



To: Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport: Councillor Kevin Blencowe

Report by: Joint Director of Planning and Economic Development for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire

Relevant scrutiny committee: Development 6 December 2016
Plan Scrutiny
Sub-Committee

Wards affected: All Wards

CAMBRIDGE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION – PROGRESS UPDATE

Not a Key Decision

1. Executive summary

- 1.1 This report has been produced to provide an update to Members on the progress of the Local Plan Examination and to inform Members of additional modifications to the Local Plan which have come forward during the examination process to ensure clarity and soundness.
- 1.2 The Councils submitted the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans for examination on 28 March 2014. Hearings sessions have been held from November 2014 through to the present day. Further hearing sessions will be timetabled for next year.
- 1.3 Appendix A to this report provides information on the content of Matters raised by the Inspectors examining the Local Plan and any modifications which have resulted from these Matters and hearing sessions.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 This report is being submitted to the Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee for prior consideration and comment before decision by the Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport.

2.2 The Executive Councillor for Planning Policy and Transport is recommended:

- To note the contents of the report and Appendix A.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Council started preparing the new Local Plans in 2011, in parallel with South Cambridgeshire District Council's preparation of a new Local Plan. The separate plans were prepared in parallel with joint working throughout the process in recognition of the close functional relationship between the two areas and reflecting the duty to cooperate. Both Plans set out policies and proposals to guide development to 2031 and together present the development strategy for Greater Cambridge. A key part of the plan-making process was the production of a range of evidence base documents, such as the Councils' Employment Land Review and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments, to inform the creation of a new Local Plan.
- 3.2 The main stages of public consultation were Issues and Options, Issues and Options 2, and Proposed Submission stages. Both Councils carried out Issues and Options consultation in 2012, followed by Issues and Options 2 consultation and Proposed Submission consultation in 2013. These consultations were carried in parallel by the two Councils.
- 3.3 The Councils submitted the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans for examination on 28 March 2014.
- 3.4 The Secretary of State appointed Miss Laura Graham and Mr Alan Wood to examine the soundness of the two Local Plans. A Programme Officer was also appointed to assist the Inspectors.
- 3.5 On 11 September 2014, the Inspectors held a Pre Hearing Meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to clarify the administrative and procedural matters which govern the hearings.
- 3.6 The Examinations started with the submission of the Plans and will end with the submission of the Inspectors' report to the Councils. There will be a separate report to each Council but as the Plans are highly interdependent in many respects, the Inspectors established that it was necessary to carry out the Examinations concurrently, with a number of joint hearings sessions.

- 3.7 The subject of the hearings is determined by the Inspectors based on the documents submitted by the Councils and the representations that have been made. As a result of their reading of the Local Plans, supporting evidence base and the representations made to the Proposed Submission consultations, the Inspectors have produced the Matters and Issues for examination; the structure of hearings; the allocation of participants to hearing sessions; and decided whether additional material is needed from participants. Each published Matter (e.g. Housing Need) has a number of issues identified, with questions posed by the Inspectors. These questions relate to issues raised by representors or queries from the Inspectors. Each hearing session covers a particular Matter and offers representors the opportunity to raise concerns about the approach taken in the Local Plans and allows the Councils the opportunity to respond to those issues.
- 3.8 Joint examination hearings on strategic issues were held between November 2014 and April 2015 on topics such as housing and employment needs, development strategy, Green Belt, transport, infrastructure and housing supply, and areas of major change.

Further work

- 3.9 Where Inspectors have concerns about the soundness of a submitted plan, Inspectors may consider that an examination cannot be completed without additional work being undertaken. This may require consideration of a suspension or partial suspension of the examination process to give the local planning authority time to undertake further work to address the issues raised.
- 3.10 After the hearings for Matters 1 - 9, the Inspectors wrote to the Councils on 20 May 2015 in relation to three main issues (objectively assessed need for new housing, overall development strategy and conformity with revisions to National Planning Policy since the Local Plans were submitted for examination) and invited the Councils to undertake additional work to address those issues before the examinations progress further. The Councils agreed to undertake additional work and the examinations were formally suspended on 28 July 2015 until March 2016.
- 3.11 Additional work was carried out in response to the Inspectors' issues, which fed into the Councils' Proposed Modifications consultation (2 December 2015 and 25 January 2016). The following additional work was carried out:
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Addendum Report;

- Cambridge Inner Green Belt Boundary Study;
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Objectively Assessed Housing Need: Further Evidence;
- Housing Land Supply Update, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council;
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Development Strategy Update;
- Local Plans CSRM – Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Transport Report;
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Infrastructure Delivery Study 2015;
- Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans Viability Update, November 2015; and
- Proposed Modifications arising from the Government’s Written Ministerial Statements.

3.12 The proposed main modifications to the emerging Cambridge Local Plan resulting from the further work can be summarised as:

- Changes to reflect the Memorandum of Understanding between the Councils (September 2014) for a joint housing trajectory for the Greater Cambridge area recognising the inter-relationship between the areas and phasing of delivery of housing;
- Changes to policies relating to the amount of development planned to come forward at Cambridge East (North of Cherry Hinton) – 1,200 dwellings of which 780 dwellings are in Cambridge;
- Changes to policies relating to climate change, specifically housing construction and related sustainable development standards in the light of amendments to national government policy;
- Changes to affordable housing policies and residential space standards to reflect changes in national government policy.

3.13 The findings of the Proposed Modifications consultation were considered by Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee on 14 March 2016¹ and Full Council on 23 March 2016² and then submitted to the Inspectors on 31 March 2016. The examination resumed in June 2016 with hearing sessions relating to joint matters on housing need and Green Belt. These hearing sessions discussed the work undertaken as part of the Proposed Modifications.

Cambridge only hearing sessions

3.14 From June to September 2016, further hearing sessions took place in respect Cambridge specific issues, including historic and natural

¹ <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=184&MId=2951&Ver=4>

² <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=116&MId=2953&Ver=4>

environment, the city centre, opportunity areas and areas of major change, climate change, retail and employment, local services and facilities.

