

CHAPTER 10: BUILDING A STRONG AND COMPETITIVE ECONOMY	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
<b>QUESTION 59: New Employment Provision near Cambridge</b>	
<p>i. Should employment provision be planned for Cambridge Northern Fringe East, and densification of Cambridge Science Park?</p> <p>Support: 23 Object: 0 Comment: 3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support in principle;</li> <li>• Reflects outcome of Employment Land Review.</li> <li>• Support as would not require additional Green Belt land;</li> <li>• Sites highly accessible by public transport;</li> <li>• Must consider impact on surrounding development.</li> <li>• <b>Support from five Parish Councils.</b></li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> - supports the exploration of further employment opportunities at Cambridge Northern Fringe East and Cambridge Science Park</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Should recognise biodiversity value of Chesterton Sidings.</li> <li>• Plan should offer flexibility, but not without full support of Local people</li> <li>• Need to consider impact on surrounding areas</li> </ul>
<p>ii. Should employment provision be planned for new allocations on the edge of Cambridge which have previously been designated as Green Belt?</p> <p>Support:4 Object: 5 Comment: 2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need a range of quality sites, to help maximise the potential of the Cambridge economy, edge of Cambridge would be most sustainable option;</li> <li>• Land west of the A10 Milton proposed.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> – will work with South Cambs to assess broad locations.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wider review of the Green Belt is required for employment purposes - not just at strategic sites. Focus should be on other sites to south i.e. Hanley Grange</li> <li>• In aiming to meet the forecast employment growth over the Plan period, there should be no new allocations of land for employment sites which have previously been designated Green Belt.</li> <li>• <b>Hauxton Parish Council</b> - Green Belt should be protected.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Shelford Parish Council – With development of Addenbrookes, further development in broad locations 4, 5 and 6 inappropriate.</li> <li>• No need for Green Belt review, but flexibility to develop with support of local people.</li> </ul>
<p>iii. Should employment provision be planned for both of the options above</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - Support</li> <li>• Support from four Parish Councils</li> </ul>

