

## Appendix K

### Actions from Scrutiny Meetings and Officer Responses and potential modifications to draft plan

Cambridge - Performance, Assets and Strategy Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Tuesday, 4th November 2025

Point summarised by Chair of Scrutiny Committee	Response	Potential modification to Draft Local Plan
<b>Consultation Process</b>		
Stressed the need for a diversity of responses, particularly from younger people (including colleges and Universities) and those from underrepresented groups.	Noted. Consultation activities will aim to reach a wide range of groups.	N/A
Requested that Cabinet and officers ensure that a non-digital, paper based version must also be made available to avoid excluding those who cannot go online.	Noted. Will aim to support access to paper copies as well as online.	N/A

Raised concerns over the consultation period being over Christmas, but noted that the need to hit the Dec 2026 final deadline and therefore urged officers and Cabinet to ensure a strong campaign of awareness to residents.	Noted. Officers will endeavour to run and engaging and comprehensive consultation.	N/A
<b>Overarching strategy, including spatial strategy, numbers of jobs and homes</b>		
Stressed the importance of this local plan taking priority and leading on any Cambridge Growth Company proposals - these sites, if agreed, need to be built out first.	Noted.	N/A
Strongly supported the current councils' stance that local planning powers should not be devolved to a development corporation.	Noted	N/A

Urged Cabinet to continue close working with East Cambridgeshire District Council to ensure that whatever comes forward in LGR supports this new local plan for Greater Cambridge .	Noted. East Cambs have been engaged though the duty to cooperate process.	N/A
Noted the key risks of reliance on the NEC site (despite the recent CWWTC decision), on the transport strategy which is not controlled by the city/district councils and on the water requirements. Members urged Cabinet to continue to engage urgently with the necessary stakeholders (including Government, CPCA, GCP and Anglian and Cambridge Water)	Noted. Officers to continue to engage with CPCA officers on Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy in line with CPCA Statement of Intent. Ongoing engagement with Cambridge Growth Company and water industry through Water Scarcity Group	N/A
Noted that the government are proposing that spatial development strategies would be developed by the Mayoral authority (Upper Tier) and stressed the importance of working closely with the CPCA on this as it develops.	Noted.	N/A
Strongly supported the very ambitious climate, net zero and biodiversity commitments in the proposals.	Noted.	N/A

Strongly supported the focus on affordable homes.	Noted.	N/A
<b>Site Specific Questions</b>		
Noted that the larger sites, especially Cambourne North, would need to ensure that infrastructure was delivered early and with sufficient provision.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This issue is addressed in several locations in the draft plan.</p> <p>Policy WS/NC: Meeting the needs of new and growing Communities, Paragraph 6, 'The timely delivery of services and facilities will be required, including the provision of key services and facilities in early phases of the development. Phasing will be established through planning obligations or conditions, and this may include requirements for the use of meanwhile or temporary uses to ensure local needs can be supported until permanent facilities are delivered.'</p> <p>Policy I/ID: Infrastructure and delivery paragraph 2 'New development must be co-ordinated and phased in tandem with</p>	N/A

	<p>the provision of appropriate physical and social infrastructure. In instances where the infrastructure provision is to be phased, the planning application must be accompanied by a phasing strategy.'</p> <p>Paragraph 10.73 '... site-wide master-planning to ensure the delivery of infrastructure and services is coordinated – it is the right size, in the right location, phased to support the pace of development, integrated into development proposals in accordance with a design-led approach, and issues of future management and transfer are addressed. Development which is poorly programmed can lead to infrastructure problems and can negatively impact local services and communities.'</p>	
<p>Noted that the provision for road freight was to support the evidenced need for this at the current time but that an increase in rail freight might occur in the future so it was hoped that the Local Plan would be able to take account of this over time.</p>	<p>Noted. Proposals for East West Rail are still evolving, but large scale freight use is not currently anticipated. The Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy being prepared by the Combined Authority will also consider the issue of road and rail freight. This issue can be kept under</p>	N/A