Modifications

- 3.15 As a part of the examination process, it is usual to put forward modifications. During the examination, Inspectors can recommend 'main modifications' (changes that materially affect the policies) to make a submitted Local Plan sound and legally compliant only if asked to do so by the local planning authority under Section 20(7C) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (as amended). The Council can also put forward 'additional modifications' of its own to deal with more minor matters.
- 3.16 The majority of plans are subject to a request from the local planning authority under Section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act for main modifications to be recommended by the Inspector where necessary to make the plan sound. These will be based on the discussions at the hearing sessions. The Council made a request under Section 20 (7C) of the 2004 Act on 03 November 2014 (Reference Document RD/GEN/140).
- 3.17 Under the delegation process agreed by Full Council at the meeting on 13 February 2014³, additional modifications have been put forward in order to assist the Inspectors and provide clarification during the examination process. The Inspectors will determine in due course whether they consider the modifications to be main or additional. Officers do not consider that the modifications result in changes in the direction of policy. Appendix A provides an overview of each of the matters and issues to date and sets out where additional modifications have occurred.

Other work

- 3.18 Further work on the Council's Monitoring Framework, gypsy and traveller accommodation needs and policy on the accessibility of housing will be reported at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee in January 2017.
- 3.19 Following submission of the Local Plan for examination in March 2014, issues relating to the provision of student accommodation have been raised. Consequently, the Council has commissioned a study to investigate the levels of demand and supply of student accommodation in Cambridge and its impact on the local housing market. This study is due to be completed in December 2016. The

³ <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=116&MId=1004&Ver=4>

findings of the study and any consequential modifications to the Local Plan will be presented at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee in January 2017.

Next Steps

3.20 Hearing sessions focussed on South Cambridgeshire started in November 2016 and will continue into 2017. These hearing sessions will cover the following issues:

November 2016	Climate change, promoting successful communities, and residential site allocations in villages
December 2016	Housing policies
January 2017	Protecting and enhancing the natural historic environment
February/March 2017	Building a strong and competitive economy
To be timetabled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic sites – Waterbeach, Bourn Airfield, Northstowe and Cambourne West • Strategy for the rural area - village development frameworks and omissions sites in villages

3.21 Following the South Cambridgeshire hearing sessions, there will be further hearing sessions for Cambridge on housing policy and further joint hearing sessions on the joint omissions sites, e.g. Land North of Barton Road.

3.22 Following further hearing sessions, the Inspectors have confirmed that they will require the Council to undertake public consultation upon all proposed main modifications for a period of 6 weeks. Depending on the scope of the modifications, further Sustainability Appraisal work may also be required. The Inspectors' report on the plan will only be issued once the Council has consulted on the main modifications and the Inspector has had the opportunity to consider the representations on these modifications.

3.23 The Inspectors examining the Local Plan will seek to deal with the responses as expeditiously as possible but there may be instances where there are significant representations on proposed main modifications that may necessitate further hearing sessions. Further hearing sessions will only be held where absolutely necessary to clarify/resolve substantive outstanding issues.

3.24 Other modifications may also be made, which do not affect the soundness of the Local Plan and are minor in nature. These 'additional modifications' do not have to be advertised. Whether to advertise any 'additional modifications' is at the discretion of the Council, but the Council may wish to do so at the same time as consulting on the main modifications.

4. Implications

(a) Financial Implications

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. The costs of preparing the local plan has already been budgeted for and included in the budget.

(b) Staffing Implications (if not covered in Consultations Section)

There are no direct staffing implications arising from this report. The review of the Local Plan has already been included in existing work plans.

(c) Equality and Poverty Implications

There are no direct equal opportunity implications arising from this report. The Local Plan has been subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment, which demonstrates how potential equalities issues have been, and will be addressed.

(d) Environmental Implications

The new Local Plan for Cambridge will assist in the delivery of high quality and sustainable new development along with protecting and enhancing the built and natural environments in the city. While national policy changes have had some impact on the level of ambition that can be included in the plan in relation to the reduction of carbon emissions from new housing developments, wider policies in the plan related to climate change and sustainable development mean that the plan should still overall have a positive climate change impact.

(e) Procurement

There are no direct procurement implications arising from this report.

(f) Consultation and communication

The consultation and communication arrangements for the Local Plan are consistent with the agreed Consultation and Community Engagement Strategy for the Local Plan Review, 2012 Regulations and the Council's Code of Best Practice on Consultation and Community Engagement.

(g) Community Safety

There are no direct community safety implications arising from this report.

5. Background papers

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- National Planning Policy Framework 2012:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>
- Cambridge Local Plan 2014: Proposed Submission:
https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/public/ldf/draft_submission/Full%20Plan/Full%20Draft%20Plan%20with%20title%20pages%20reduced%20size.pdf

6. Appendices

- Appendix A: Cambridge Local Plan Examination – Overview of Matters and Issues and Modifications

7. Inspection of papers

To inspect the background papers or if you have a query on the report please contact:

Author's Name: Sara Saunders
Author's Phone Number: 01223 - 457186
Author's Email: sara.saunders@cambridge.gov.uk

Appendix A: Cambridge Local Plan Examination – Overview of Matters and Issues and Modifications

1. This appendix introduces the Matters set out by the Inspectors. It addresses joint Matters and Cambridge-only Matters. Additional modifications have been proposed for clarity and to ensure soundness in the light of national policy and guidance, rather than seeking to change policy emphasis.

Matter 1: Legal process and requirements (Tuesday 4 November 2014):

2. The main focus of debate for Matter 1 was around whether the Councils had complied with all the legal requirements for preparing the sustainability appraisal and whether it had fulfilled the duty to cooperate. The Councils maintained that the legal requirements had been met. Modifications from this session related to the Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory, which was agreed in principle on 9 September 2014 at Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee¹. The subsequent modifications were taken forward as part of the Proposed Modifications consultation in early 2016.

Matter 2: Overall spatial vision (Wednesday 5 November 2014):

3. Matter 2 hearings considered whether the development strategy across the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans is the right one. There was broad consensus among the parties appearing that the development sequence is appropriate, with its focus on Cambridge, then edge of Cambridge, then new settlements and then better served villages. There was a lot of debate about whether the strategy in the two plans is consistent with the sequence, with parties both for and against more or less development at all stages in the sequence. The Councils maintained that the strategy strikes the appropriate balance and is soundly based. No modifications were proposed by the Council in relation to this statement. The Inspectors raised this issue as a concern in their letter of 20 May 2015 and further work was undertaken as part of the Proposed Modifications process.