<p>Support:5 Object: 0 Comment:3</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs to be evidence led</li> <li>Milton Parish Council – Must be conditional to A14 improvements.</li> </ul>
<p>iv. Should employment provision be planned for neither of the options above</p> <p>Support: 7 Object: 0 Comment: 3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a wider review of the Green Belt is required for employment purposes</li> <li><b>Fen Ditton Parish Council</b> – only densification is acceptable.</li> <li><b>Camborne Parish Council</b> – employment growth should be adjacent to new developments to make them sustainable.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued growth of employment and population is undesirable.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any additional comments</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 0 Comment: 15</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Histon &amp; Impington parish Council</b> – How many new jobs are required beyond indigenous operations? City and South Cambs plan need to be closely coordinated. Need provision for SMEs.</li> <li><b>Swavesey Parish Council</b> – Also need to consider road infrastructure.</li> <li><b>Cottenham Parish Council</b> – Need high speed broadband.</li> <li>Also need provision in villages.</li> <li><b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> - Business has demonstrated need to be located close to City. Encourage high tech firms to locate head quarters in sub-region. Need variety and choice of spaces. Coordinate with surrounding areas.</li> <li><b>Waterbeach Parish Council</b> – Development should take place where infrastructure already exists.</li> <li>Trinity College - Pleased Local Plan acknowledges importance of Cambridge Science Park and opportunities for densification. .</li> <li>Marshall Group – Intend to promote employment growth at Cambridge East, including brownfield land for business park development.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 60: Employment Allocations</b></p>	
<p>A: Should the existing employment allocations where development is partially complete be carried forward into the Local Plan?</p> <p>Support:22 Object: 2 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence that they are inappropriate.</li> <li>The Pampisford site is well related to the Sawston bypass and can provide employment opportunities for both Pampisford and Sawston.</li> <li><b>Support from 11 Parish Councils</b></li> <li><b>Cambridge City Council</b> - supports the proposal to carry forward existing employment allocations where development is partially complete.</li> <li><b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Support.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment development must be directed to more sustainable sites than last round of plans.</li> <li>• Convert redundant buildings instead, as industrial estates create congestion.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>
<p><b>B:</b> Should the existing employment allocation North of Hattons Road, Longstanton be carried forward into the Local Plan?</p> <p>Support: 8 Object: 2 Comment: 2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 2 Parish Councils</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> - supports the proposal to carry forward existing employment allocations where development is partially complete.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Support.</li> <li>• It will come forward in the future, especially given the new guided busway, continuing development of the Home Farm site and Northstowe.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over a mile from the guided busway. Employees would probably use their cars rather than the bus wasting fuel, adding to pollution and traffic congestion. Should be housing as Northstowe developments are likely to be delayed because of the failure to improve the A14. If it isn't going to be housing it should be left as agricultural.</li> <li>• Greenfield land, and should be preserved as such.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comberton Parish Council</b> – should be decided at local level.</li> <li>• <b>Cottenham Parish Council</b> – should remain employment not housing unless replaced elsewhere.</li> </ul>
<p><b>C:</b> Are there any other areas that should be allocated in the Local Plan for employment?</p> <p>Support:4 Object: 0 Comment:7</p>	<p>New allocations suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South of Milton Park and Ride,</li> <li>• Tear Drop site, adjacent to A14, Milton</li> <li>• Land at London Road Pampisford</li> <li>• CEMEX site, Meldreth</li> <li>• TKA Tallent Site, Bourn Airfield (in association with development option at Bourn Airfield).</li> <li>• Land east of Spicers, Sawston</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Papworth Everard Parish Council</b> - Papworth Hospital Site</li> <li>• <b>Cottenham Parish Council</b> - 'allocation' is the wrong approach, areas should be 'identified' as possibilities e.g. opposite the Brookfield industrial estate.</li> </ul>
<b>QUESTION 61: Local Development Orders</b>	
<p><b>A:</b> Should the Council consider issuing Local Development Orders to help speed up employment development?</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could assist employers to set up more quickly</li> <li>• Where no impacts, e.g. impacts on residential development</li> <li>• Council should look to deploy all the tools they have to speed up and also encourage employment</li> </ul>

<p>Support:7 Object: 14 Comment: 1</p>	<p>development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other local authorities have issued LDOs to help establish wind energy construction and manufacturing</li> <li>• I'm working on an LDO elsewhere in England and can already see the benefits.</li> <li>• <b>Cottenham Parish Council</b> – yes, if would help employers set up quickly, in areas without residential impact, not Green Belt.</li> <li>• <b>Cambourne Parish Council</b> – support.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing process of consultation with communities should be retained.</li> <li>• <b>Objections from five Parish Councils.</b></li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> would be concerned about LDOs for sites on the edge of the city, due to the potential negative impacts on the setting of the city.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comberton Parish Council</b> - It would be good practice for SCDC not to have any 'unreasonable' constraints in its standard planning rules for anyone.</li> </ul>
<p><b>B:</b> If so, where?</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambourne Parish Council</b> – Cambourne Business Park</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 62: Limitations on the Occupancy of New Premises in South Cambridgeshire</b></p>	
<p>i. Retain the current policy approach to encourage high tech research and development but offices, light industry and warehousing being small scale local provision only.</p> <p>Support:19 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Support from 6 Parish Councils</b></li> <li>• Has been successful in supporting development of the area.</li> <li>• Other parts of the UK need employment more than the Cambridge area and will be keen to take employment of a type unsuitable for this region.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need to further encourage high tech R&amp;D, they are already all too keen to come here.</li> </ul>
<p>ii. Retain the policy in its current form for specified areas: Cambridge Science Park Granta Park Babraham Institute Wellcome Trust Melbourn Science Park</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Support from 7 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern could place sites at competitive disadvantage.</li> <li>• User restriction should permit greater flexibility and allow activities which are not in themselves high technology, but help foster their growth and</li> </ul>