	review regarding any implications for the local plan.	
Asked Cabinet and officers to ensure that the policy on CBC (S/CBC p 211) made clearer reference to a masterplan being brought forward ahead of development (as currently this is only mentioned in the first paragraph but not in the actual policy).	<p>The need for a masterplan for the site is addressed in the draft plan.</p> <p>Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) paragraph 27 includes a requirement that, '...the applicant must prepare and submit, for approval as part of future outline planning applications: A comprehensive campus-wide masterplan which addresses key requirements'</p>	N/A
Asked that the policy or supporting text on North East Cambridge (S/NEC, 16. iii, p107) should recognise future developments which might allow a vehicular bridge over the railway and that developments undertaken should not undermine this.	Noted. The Councils recognise the impact of the downtime of Chesterton Fen (Fen Road) level crossing on the community and businesses north of the crossing. Delivery of improvements are the responsibility of Network Rail. The Councils are unable to safeguard land via the Local Plan until such a time that there is a firm proposal with a consent to be implemented. We continue to engage with all relevant partners to seek a resolution to this issue including Network Rail, the Combined Authority as Local	N/A

	Transport Authority via the Greater Cambridge Transport Strategy, and with Cambridgeshire County Council as Local Highways Authority.	
<b>Climate Change</b>		
Confirmed unanimous strong support for the ambitions around net zero and addressing the biodiversity emergency.	Noted	N/A
Requested that every effort was made to retain BNG on site rather than off site.	Noted. Policy BG/BG: Biodiversity and geodiversity requires BNG to be provided on-site where this is feasible and effective. Existing approach focusing on “on-site” first previously agreed by both Councils.	N/A
Noted the river corridors should balance the needs of active travel with the environment surrounding them.	Noted. Policy BG/RC: River corridors seeks to balance a range of uses and pressures on river corridors to ensure issues can be properly considered through the planning process.	N/A
Questioned how robust viability policies were and stressed the importance of	Noted. The draft plan has been subject to a whole plan viability assessment. The	N/A

developers delivering infrastructure and affordable homes.	policies regarding infrastructure and viability are considered to be robust.	
Asked Cabinet members and officers to ensure that terminology around allotments was clearer to differentiate between rented individual plots and those shared in a community or workspace	Approach to allotments and growing spaces can be clarified.	Replace references to 'food growing space' with ' <b><u>food growing and allotment space</u></b> '
Raised concerns about the assurances from Water Industry regarding retrofitting and demand management and whether these would come forward as proposed and in a timely manner, and on how water scarcity and new potable water supplies, and also provision for foul water discharge were crucial to these policies.	Noted	N/A
Requested that ambitious conditions be applied to development, requiring enforcement and monitoring and to allow data sharing with the Local Planning Authority for sustainable building standards and that these should be referenced in the Local Plan.	The plan could clarify that conditions may be used to assist with monitoring and implementation.	Add to policy CC/NZ paragraph 7:  7. 'All applicable developments must demonstrate use of an assured performance method in order to ensure that the buildings' operational energy performance reflects design intentions



		<p>and addresses the performance gap. <b><u>which may be secured via condition.</u></b></p> <p>Add to Paragraph 4.36 :</p> <p>‘... Meanwhile, evidence must be provided to show how the stated water efficiency levels can be achieved by the proposed development as part of a Sustainability Statement. <b><u>Conditions may also be applied seeking evidence of implementation and post occupancy water use.</u></b>’</p>
Asked that it should be clearer that there was an expectation for biodiverse roofs on all flat roofs, including garages and cycle stores.	Plan could clarify that opportunity extends to garages and cycle sheds.	Add to the end of paragraph 4.39 <b><u>‘The policy requires suitable flat roofs to be green or brown roofs. This should include garage and cycle sheds.’</u></b>
<b>Wellbeing and great places</b>		
Requested that Artists' studios (as distinct from exhibition space) were added to the meanwhile uses in para 6.61 p 495 (policy WS/MU).	Agree that artist spaces have potential to be a suitable meanwhile use, and could be added as an example.	<p>Amend paragraph 6.61:</p> <p>‘A ‘meanwhile use’ is the temporary use of a site or building for a duration of time</p>