Matter 3: Housing Need (Tuesday 11 and Wednesday 12 November 2014):

4. The main focus of debate over the day and a half was whether the figures of 14,000 new homes in Cambridge and 19,000 new homes in South Cambridgeshire identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) are appropriate. The Councils maintained that these figures are justified, and highlighted that the SHMA has already been endorsed in respect of the Fenland and East Cambridgeshire Local Plans. Objectors argued for substantially higher housing figures for both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and particularly

¹ <http://democracy.cambridge.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=184&MId=2558&Ver=4>

focused on affordability of housing. No modifications were proposed by the Council in relation to this statement. The Inspectors raised this issue as a concern in their letter of 20 May 2015 and further work was undertaken as part of the Proposed Modifications process.

Matter 4: Employment and Retail (Tuesday 18 November 2014):

5. There was broad agreement that the 22,100 jobs for Cambridge and 22,000 jobs for South Cambridgeshire between 2011 and 2031 included in the plans is a reasonable assessment of need. However, objectors argued that within that number there is a need for more R&D land than the plans assume and that it should be located in or on the edge of Cambridge. The Councils maintained that the plans provide a good supply of land for all employment needs in appropriate locations that will continue to support the Cambridge economy into the future. No modifications were proposed by the Council in relation to this statement.

Matter 5: Infrastructure/Monitoring/Viability (Wednesday 19 November 2014 and Thursday 19 March 2015):

6. Objectors raised technical issues around the Councils' evidence on infrastructure and had concerns about the reliability of funding of the infrastructure necessary to deliver the development strategy, raising doubts about the confidence that could be placed at this stage on City Deal. They raised the cost of a new settlement based approach compared with development in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge. The Councils maintained that the plans, and the evidence supporting them, show that the Councils understand the infrastructure required to deliver the strategy and that there is a reasonable prospect of it being delivered, and that the Inspectors can have confidence in the significant difference that City Deal will make.
7. The Inspectors asked the Councils to review the monitoring frameworks in order to ensure that the policies can be monitored effectively. Modifications to Appendix M: Monitoring and Implementation will be proposed later in the examination process.

Matter 6: Green Belt (Tuesday 10 and Wednesday 11 February 2015):

8. In relation to general issues on Green Belt, promoters of large sites on the edge of Cambridge challenged the robustness of the Councils' joint Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2012 and the methodology used, arguing that their various preferred approaches were more appropriate and that much larger areas of land could be released from the Cambridge Green Belt and allocated for development without significant harm. They considered that the level of need for jobs and homes and the sustainability merits of land on the edge of Cambridge comprise exceptional circumstances for reviewing the Green Belt.

9. Several local environmental groups and local residents argued that there were no exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt, questioning the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt included in both Councils' Local Plans. They considered that even the smaller allocations included in the Local Plans should be deleted.
10. The Councils confirmed the need for jobs and homes to comprise exceptional circumstances to review the Green Belt but only so far as this would not cause significant harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. It was maintained that the Green Belt purposes included in the Plans are appropriate in the context of its role in protecting the setting and character of Cambridge as a historic town, carrying these purposes forward from earlier plans and supported by independent Inspectors. It was confirmed that in reviewing the Green Belt the Councils had considered the implications for sustainable patterns of development. The Green Belt was assessed alongside transport implications and a range of strategy options, informed by sustainability appraisal. This informed the preferred strategy taken forward in the Local Plans, which includes four small releases in Cambridge: two at Worts' Causeway and two at land south of Fulbourn Road and two modest Green Belt releases in South Cambridgeshire at NIAB 3 and land south of Fulbourn Road adjacent to the Peterhouse Technology Park.
11. The Council put forward a modification to Policy 4: The Cambridge Green Belt to ensure consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework and modifications to Appendix B: Proposals Schedule to amend the site area of Site GB1: Land north of Worts' Causeway to exclude the County Wildlife Site from the developable area and to the densities of Sites GB1 and GB2: Land north and south of Worts' Causeway to reflect a gross rather than net density approach.
12. The Inspectors raised this issue as a concern in their letter of 20 May 2015 and further work was undertaken as part of the Proposed Modifications process.

Matter 7A: Strategic Transport Issues (Wednesday 18 February 2015):

13. In discussing strategic transport issues, some objectors considered that there was not sufficient detail on the transport measures in the plans. The Councils confirmed that there was an appropriate level of detail at this stage, reflecting the longer term nature of many of the developments, and the more detailed stages of planning to come for the new settlements.
14. Some questioned whether specific transport measures were deliverable. The Councils confirmed that they considered they were deliverable, and capable of coming forward on time for when they were needed. It was highlighted that the

City Deal schemes would bring forward infrastructure earlier than would otherwise be possible. With regard to funding, the Councils provided an update on the City Deal, including the prioritisation of schemes for the phase 1 funding agreed by the City Deal Executive Board in January 2015, and progress regarding the trigger points for future funding tranches.

15. The hearing also considered whether the Local Plans would deliver a sustainable strategy in terms of transport. Some objectors considered that transport measures were added to mitigate the development strategy, rather than influencing the location of development. The Councils highlighted that the Local Plans had been prepared in parallel with the County Council's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, which is part of the County Council's Local Transport Plan. Transport was considered at each stage of the plan making process.
16. Promoters of large sites on the edge of Cambridge focused on the transport benefits that sites on the edge of Cambridge could deliver over other development options. The Councils acknowledged that Cambridge and the edge of Cambridge were at the top of the search sequence for new sites, and they were aware of the potential benefits. The Councils advised that the plans needed to consider a range of issues, not transport in isolation. As indicated in the Green Belt hearings, further development would cause significant harm to the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. Much of the remainder of the development is focused on new settlements, on transport corridors where significant improvements to transport are planned, particularly to support non-motorised forms of transport.
17. No modifications were proposed by the Council in relation to this statement.

Matter 7B: Transport Issues for Cambridge (Thursday 19 February 2015):

18. Discussions at this hearing session focused on the cycle parking standards in the draft Local Plan. Cambridge Cycling Campaign sought increases to the level of cycle parking required particularly for 1 bed flats. The Councils highlighted that the standards delivered a good level of provision, and were appropriate. The Cycling Campaign also sought stronger guidance on the location of cycle parking, and use of double stacking cycle stands.
19. There was general support for the principle of the Chisholm Trail, but some local residents expressed concern at the potential impact of the proposed bridge over the Cam at Ditton Meadows. County Council Officers stated that the design and location of the bridge was not a matter for the Local Plan, and a separate consultation process was continuing.