<p>North West Cambridge (University)</p> <p>Support: 9 Object: 2 Comment: 1</p>	<p>development. This could include for example business services, financial and management services patent agents and specialist manufacturing and accessibility. There would also be significant benefit in allowing an element of D1 (conferencing/education and training centres). It is essential to recognise that support services are essential to the continued success of clusters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should also be a recognition that the nature of B1 uses is evolving, with a merging of traditional R&amp;D uses and B1(a) Offices, and that the provision and size of offices should not be unduly restricted.</li> <li>• Existing policy framework is overly restrictive, failing to recognise that high value manufacturing, high tech headquarters, and importantly support services can help reinforce the development of high-technology clusters.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wording of policy should acknowledge the contribution of complementary development, such as information technology and conference and training programmes.</li> </ul>
<p>iii. Amend the policy to allow for large scale, high value manufacturing and high tech headquarters to locate to South Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>Support:4 Object: 1 Comment: 4</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - support an amendment of policies to allow for greater flexibility</li> <li>• <b>Support from 3 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need maximum restriction of further industry</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Croydon Parish Council</b> - Maybe not large scale, but small/medium scale manufacturing.</li> <li>• The restriction of only high tech companies, and having companies needing to prove that they need to be in the district has restricted the type of employment available to local people.</li> </ul>
<p>iv. Remove the policy apart from the restriction on large-scale warehousing and distribution.</p> <p>Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need maximum restriction of further industry</li> </ul>
<p>v. Remove the policy entirely.</p> <p>Support: 3 Object: 3 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So that other types of employment are not discouraged from the Cambridge area.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need restrictions on large scale warehousing.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>

<p>comments.</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 2 Comment: 13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration should be given to the needs of these local businesses and what should be done to ensure their long-term sustainability within the area.</li> <li>• Existing policy over restrictive, failing to recognise high value manufacturing, high-tech headquarters, and support services.</li> <li>• Support policies to improve diversity of jobs including additional manufacturing jobs, in addition to high tech industries and to assist education and skills sector, including land for education/ company partnerships.</li> <li>• District needs to attract jobs for a great many less skilled workers.</li> <li>• Retention of existing policy supporting low intensity high value employment would align with overall employment trend of area.</li> <li>• Need to facilitate businesses that need Cambridge location, and discourage those that can locate elsewhere.</li> <li>• An example of what should not be done are the recent plans for the Cambridge Research Park on the A10. Specifically granting planning for 'industrial' buildings is a wasted opportunity to keep the faith with the strength of Cambridge.</li> <li>• Change the focus of development from almost exclusively housing, to a broader mix of housing and different size of office and laboratory space, that will favour high tech SMEs particularly in the first five years of their development.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> – will continue to work with South Cambs in reviewing policy approach.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 63: The Promotion of Clusters</b></p>	
<p>Should the Local Plan continue to include a policy supporting the development of clusters?</p> <p>Support:35 Object: 2 Comment: 4</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essential to the ongoing success of Cambs</li> <li>• Need to also support supporting services</li> <li>• To support protection and availability of sites for cluster development</li> <li>• The concentration (in the form of a mini-cluster) of biotechnology businesses at Granta Park/TWI has itself brought significant benefits.</li> <li>• The promotion of clusters is a planning policy approach that complements the Wellcome Trust Genome Campus Development Plan.</li> <li>• Support is particularly important given the growing evidence that the Cambridge Cluster has lost momentum as highlighted within the SQW Cambridge Cluster at 50 Report amongst others.</li> <li>• Should not be at the expense of also encouraging other business and employment opportunities.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 10 Parish Councils</b></li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - important</li> </ul>