		before it is turned into a more permanent end state, providing an active and potentially beneficial use on what would otherwise be vacant land awaiting development. Examples of meanwhile uses include pop-up shops, markets and cafes, creative workspace and exhibitions, <b><u>artists studios</u></b> , short-term office units, sustainable energy generation, community meeting places and facilities, and temporary housing.'
Asked for a clearer definition of appropriate densities and character in city, edge of city and rural spaces.	The supporting text to policy GP/HD: Housing density acknowledges that further work is required to explore how density should be applied, but amendment could make the need for this further work clearer.	Amend paragraph 7.27:  'The Councils intend to further develop the evidence for this policy, <b><u>exploring how density should be applied in different locations, and</u></b> including identifying specific locations where higher density development would be appropriate.
Asked for a greater recognition of the value of community assets such as pubs in both urban and rural areas.	Additional supporting text is proposed under the policy: WS/CF: Community, Sports, and Leisure facilities.  It should also be noted that the importance of pubs is recognised by	Add to paragraph 6.47, 'The National Planning Policy Framework advises that plans should guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its

	<p>having a standalone policy (WS/PH: Public houses), and paragraph 6.99 specifically addresses the importance of pubs, 'Public houses are an important part of Greater Cambridge's communities. They help to foster social interaction and local community life in both urban and rural areas'.</p>	<p>day-to-day needs. <b><u>Community assets such as community halls and public houses, both in urban and rural areas should be recognised for their importance in adding social value to existing and emerging communities.</u></b> Where proposals will result in the loss of community, sports and leisure facilities, applicants should seek to replace facilities, either on site as part of development or off-site (where considered appropriate by service providers and this can be secured through planning obligations linked to the development).</p>
<p>Asked that consideration be given to adding in a policy of provision of community spaces for hire prior to the Regulation 19 consultation.</p>	<p>Evidence has been prepared through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan exploring the need for new community spaces associated with new development. However, the complexity of delivering community services means that further evidence is being prepared to ensure policy requirements are robust and future community provision can respond to changing needs and opportunities.</p>	<p>Add new paragraph after 6.31:</p> <p><b><u>'The Councils are preparing further evidence to explore the need for community facilities including community rooms for hire, to ensure that policy requirements are robust and future community provision can respond to changing needs and opportunities.'</u></b></p>

<p>Asked that consideration be given to a policy limiting gambling and betting venues prior to the Regulation 19 consultation, noting recent UK wide research on this area.</p>	<p>There are examples of policies applied in districts elsewhere that seek to use control of land use to address health impacts of uses such as betting shops. However, in order to create a sound policy would need local evidence to inform appropriate policy application and the geography it could apply to. Therefore reference can be added in the supporting text as an area for further exploration, where people may also comment on the issue though the consultation.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 6.17:</p> <p>‘Concentrations of hot food takeaways and fast food outlets can damage the health of local communities by reducing choice and providing a plethora of opportunities for less healthy food choices. The policy seeks to avoiding clustering of these uses to ensure a balanced mix of uses within a village or shopping parade and to prevent such outlets from dominating. <b><u>We are also exploring whether such controls should also be applied to other uses that have health impacts, such as betting shops, and would be interested on receiving views on this issue through the consultation.</u></b>’</p>
<p>Asked that consideration be given to adding in a register of community facilities available in each area prior to the Regulation 19 consultation.</p>	<p>Noted. This will be considered as part of the additional evidence preparation towards the regulation 19 plan.</p>	

Requested that reference be made in the supporting evidence in Policy GP/QD to indicate that roads built to adoptable standard were encouraged (noting that whilst currently the County Council does not adopt smaller roads, this policy may change in future so this would future proof the document).	The plan cannot require all roads to be adopted, but supporting text could encourage developers to seek adoption.	Add to end of paragraph 10.73  <b><u>'In addition, developers are encouraged to design to adoptable standards and seek adoption of roads and spaces where possible'.</u></b>
<b>Jobs</b>		
Disappointment that Short Term lettings were not covered in the policy about visitor accommodation (or HMOs later) and strongly supported this being considered for further investigation and evidence of impact, and inclusion if possible prior to submission of the plan.	Noted. The application of policy is currently limited by the use class order not classifying short term let as a separate use. Government have indicated this is under review, but currently the policy cannot do more.	N/A
<b>Homes</b>		
Concern that shared ownership was not a very successful model and welcomed the inclusion of "and other affordable" in policy H/AH.	Comments noted. Shared ownership is a recognised form of affordable housing in national planning policy. The Plan must accord with national policy.	N/A