20. Additional modifications arising from Matter 7: Transport all relate to Appendix L: Car and Cycle Parking Standards. The modifications were all agreed with the Cambridge Cycling Campaign to ensure clarity of approach to cycle parking in new residential and non-residential developments.

Matter 8: Housing Land Supply and Delivery (Tuesday 17 and Wednesday 18 March 2015):

21. These hearings covered issues in relation to housing supply, the housing trajectory, five year land supply, windfalls and the City Deal 1,000 extra homes on rural exception sites.
22. On housing supply, the Council's assumptions were challenged on a number of brownfield sites in Cambridge and whether they were likely to come forward. The Council has completed a number of statements of common ground with landowners to address the delivery of sites.
23. On five year supply and the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on the joint housing trajectory between the two Councils, there was a variety of views on whether it was consistent with national policy and guidance. The Councils explained the development strategy across the two areas and the phasing of delivery, particularly for the fringe sites that have logically started in Cambridge and have just not reached South Cambridgeshire yet. The appropriate buffer to be provided in five year supply calculations (5% or 20%) and the appropriate method to make up any shortfall from the beginning of the plan period ('Liverpool' – spread over the rest of the plan period, or 'Sedgefield' – made up in full over the next five years) was discussed. The Councils explained the basis on which the plans had been prepared and submitted and why that was appropriate.
24. The Councils each explained their methodology for windfalls. Concerns were raised about the Council's assumptions because of the policy on protection of employment land, which was perceived by objectors to impact on the delivery of windfall sites through the plan period. Whilst most objectors considered the Council's method of calculating windfall was appropriate, Cambridge Past Present and Future considered the approach to be overcautious and asked for more reliance to be placed on windfalls in order to remove the need to remove land from the Green Belt.
25. The commitment by South Cambridgeshire District Council through City Deal to provide an additional 1000 homes on exceptions sites in addition to the Local Plans was discussed.
26. No modifications were proposed by the Council in relation to this statement.

Matter 9: Areas of Major Change (Tuesday 28 April 2015 – Thursday 30 April):

27. These hearings covered issues in relation to Cambridge City Council's policies on general principles for areas of major change and the University of Cambridge's West Cambridge site; South Cambridgeshire District Council's policy on Orchard Park; and both Councils' policies on land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (NIAB/Darwin Green 1, 2 and 3).
28. The Cambridge East hearing discussed the policies in the Local Plans which safeguard land at the airport for future development if it were to become available after the plan period, and allocate land north of Cherry Hinton in both districts for residential development within the plan period (Policy 12 and Policy SS/3). The potential was raised to retain more of the existing allocation from the Cambridge East AAP in the area north of Cherry Hinton, reflecting current understandings of land deliverable in the plan period. Proposed Modifications work included modifications relating to the number of homes to be delivered within the plan period at land north of Cherry Hinton.
29. On general principles (Policy 13), an objector challenged the Council's approach to addressing the needs of the historic environment in areas of major change. Another objector raised concerns in relation to piecemeal development adjacent to areas of major change. The Council explained that a range of policies throughout the Cambridge Local Plan appropriately address the protection of the city's historic environment and other assets which may be impacted upon by development. The Inspector highlighted that the historic and natural environment would be addressed at future hearing sessions in greater detail. Modifications were made to Policy 13 and its supporting text to make more reference to protecting and enhancing heritage assets.
30. In relation to hearings on Cambridge Northern Fringe East (Policy 14), an objector questioned whether the Local Plans were sufficiently detailed and evidenced, and whether it was appropriate to rely on a separate Area Action Plan. The Councils argued that the Local Plans policies included sufficient detail for the employment led mixed use development of this complex brownfield site, and production of an Area Action Plan was entirely appropriate. Concern was also raised about the deliverability of development, particularly in view of the long planning history of this site. The Councils highlighted the significant progress that had been made in recent years, including the new railway station now having planning permission and funding, the extension to the guided busway now under construction, rationalisation of existing rail sidings now having planning permission, and the support for redevelopment of this area by a number of landowners. Indeed, Brookgate (development partner of Network Rail) argued that development should be able to come forward ahead of the Area Action Plan. The Councils explained that a balance needed to be achieved

between early development to provide vitality around the new station, and securing the wider regeneration of the area. Additional modifications were proposed to Policy 14 and its supporting text and figure reflect the naming of the station, to ensure consistency with the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, to safeguard biodiversity and the minerals and waste safeguarding areas in the area, and clarify the need for production of an area action plan.

31. The focus of the discussion for the land South of Coldham's Lane session (Policy 15) was biodiversity, as the site's promoter had supported the principle of the policy. The Wildlife Trust raised concerns about the potential ecological impact of proposals for commercial uses on the former landfill sites east of Norman Way and an urban country park on the landfill site west of Norman Way and the lakes to the south of the railway line. The Council confirmed that a range of ecological surveys were underway and that appropriate ecological enhancement would be provided across the South of Coldham's Lane area of major change. Additional modifications were proposed to Policy 15, its supporting text and Figure 3.4 to clarify the requirements for each part of the area of major change and safeguard biodiversity.
32. In respect of Policy 18: West Cambridge, there was no discussion of the Matters and Issues during the hearing session. The Council put forward an additional modification to Appendix B: Proposals Schedule to remove agricultural land from the description of the West Cambridge site (Site M13), reorder the policy for sense, clarify that the floor space on the site includes existing buildings, and clarify terminology.
33. In respect of Policy 19 on the land between Histon Road and Huntingdon Road, the policy and supporting text and figures were amended to remove reference to NIAB and refer to land between Histon Road and Huntingdon Road. The policy was also modified to reflect that planning permission has been granted.

Matter PM1A – Objectively Assessed Housing Need (Tuesday 7 June 2016):

34. This hearing session followed the Proposed Modifications consultation and further work on a range of issues. The focus of this hearing and PM2: Green Belt was around issues arising from Proposed Modifications consultation, rather than reopening previous discussions. In respect of housing need, the Inspector sought views on whether the way the Councils have calculated housing need to 2031 is generally compliant with national planning practice; whether the need figures of 14,000 homes for Cambridge 2011-2031 and 19,500 for South Cambridgeshire are robust; and what is the relationship between these figures and the 1,000 extra homes which are part of the City Deal.