	<p>from a perceptions perspective in affirming South Cambs support for the Cambridge high tech cluster.</p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>CPRE</b> – clusters should be contained within overall employment policy</li> <li>• <b>Papworth Everard Parish Council</b> – Clusters do not support sustainable development in rural areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cottenham Parish Council</b> – If policy still has value then continue.</li> <li>• <b>Litlington Parish Council</b> – Where economically viable.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past, Present and Future</b> – Good transport links between clusters are important.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 64: Shared Social Spaces as part of Employment Areas</b></p>	
<p>Should the Local Plan seek shared social spaces on or near employment parks?</p> <p>Support:26 Object: 5 Comment: 3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for seeking shared social spaces in or nearer employment parks.</li> <li>• Granta Park is an example of what can be achieved.</li> <li>• If possible facilities should also be available to general public.</li> <li>• <b>Cottenham Village Design Group</b> – Can be used to supplement existing sports and social provision in local area.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 10 Parish Councils</b></li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - - important from a perceptions perspective in affirming South Cambs support for the Cambridge high tech cluster.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should support but not be incumbent on employers to provide.</li> <li>• No need for a policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comberton Parish Council</b> – Can be addressed by landlords if the perceive issue as serious.</li> <li>• <b>Cottenham Parish Council</b> - Employment should be in places where social needs can be met already.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 65: Broadband</b></p>	
<p>Do you think that the Local Plan should include a policy seeking provision for broadband infrastructure in new developments?</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be high-speed e.g. 100mbs</li> <li>• Should require fibre optic connection, not just ducting.</li> </ul>



<p>Support:52 Object: 1 Comment: 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High tech companies rely on high speed broadband to remain competitive and in the forefront of their chosen field.</li> <li>• This is essential to avoid communities with poor broadband speed becoming blighted because working from home is not an option.</li> <li>• Broad location 7 has necessary scale to deliver superfast broadband network.</li> <li>• The policy should be very specific and request that all new build must have fibre connected</li> <li>• <b>Support from 21 Parish Councils</b></li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - Supports working from home and reduces need to travel.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need for a policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cottenham Parish Council</b> – Should have policy seeking quality improvement across the district.</li> <li>• Should require dark cable, even where the exchange has yet to be upgraded to use it.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 66:</b> <b>Established Employment Areas in the Countryside</b></p>	
<p><b>A:</b> Should development within established employment areas in the countryside be allowed?</p> <p>Support:23 Object: 3 Comment: 8</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilise existing asset base.</li> <li>• New areas should only be added if need can be established.</li> <li>• Redevelopment should be welcomed where there is environmental benefit</li> <li>• To support viability of sites.</li> <li>• Should be conditional it is not in the Green Belt</li> <li>• Should enable redevelopment, subject to visual and other impacts</li> <li>• <b>Support from 8 Parish Councils</b></li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - Support</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need for a policy.</li> <li>• <b>Whaddon Parish council</b> – this should not be allowed.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be amended to allow the expansion of existing business parks where it would have no impact on the surrounding area.</li> <li>• Area of Granta Park should be expanded to reflect existing development on the park. Additional are should be included to the south, for secondary development / landscaping.</li> </ul>
<p><b>B.</b> Should additional areas (both around 10 hectares), be included at – 1. Eternit UK site between Meldreth</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Support from 2 Parish Councils</b></li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - Support</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p>



<p>and Whaddon</p> <p>Support:6 Object: 6 Comment: 2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many heavy lorries coming through Whaddon.</li> <li>• Would increase traffic on already busy A1198</li> <li>• <b>Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council</b> – object unless heavy goods vehicles are prohibited from using Chestnut Lane to access the site, or highway improvements are carried out including provision of a footway between A1198 and the wireless station site.</li> <li>• <b>Whaddon Parish Council</b> - The local infrastructure does not support the increased traffic this would cause.</li> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish Council</b> – Poor infrastructure and significant environmental impact.</li> <li>• <b>CPRE</b> – site not in a sustainable location.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As long as it is not detrimental to the rural nature of the site as a whole.</li> </ul>
<p>B. Should additional areas (both around 10 hectares), be included at – 2. Barrington Cement Works (area of existing and former buildings)</p> <p>Support:9 Object: 4 Comment:3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local residents to determine.</li> <li>• Barrington itself has a mixture of enterprises, the cement works should mimic this</li> <li>• Any development for employment on this site must be carefully planned so that traffic in villages is minimised or indeed reduced.</li> <li>• Impact of rail movements has a substantial and detrimental impact on residents in parts of Barrington close to the railway. Other ways of using the line should be considered.</li> <li>• Employment opportunities in this area are limited. Using the land for infill would not create long-term jobs.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 4 Parish Councils</b></li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - Support</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Whaddon Parish Council</b> – local infrastructure would not support increase in traffic.</li> <li>• <b>Haslingfield Parish council</b> – Poor infrastructure and significant environmental impact.</li> <li>• <b>CPRE</b> – site not in a sustainable location.</li> <li>• <b>CEMEX</b> - There is no permanent employment on-site and it is incorrect to describe it as being of "significant existing employment development". Considers the site is suitable for residential-led development, including other uses.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As long as it is not detrimental to the rural nature of the site as a whole.</li> <li>• Barrington Cement works is within the consultation area for development affecting the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lord's Bridge.</li> <li>• Partial development of the site would be acceptable alongside ecological restoration of the</li> </ul>

