B

organisation mapping				
-------------------------	--	--	--	--