35. Participants asserted that our housing figures had been calculated over the wrong Housing Market Area (HMA) referring to the new travel to work areas for 2011, published in October 2015, and that the correct HMA should be Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire and East Cambridgeshire only. It was stated that the Councils' approach will result in large increases in commuting into Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire by 2031 which is unsustainable. The Councils were criticised for not doing a more comprehensive review of our objectively assessed housing need and had used the wrong demographic starting point for Cambridge. The Councils' evidence was criticised because no adjustment had been made in it to make up for a forecast decline in household formation in young adults.
36. It was asserted that housing need in Cambridge should be adjusted upwards to help provide more affordable housing. The Councils' evidence was criticised in that for not having properly taken into account expected economic growth to 2031 and not having fully taken market signals into account especially regarding land and house price growth. Participants stood by their own calculations of housing need which were all substantially higher than those included in our Local Plans.
37. In response to these criticisms, the Councils defended their approach to calculating housing need and the Local Plan targets of 14,000 and 19,500 homes for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire respectively. The Councils stated that the approach has taken proper account of economic forecasts and market signals, is consistent with national practice, and is not out of date. No adjustment in household formation rates was justified as these reflect national trends. The provision of affordable housing in Cambridge was defended as being the most that could sustainably be provided and without impacting housing delivery elsewhere in HMA. The Councils also explained that the approach that had been taken in considering whether an upwards adjustment should be made for the provision of affordable housing is consistent with guidance provided by the Planning Advisory Service. The demographic starting point identified for Cambridge was defended as being the most appropriate based on past evidence. The existing HMA was demonstrated to be the most appropriate in terms of self-containment in commuting and migration and that it is the right approach to look at commuting going forward based on past trends.
38. No modifications were put forward in relation to this hearing session.

Matter PM1B – Five Year Housing Land Supply and Joint Housing Trajectory (Wednesday 8 June 2016):

39. The Inspector sought views on whether there were local circumstances to justify a joint housing trajectory for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, and whether it would assist delivery of sustainable development.
40. Participants offered a range of views. Some considered that the Cambridge area was no different from other areas where planning between districts needed to be coordinated, and a joint housing trajectory should not be applied without having a joint plan. They also argued that South Cambridgeshire could not demonstrate a 5 year land supply on its own in the early years of the plan, and therefore further sites should be allocated. In order to deliver in the short term these would need to be at villages. This would help boost housing supply in South Cambridgeshire.
41. The Councils argued that the joint approach reflected the sustainable development strategy for the Cambridge area, and the sequential approach to development prioritising development in Cambridge, then the edge of Cambridge (where this would not cause significant harm to the Green Belt), new settlements, and finally better served villages at the bottom of the sequence. The joint sites on the edge of Cambridge form an important part of both plans. These are now coming forward, but for practical purposes are being built out from the edge of Cambridge, meaning high levels of supply on the Cambridge side of the boundary in the early years of the plan and a lesser contribution to South Cambridgeshire's numbers. Together the plans provide a 5 year land supply throughout the plan period. The strategy within the submitted Local Plans would boost housing supply, as it includes a robust strategy across a range of sites to meet identified housing needs. The consequences of not having a joint trajectory would be to require the allocating of a large number of new sites in villages, over and above identified needs, and this would not constitute sustainable development.
42. The Councils included in their statement to the examination a request to the Inspector that she confirm at the earliest possible time the acceptability of the joint trajectory approach in principle. The Inspector responded at the hearings by saying that she recognised that this issue is an important one for South Cambridgeshire but that her view is that she would find it difficult to provide interim findings on this issue because it is so related to the development strategy and there are still hearings to come related to this. She said she would keep the issue in mind as the examination progresses.
43. As part of the City Deal, the Councils have agreed to prepare a joint Local Plan and Transport Strategy for Greater Cambridge starting in 2019. The

Examination considered whether this commitment should be included in the Local Plans. The Councils stated that they would have no objection to including a reference to this, but it was not necessary to make the plans sound. Commercial Estates Group argued that an early review was necessary for soundness, and the plan should include information on the scope of the review and a deadline for completion of this review. The Councils argued against this approach that would in effect place a sunset clause on the plan, which was not appropriate or justified and did not appropriately reflect the review process.

44. No modifications were put forward in relation to this hearing session.

Matter PM2 – Green Belt Review Methodology (Thursday 9 June 2016):

45. The Inspector sought views on the methodology used in the Cambridge Inner Green Belt Study (November 2015) and whether the methodology enabled a clear and transparent assessment of how the existing Cambridge Green Belt performs against the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The Inspector focussed on three areas comprising the baseline studies and analysis; the identification of sectors and sub-sectors for assessment; and the identification of qualities as assessment criteria.

46. It was emphasised by the Inspector that site specific issues were not to be addressed in this hearing, with specific allocations or omissions sites being considered later.

47. The Councils' consultant confirmed that the study had been carried out using a range of baseline studies which defined characteristics. The study identified observable facts on the ground and followed established methodologies in terms of understanding townscape and landscape. The Councils' consultant also confirmed at the Inspector's request that there was no single accepted methodology or national standard for Green Belt assessment. The Councils' study and the objectors' studies all use different approaches to assess the importance of land to the Green Belt purposes.

48. Most of the discussion centred on the identification of the sectors and sub-sectors and the qualities which performed the role of assessment criteria. All of the objectors considered that the sectors and sub-sectors for assessment should have been split up differently. The Councils explained that if smaller parcels of land were assessed, there was a risk of losing sight of the bigger picture and producing skewed results which may lead to land being erroneously identified as not being important for Green Belt purposes. The Councils also confirmed that there had been a consistent approach across all sectors and sub-sectors to first assess the importance of the land to Green Belt purposes and then assess the potential for any release of land for development.

49. In relation to the 16 qualities used in the study as assessment criteria, the Inspector sought further clarification from the Councils as to how these qualities related to the Green Belt purposes. The Councils confirmed how these qualities related to the Green Belt purposes and set out the genesis of the qualities based on the Green Belt purposes and earlier studies of the Cambridge Green Belt. The qualities were criticised by the objectors as not being directly related to Green Belt purposes or not being measurable and transferable for use by other landscape architects. The Councils confirmed how the qualities were assessed. There was also extensive discussion of the importance of national Green Belt purposes versus Cambridge Green Belt purposes, with the objectors being of the view that the Cambridge-specific Green Belt purposes should not be used. The Cambridge-specific Green Belt purposes arose from the 2003 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan Panel Report and have been used consistently by Cambridge, South Cambridgeshire and East Cambridgeshire since that time. The Councils defended the use of both national and locally specific Green Belt purposes to assess the importance of land.