	site and the potential allocation of open space provision e.g. country park.
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 0 Comment:8</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A matter for local communities.</li> <li>• Does existing employment development equate to brownfield site?</li> <li>• Where further development within established employment areas is permitted, provision must be made for safe access e.g. cycle and walking</li> <li>• Further employment on the existing sites to be considered on individual merit, but should take place within the sites rather than extending them.</li> </ul>
<b>QUESTION 67: New Employment Development in Villages</b>	
<p>What approach should the Local Plan take to the scale of employment development in villages?</p> <p>1. Continue to restrict to small scale development (employing 25 people) and the size limitations: Offices (B1a): 400 m2, High tech / R &amp; D (B1b): 725 m2, Light Industry (B1c):800sq m2, General Industry (B2):850 m2, Warehousing (B8):1,250 m2).</p> <p>Support:18 Object: 4 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should only deviate from this in exceptional circumstances.</li> <li>• Needed to give clarity and certainty to local people and developers about what is not acceptable</li> <li>• Traffic generated from any development is a concern to neighbouring properties. Smaller developments should create less of a problem with this.</li> <li>• To allow larger employment developments within existing villages would have a severe impact of the infrastructure, utilities, services and facilities currently available to those villages</li> <li>• The spacing already considered in your plan for employment development is large for a village.</li> <li>• Support retention of the existing restrictions because otherwise there is likely to be an economically-driven expansion in local industry with yet further demands on local housing.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 6 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strict policies will simply discourage employment within the rural area which will only harm the sustainability of these places.</li> <li>• Object to the, 'planning by numbers', method that imposes limits based on arbitrary categories.</li> <li>• The current restrictions are too great and actively discourage employment provision in the villages which runs contrary to the aims to reduce the level of commuting and build sustainable communities.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCDC should be sensitive to wishes of local community.</li> </ul>
<p>2. A more flexible approach that development should be in keeping with the category, character and</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies have proven to be insufficiently flexible and may have discouraged employment which</li> </ul>

<p>function of the settlement.</p> <p>Support:33 Object: 1 Comment: 2</p>	<p>might have been appropriate but just fell the wrong side of the policy limitations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies relating to economic development should be flexible to ensure development comes forward. Strict policies will simply discourage employment within the rural area which will only harm the sustainability of these places</li> <li>• In order to allow businesses to grow and thrive in the difficult time we now have but for the future, current policies will need to be relaxed.</li> <li>• Restricting new employment development to specific uses and sizes does not provide the encouragement to developers to invest in employment schemes in villages.</li> <li>• Each application should be considered on its merits, particularly in the context of the circumstances prevailing at the time of submission and the overall makeup of the village and its immediate surroundings.</li> <li>• Parish councils should have the final word.</li> <li>• All restrictions should be removed with a more flexible approach which actively encourages all forms and scales of development within the villages, particularly those with good public transport links.</li> <li>• <b>Cottenham Parish Council</b> - reworded as: "A more flexible approach that development should be in keeping with the category of the settlement and the aspirations of its residents."</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - We support amending policies to allow for the expansion of existing businesses and the creation of new businesses within villages and the countryside where deemed to be of an appropriate scale.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 12 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfortunately flexibility is open to abuse for financially motivated reasons.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 5</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strict policies will simply discourage employment within the rural area which will only harm the sustainability of these places, which would be both contrary to the ethos of the Local Plan, but crucially that of the NPPF.</li> <li>• A more flexible approach that development should be in keeping with the category, character and function of the settlement. In particular, work from home units should be encouraged, as the small businesses are the life blood of this district.</li> <li>• Support working from home units, e.g. garage conversions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 68: New Employment Buildings on</b></p>	