Welcomed mention of Article 4 directives relating to HMOs and would request more details on how this could be used to manage HMOs in the city (policy H/MO para 9.98).	Noted. The supporting text in the draft plan acknowledges that this is an area for further exploration.	N/A
Asked for officers and Cabinet to consider adding a reference to an expectation of reasonable level of management fees in the policy or supporting text for both Build to Rent and Co-living (H/BR and H/CO).	This is not an issue that can be directly controlled by the planning process, but could be referenced in the supporting text in the infrastructure theme.	Add to supporting text after paragraph 10.78. <b><u>'Where management or on-going maintenance fees are applied the Councils would encourage developers to keep these affordable and proportionate.'</u></b>
Welcomed the commitments to additional Gypsy and Traveller plots	Noted	N/A
Raised concerns that a policy for students (policy H/SA) should not allow 25% staff accommodation, and that staff accommodation should meet the relevant housing standards for private amenity space and room size and be treated as	There may be circumstances where it is appropriate to include staff accommodation alongside student accommodation. The policy sets requirement for it to meet an identified need, and to limit the percentage of the	N/A

housing not student accommodation. However, members welcomed the commitment to affordable homes contributions for student housing policy.	overall proposal to ensure it remains focused on student provision.	
Noted that student numbers were likely to change over time and suggested that this could be more clearly acknowledged in the supporting text.	Noted. The student need information focuses on a shorter time period because it relates to growth plans and expectations of institutions. Information on need for student accommodation will need to be kept under review, including through future local plan updates. This could be noted in the supporting text.	Add to end of paragraph 2.21 'Engagement with Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge and its Colleges has concluded that for students there is a specialist accommodation need for 2,042 additional student units by 2033. <b><u>Information on need for student accommodation will need to be kept under review, including through future local plan updates'</u></b>
Asked that 1.d of H/SA should include a means of tracking any net loss of affordable or market housing.	Our monitoring data identifies the loss of market homes and the creation of student accommodation in overall terms where there is a planning decision. We will explore how this can be reported through the monitoring report process.	N/A
<b>Infrastructure</b>		

Support the future proofing of transport strategies to make sure they can accommodate future needs.	Noted.	N/A
Supportive of delivery of last miles hubs enabling sustainable transport.	Noted.	N/A
Asked that Policy I/DT (d) is reviewed as currently it only prevents development when "severe harm" is caused to the highway which might negatively impact active travel and transport links.	Policy amendment has been suggested to provide greater clarity around how harm should be considered. 'Severe harm' was used as reference to the national planning policy approach to cumulative highway impacts. This can be separated out from the wider consideration of unacceptable harm from a development.	Amend Policy I/DT: Digital and telecommunications infrastructure paragraph 1d:  <b><u>The development does not cause severe impacts on the road network; and</u></b> The development <del>does not cause severe harm to the highway,</del> and will not cause detrimental impacts to safety or functioning of active travel infrastructure or highways.

### South Cambridgeshire - Scrutiny and Overview Committee 6 November 2025

Update from Scrutiny and Overview Committee - Officer actions arising	Response	Potential modification to Draft Local Plan
---	----------	--



<b>from the Scrutiny Committee discussion:</b>		
<b>Consultation</b>		
<p>i. Officers would look at different ways to structure / group the draft Local Plan document library so that it was easier to navigate through them either by location or topic. This was the next step in the process if Cabinet approved the draft Local Plan for consultation.</p> <p>ii. Officers would check through the consultation documentation to ensure consistent unit measurements are used.</p> <p>iii. If the consultation was approved; share a draft copy of the Local Plan summary document with members.</p> <p>iv. Officers would check the options available for members of the public to access hard copies of the draft Local Plan and would check the wording of the response forms to ensure these were accessible.</p>	Noted. These actions will be completed ahead of consultation.	N/A