50. No modifications were put forward in relation to this hearing session.

Matter CC1A – Design and Historic Environment (Tuesday 14 June 2016):

51. This Matter covered issues in relation to the River Cam, the setting of the city, design, tall buildings and the historic environment. The Matters and Issues focussed primarily on the setting of the city, tall buildings and the Council's historic environment strategy. In relation to the setting of the city (Policy 8), this policy was subject to opposition from Commercial Estate Group and RLW Estates, who have interests in Cambridge South East and Waterbeach respectively. There was concern expressed about the application of Policy 8 on the setting of the city and the possibility of it representing a double hurdle for development proposals to address (alongside Policy 4: The Cambridge Green Belt). The Council explained how the policies were to be applied and confirmed the importance of the policy in maintaining landscape character, enhancing biodiversity and allowing access to Green Belt land on the city's fringes.

52. Tall buildings (Policy 60) were the subject of some discussion in terms of the wind tunnel effects created by tall buildings and the need for visual impact assessment of planning applications. The Council confirmed that these matters were addressed effectively by the policy and supporting Appendix F within the Local Plan, which will in due course replace the Council's Skyline Guidance.

53. Objectors raised concerns that the Council had not produced a historic environment strategy. The Council confirmed that the Local Plan formed part of a positive strategy for the historic environment consistent with the National

Planning Policy Framework. The Council also confirmed that the historic environment has been considered throughout the plan-making process, as an essential part of the evidence base for the Plan.

54. Additional modifications were made to Policy 7: The River Cam and its supporting text to address Historic England's concerns about impact on heritage assets and the River Cam corridor. Modifications were also made to Policy 8: Setting of the City and its supporting text to address Natural England's concerns about agricultural land and to ensure consideration of green infrastructure. Policy 57: Designing New Buildings and its supporting text were modified to require features and facilities to maintain and increase levels of biodiversity.
55. Modifications were made to Appendix C: Designations Schedule to clarify the designations within the schedule and to rename two protected open space sites.
56. Modifications were made to Policy 60: Tall Buildings and the skyline and its supporting text, and Appendix F: Tall Buildings and the Skyline, to reflect discussions with Historic England. The modifications have clarified the guidance for use in development management decisions, reflected the content of Historic England's recent advice note on tall buildings, and included additional viewpoints on the city's edges.
57. Policy 61: Conservation and enhancement of Cambridge's historic environment and its supporting text, and Policy 62: Local heritage assets were modified to better reflect the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.
58. Modifications were made to Appendix G: Local Heritage Assets to update the list of Local Heritage Assets and to clarify that designed landscapes could be Local Heritage Assets.
59. The Glossary definitions of heritage asset, historic core, and chalk hills were also modified or introduced for clarity.

Matter CC1B: Open Space and Natural Environment (Wednesday 15 June 2016):

60. This Matter covered issues in relation to the protection of open space and specific Protected Open Space designations. There was discussion during the hearing session about how the evidence base, particularly the Council's Open Space and Recreation Strategy 2011, complied with the National Planning Policy Framework, and whether the policy requirements for protection of open space should include specific re-provision requirements and evidence of demonstrable educational need. There was specific discussion of a number of sites, all of which were owned by colleges of the University of Cambridge or the Perse

School. Objectors were concerned that the institutions would not be able to grow. The Council defended the established policy position and made repeated reference to the need to apply the policy approach from the protection of open space consistently across the city, considering the planning merits of applications as they come forward. The Council confirmed that the policy approach was neither onerous nor inflexible, but sought to balance the need for educational institutions to be able to grow without losing the open spaces which form an essential part of Cambridge's character.

61. Modifications were made to Policy 67: Protection of Open Space and its supporting text to clarify wording of the policy and to clarify the Local Plan's requirements for assessment of open space in a planning application. Policy 68: Open space and recreation provision through new development and its supporting text was modified to clarify the Local Plan's requirements for delivery of open space and to make reference to the Playing Pitch Strategy and the Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy. Policy 69: Protection of sites of local nature conservation importance and its supporting text was modified to address Natural England's concerns about the hierarchy of national and local biodiversity and geodiversity sites and to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. Policy 71: Trees and its supporting text was modified to address concerns raised by the Inspector regarding the clarity of the policy. Modifications were made to Appendix I: Open Space and Recreation Standards to reflect the findings of the recently completed Playing Pitch Strategy and Indoor Sports Facilities Strategy. This involved reference to the new strategies to ensure that they are taken into account when development is proposed, and amendments to the standards to reflect changing usage of artificial pitch provision.

Matter CC2A & B – City Centre and Hierarchy of centres and retail capacity (Tuesday 5 and Wednesday 6 July 2016):

62. This hearing covered issues in relation to the City Centre, development in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area, Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change. The hearings session focussed primarily on appropriate development in the City Centre and development in the area around the Grafton.
63. In relation to development in the City Centre, this policy was subject to debate with representatives of the Grafton Shopping Centre and the Grand Arcade Shopping Centre. They argued that the policy should be more flexible and not require as high a proportion of A1 uses in primary and secondary frontages. They also argued that developments of over 2,500 sq m should not be required to provide a mix of unit sizes if they could demonstrate that it was unviable to do so. The Council explained that the policy provides certainty to applicants and that the percentage of A1 uses is required in frontages in order to protect the viability and vitality of shopping frontages. The Council also explained that in

terms of retail developments over 2,500 sq m, it was important to encourage diversity and consumer choice.

64. Policy 11 sets out how development around the Grafton will aim to meet the majority of the Council's retail needs to 2022. It was argued by the owners of the Grand Arcade that the amount of retail development here was not deliverable, and that development at the Grafton would impact on the retail offer in the Historic Core. The Council explained that as the development here was planned to meet forecast retail needs any impact on the Historic Core would be minimal and enhancing the offer at the Grafton would enhance the City Centre as a whole. The new owners of the Grafton Centre were present and supported the Council's approach and explained that they will be working with the Council in preparing an SPD which will test the precise amount of retail development that can come forward along with exploring public realm improvements in this area, and a range of other uses.
65. The second hearing session on retail covered issues in relation to the retail impact assessment threshold and the forecast need for retail floorspace. The owners for the Grand Arcade expressed concern that the threshold for the impact assessment should be lowered so as to protect the retail offer of the City Centre. The Council explained that the proposed threshold flowed from the recommendations of the Retail Study. As the City Centre was healthy and performing well, a lower threshold could not be justified. The Council also argued that the policy was clear on the requirements needed to meet it and flexible enough to deal with circumstances where developments could harm the health of nearby centres. The owners of the Grand Arcade also expressed concern about the uncertainties around the forecast retail need, particularly in relation to the growth of internet shopping. The Council explained that the evidence base took into account the uncertainties around the rise in internet shopping and appropriate caveats have been incorporated into the policy and supporting text. In addition, the Council explained that the policy and subsequent retail proposals will be subject to monitoring over the plan period through the annual monitoring report and that action will be taken if necessary.
66. Modifications were proposed in respect of paragraph 2.65 in order to be consistent with the Council's Retail and Leisure Study Update on the forecasting for retail. Policy 10: Development in the City Centre Primary Shopping Area and its supporting text were subject to modifications in order to clarify the requirements of the policy in respect of centre uses and the level of flexibility of the policy. Policy 11: Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change was amended to consider the impact of development on the historic core and clarification of the approach to the production of an SPD for the area.

Matter CC2C: Station Area West and Clifton Road Areas of Major Change:

67. No hearing session was held on this Matter. In the course of drafting the hearing statement on this Matter, a number of additional modifications were proposed to Policy 20: Station Areas West and Clifton Road Area of Major Change for clarity and to be consistent with other sites where SPDs are being produced to assist their delivery. Additionally, the possibility of investigating a foot and cycle access to the station from the east was identified. Additional modifications were also made to Appendix B: Proposals Schedule to clarify the mixed use nature of the development at Betjeman House, and ensure consideration of the botanic gardens and the conservation area when development comes forward at Betjeman House.

Matter CC2D: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area:

68. No hearing session was held on this matter. In the course of drafting the hearing statement for this Matter, a number of modifications were proposed to Policy 21: Mitcham's Corner Opportunity Area to clarify the status of the masterplan and extend the southern boundary of the opportunity area.

Matter CC2E: Eastern Gate Opportunity Area:

69. No hearing session was held on this matter. In the course of drafting the hearing statement for this Matter, a number of modifications were proposed to Policy 22: Eastern Gate Opportunity Area and its supporting text to clarify the requirements of the policy, particularly with reference to storey heights.

Matter CC2F – Mill Road Opportunity Area and Sites R9, R10 and R21 (Tuesday 12 July 2016):

70. This Matter covered issues in relation to Policy 23: Mill Road Opportunity Area and Site R10: Mill Road Depot. Site R9: Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road, and R21 315- 349 Mill Road and Brookfields were not the subject of discussion. The objectors appearing in relation to this matter were local residents. The discussion at the hearing session focussed primarily on the following issues in relation to the Mill Road Depot site:

- Loss of the Hooper Street garages;
- Bharat Bhavan's status as a building at risk;
- The proposed density of development;
- The impact of development on character and local distinctiveness;
- The site's access onto Mill Road.

71. The status of the Hooper Street garages was clarified. The Council confirmed that they remained part of the allocation, but could come forward after the rest of the allocation, given the existing long leases on the site.
72. The debate included discussion of the Bharat Bhavan Free Library building (Grade II listed) and its status as being a building at risk. The Council confirmed that it is aware of the condition of Bharat Bhavan, which is not considered to be a building at risk. The Council confirmed that it will continue to engage with the County Council and the leaseholder of Bharat Bhavan to ensure a positive outcome in respect of the building and its relationship with the wider allocation.
73. Concerns were expressed about constraints not having been properly addressed, including access, parking and contamination, and the risk of the site being bought by a developer and sitting unused for a number of years. The Council confirmed that, as part of the draft SPD, further work had already been undertaken on access to the site and contamination issues. The Council also confirmed that these issues were capable of mitigation and will continue to address them through the development process.
74. The character and appearance of the proposed development was also discussed. There was concern that insufficient consideration had been given to the impact on the conservation area and listed buildings. The Council confirmed that the development would be considered in relation to the character and distinctiveness of the area and that the Local Plan addressed this matter in Appendix B: Proposals Schedule (as amended). The issue of the nature of housing on the site was also addressed. Concern was raised that the site would come forward as student accommodation and that there would not be sufficient affordable housing. The Council confirmed that the allocation is for residential accommodation, not student accommodation, and that it would provide at least 40% affordable housing.
75. Modifications were made to Policy 23 and its supporting text to clarify public realm improvements and materials, the site allocations within the opportunity area, and the conservation areas status of the opportunity area. Figure 3.10: Mill Road Opportunity Area was modified to add the conservation area boundary and to note the need for junction improvements on the Mill Road Depot access. An additional modification was made to Appendix B: Proposals Schedule in respect of Site R21 to alter the site's capacity, including the number of dwellings and the density is proposed as a result of the Council's reassessment of the site's overall capacity.

Matter CC2G: Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area and Sites E5 and M5 (Wednesday 13 July 2016):

76. This Matter covered issues in relation to Policy 24 Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Rd corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area and Sites E5: 1 and 7 – 11 Hills Road and M5: 82-88 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman Street. However, only Site E5 was subject to discussion. The University of Cambridge was represented by Bidwells at the hearing session in relation to Site E5, which is owned by the University of Cambridge and will be vacated by Cambridge Assessment, once the new Cambridge Assessment offices on Shaftesbury Road are completed in 2018.
77. Concern was expressed that the transport proposals for Hills Road contained in the Local Plan (Policy 24) and in the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (Policy TSCSC 9 and within the accompanying Action Plan) would not be carried out consistently and coherently. The Council confirmed that the Local Plan and the Transport Strategy were aligned and would work together effectively to deliver improvements in this area. It was also highlighted that the County and City Councils and the University of Cambridge were all working together to deliver City Deal. The current City Deal consultation on peak-time road closure could have a positive impact on Hills Road, bringing about the improvements for sustainable transport desired by both the City Council and the University of Cambridge, as landowner of Site E5.
78. There was discussion about Site E5 being allocated for employment use only. It was argued that a mix of uses should be developed on the site, which could include retail and leisure, and student accommodation. The Council confirmed that this was an important employment allocation in a key location for employment. This was supported by the Council's evidence base in relation to employment. Retail and leisure uses would not be suitable outside the City Centre and the Hills Road Local Centre and would dilute the site's offer for employment use to meet the city's objectively assessed needs for jobs. The Council confirmed that a student accommodation study is being undertaken and that the findings of the study would be reported back to the Inspectors examining the Local Plan in due course.
79. Policy 24 Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre Opportunity Area and its supporting text and Figure 3.11 was modified to clarify the materials to be used in the public realm, including 1 Regent Street and Furness Lodge.