V. Officers would look at the formatting of the Local Plan document, noting members' preference for the use of boxes to differentiate policy wording from supporting text, noting this had to comply with the requirements of accessibility legislation.		
<b>Strategy</b>		
Check the categorisation of Odsey and Cold Harbour noting that they didn't appear to be included in the settlement hierarchy.	<p>These hamlets do not have Defined Development Extents and as such are not included in Policy S/SH: Settlement Hierarchy.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.135 of the draft plan explains this approach - 'Defined development extents have not been defined around small clusters of houses or areas of scattered development where such buildings are isolated in open countryside or detached from the main concentration of buildings within Cambridge or a nearby settlement. Although it is recognised that such dwellings may be considered locally as</p>	N/A

	'part' of the nearest settlement in community terms, it is important in planning policy terms to limit the amount of new development that can take place in rural areas with few services and little or no public transport.'	
<b>Sites</b>		
Officers to check that the RSPB Hope Farm land did not fall within the Cambourne North allocation.	Officers have checked and confirmed that the RSPB Hope Farm land does not fall within the Cambourne North allocation.	N/A
Officers agreed to run briefings during the consultation for Parish Councils and District Councillors regarding the development at Grange Farm, and including addressing foul water issues.	This will be completed as part of the consultation	N/A
Encourage officers to think more about the active travel connections to the Spicers site, including from Whittlesford.	Agree the policy could usefully reference other locations.	Amend Policy S/RSC/FSS Former Spicer's Site as follows:

		... c. Contribute financially to strategic public transport and active travel schemes in the south east corridor appropriate to the scale and nature of the development, including active travel links to Sawston, Shelford <b><u>and other nearby villages.</u></b>
For the Grange Farm allocation, officers to consider the request to change the wording of the 'Cambridge South East Transport Busway' to CSET Transport Corridor.	Policy amendment proposed to refer to CSET "scheme" instead of CSET "busway".	Policy S/GF: Grange Farm, Movement section 13a: "Provide a segregated link for the proposed Cambridge South East Transport <del>busway</del> <b><u>Scheme</u></b> "
Look at the wording of the Whittlesford Parkway policy including the wording 'a transformed public realm'.	Officers recognise the need for proposals to consider existing residents and local people when proposals for this area come forward to shape the form of change in this area, address access issues and other concerns. The need for engagement can be clarified in the supporting text.	Add to the end of paragraph 3.4.57. <b><u>'Further development of plans for the area will need engagement with residents, local businesses and other stakeholders.'</u></b>
<b>Infrastructure</b>		
Officers to liaise with Cllr Dr Richard Williams regarding his query that the Local Plan affordable housing viability	Completed.	N/A

assessment didn't make allowance for any s106 contributions.		
<b>Green issue</b>		
Check the wording of policies to ensure they support the aim of wildlife networks.	<p>The draft plan supports delivery of a connected nature network in the following ways. Policy BG/GI requires "Major residential and commercial development... to ensure that on-site green and/or blue infrastructure is b. Connected – provides or fills a missing natural link in the landscape for the benefit of nature and people"; requires development to support delivery of the identified Green Infrastructure Strategic Green Infrastructure initiatives, which themselves match with the Cambridge Nature Network. Separately, Policy BG/BG Biodiversity states that the Councils will encourage delivery of replacement habitat within areas identified within the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Local Nature Recovery Strategy priority areas.</p> <p>Ahead of Proposed Submission the Councils will explore how the Local Plan</p>	N/A

	can support nature networks even more, including how best to support delivery of the final Local Nature Recovery Strategy.	
<b>Places</b>		
Officers to provide information regarding public art policies to Councillor Richard Stobart after the meeting.	<p>Completed.</p> <p>Policy GP/QP: Establishing high quality landscape and public realm and its supporting text set out the approach to public art. The supporting text includes,</p> <p>‘Successful public art demonstrates ambition, innovation and is relevant to its context, alongside providing social, economic and cultural benefits. It should genuinely engage people, including sections of the community that are hard-to-reach and contribute to local identity. Very broadly, public art can be understood as a process of engaging artists’ creative ideas in the public realm and with the community.’</p>	N/A
Advise Councillor Heather Williams after the meeting what had happened to current policies NH/11 – Protected Village Amenity Areas and NH/13 –	Completed. These existing policy designations are carried forward in the emerging Local Plan within policies BG/POS: Protected Open Spaces, and	N/A

Countryside Frontages in the draft Local Plan.	GP/LC: Protection and enhancement of landscape character.	
--	---	--