Matter CC3: Climate Change (Thursday 14 July 2016):

80. This Matter covered issues in relation to policies within Section 4 of the Plan, which covers climate change and managing resources. However, as only one objector attended the session, the focus of the discussions was on Policy 29: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy. Concerns were raised that the modifications made to the policy in light of changes to national policy related to wind turbine development unduly restricted the delivery of wind turbines in the city and that it did not take into account actual wind speeds in the city. The Council confirmed that while it was supportive of all forms of technology, wind resource mapping carried out as part of the Decarbonising Cambridge Study indicated that the wind resource in the city is highly constrained. As such, the Council does not consider it appropriate to allocate sites in the city for wind turbine development, focussing instead on other renewable and low carbon technologies that have been proven to be technically feasible in the city.
81. Additional modifications were proposed to Policy 35: Protection of human health from noise and vibration and its supporting text to better reflect the wording contained within paragraph 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework and paragraph 30-012-20140306 of the National Planning Practice Guidance.

Matter CC4: Supporting the Cambridge Economy (Tuesday 6 September 2016):

82. Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space was discussed in this Matter. Objectors representing the University of Cambridge in respect of allocation E5, dealt with in Matter CC2G, thought that the clarity of the wording of Policy 40 could be improved in relation to references to Appendix B and in defining the City Centre. The Council explained that the wording of the policy was considered to be clear as the site falls outside the City Centre but offered to add a definition to the glossary of the City Centre.
83. The Inspector then moved onto looking at the availability of land at Addenbrooke's/the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Objectors representing Pigeon Land and LIH set out their case which was:
1. There is a specific important sub-sector of the bioscience sector that requires close proximity to CBC, in order to access clinicians and tissue samples;
 2. The bioscience sector is important to the Cambridge economy and the UK economy;
 3. Once you assess the take-up rate of land at CBC it is apparent that there will be a short-term shortage of land to meet the needs of the above sub-sector.

84. The Council agreed that the bioscience sector is important to the Cambridge and UK economy, and that this was recognised in the Local Plan through the strategic allocation at Cambridge Biomedical Campus. The Council explained that no convincing evidence has been submitted indicating either an amount of floorspace that needed to be a particular distance away from CBC or evidence of a queue of firms frustrated by their inability to find a suitable site. The Council also indicated that it is not reasonable to scale forward a period of growth at the CBC that includes AstraZeneca and Papworth Hospital taking up floorspace, as these are both one-off moves in a short period of time.
85. In respect of Policy 41: Protection of business space, objectors representing the University of Cambridge in respect of allocation E5 questioned the 12 month marketing requirement before the loss of employment land can be accepted. They argued that whilst it was not an unusual approach, a maximum 6 months should be considered. The Council pointed to Appendix K, which allows for a 6 month focussed marketing campaign, and that this policy flows from the evidence base, which recommends protecting office development in addition to industrial and storage sites.
86. Additional modifications were proposed to Policy 40: Development and expansion of business space and its supporting text. These modifications primarily related to clarity of tables 5.1 – 5.3 and allocations for employment use.
87. Additional modifications were proposed to Policy 41: Protection of business space to clarify allocation of sites for employment uses, flexibility of use of sites while marketing of sites takes place, and the general need for marketing of sites.
88. Additional modifications were proposed to Policy 43: University Faculty Development for clarity and to provide additional information on the progress of University of Cambridge sites in the plan period.
89. Additional modifications were proposed to Policy 44: Specialist colleges and language schools and its supporting text to clarify requirements to prevent use of family dwelling houses by students.
90. An additional modification was proposed to the Glossary to include a definition of the City Centre.
91. An additional modification was proposed to Site U3: Grange Farm off Wilberforce Road as a part of this Matter to ensure appropriate consideration of biodiversity on the site. This addressed an issue raised by objectors and questioned by the Inspector.

Matter CC5 – Services and Local Facilities (Wednesday 7 September 2016):

92. At the hearing session for services and local facilities, objectors representing Grosvenor, USS, Wrenbridge and Cambridge United Football Club spoke about the need for a community stadium and sporting village. They asserted that there was substantial evidence showing the need for a range of indoor and outdoor sporting facilities across the area. They also raised the issue of clustering and co-location of sports facilities.
93. The Council confirmed that there was not a wealth of evidence indicating the need for a community stadium. The Council, working with South Cambridgeshire, Sport England and the relevant National Governing Bodies for sports, commissioned two sports strategies: a Playing Pitch Strategy 2015-2031 for grass and all weather pitches, and an Indoor Sports Facility Strategy 2015-2031 to guide future provision of indoor sports halls, swimming pools and outdoor cycling facilities to serve existing and new communities. Both strategies address planned growth to 2031 and do not require the provision of a community stadium to address these needs.
94. Additional modifications were made to Policy 75: Healthcare facilities to use a generic term to describe the health organisations which the Council will need to engage with in bringing forward healthcare facilities.
95. Additional modifications were made to Appendix C: Designations Schedule - List of protected public houses (Policy 76) to include two new public houses², rename existing public houses, and delete four public houses³. Two additional modifications were made to Appendix K: Marketing, Local Needs and Viability Appraisal to clarify steps for marketing and freehold and leasehold arrangements.

N.B. Matter CC6: Maintaining a Balanced Supply of Housing has not yet been heard.**Matter CC7 – Allocations and Change of Designations:**

96. Matter CC7 was timetabled to be heard in September 2016. The element of the Matter relating to Site R17: Mount Pleasant House was postponed pending the publication of the Councils' student accommodation study. Matter CC7 also raised issues relating to Site R12: Ridgeons, Cromwell Road. No objectors asked to appear in relation to this site and the Inspector did not have any further questions after reading the Council's hearing statement. The Council proposed additional modifications to Appendix B: Proposals Schedule in respect of Site

² The Pint Shop and The Old Bicycle Shop

³ The Ranch, The Rosemary Branch, The Penny Ferry, The Zebra.

R12 to refer to the production of a planning and development brief for the site. This document has been approved for adoption as a supplementary planning document, pending the adoption of the emerging Local Plan. An outline planning application has now been submitted for this site.