<b>the Edge of Settlements</b>	
<p><b>A:</b> What approach should the Local Plan take to employment development on the edges of villages?</p> <p>1. Flexibility to utilise previously developed land adjoining or very close to the village frameworks of any villages.</p> <p>Support:36 Object: 1 Comment:3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid greenfield development in Green Belt.</li> <li>• Flexibility is again the key. Employment development in the rural area aids sustainability and therefore should be encouraged.</li> <li>• Promoting business and employment in rural villages is vital for the success and sustainability of local communities as well as potentially providing a reduction in the overall number of commuter miles.</li> <li>• Employment development should not encroach on green-field land. Parish councils should be able to divert building onto previously developed land.</li> <li>• Allow such development only if it can be shown to be of a size and character not detrimental to the village.</li> <li>• Aspirations can be met if the local plan abides by the wishes of the individual villages affected by any proposal.(Localism)</li> <li>• Using greenfield land should be avoided at all costs, as this is one of the aspects that makes our area the "best to live in".</li> <li>• <b>Support from 15 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support consideration of taking a more flexible approach to employment development in villages but believe neither of these options go far enough, we object to the, 'planning by numbers', method that imposes limits based on arbitrary categories. All employment development proposals should be judged upon their individual circumstances and merits.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The nature of the development should be sensitive to the character of the village and the wishes of the local community.</li> <li>• All development, including employment, should preferably be within the village framework in order to protect the countryside and to provide certainty.</li> </ul>
<p>2. Flexibility to utilise green-field land adjoining, and logically related to the built form of the settlement of Rural, Minor Rural Centres [and Better Served Group villages if added as a new category of village – see question 13].</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan should provide the flexibility to also utilise greenfield land where logically related to the built form of a Rural and Minor Rural Centre, which would benefit the local economy through appropriate forms of development.</li> <li>• Flexibility is again the key. Employment development in the rural area aids sustainability and therefore should be encouraged.</li> <li>• For employment, not housing.</li> </ul>

<p>Support:8 Object: 8 Comment:1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Support from 2 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenfield land should only be developed as a last resort, either for housing or business. This option will open the possibility for business use to creep beyond village frameworks, leading to sprawling villages and loss of open spaces, with associated impacts on wildlife, quality of life, etc.</li> <li>• All employment development proposals should be judged upon their individual circumstances and merits.</li> <li>• Unsustainable as it will lead to sprawl.</li> <li>• Will lead to cumulative development.</li> <li>• The absolutely top planning priority in my view is to prevent the net conversion of greenfield land into built-up land of any sort.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Objection from 1 Parish Council</b></li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SCDC should be sensitive to avoid creep of villages into the green belt.</li> <li>• A flexible approach to the provision of employment provision in and adjoining villages should be taken to enable the relevant circumstances pertaining at the time of any application to be taken into consideration.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment:8</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cottenham Parish Council</b> - option (ii) together with a yes to question B is consistent with CPC views as to the conditions to be applied to extensions of a village framework.</li> <li>• should be increased flexibility to utilise both brownfield and greenfield land adjoining all villages</li> <li>• The character and setting of the village, including its edge, must be preserved.</li> <li>• Any employment generating sites should have good communication and transport links to the settlements whose employment needs they should ideally serve.</li> <li>• Any flexibility in the policy is likely to allow the framework principle to be "ridden over"</li> <li>• Boundaries and the greenbelt should be protected to prevent sprawl and keep the character of the village and the district.</li> <li>• Employment will compete with housing for these sites. Green Belt considerations must apply.</li> </ul>
<p><b>B:</b> Should applicants be required to demonstrate there is a lack of suitable buildings and sites within</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be in-place ensure that existing employment uses are not relocated to the edge of a settlement so as to liberate residential</li> </ul>

<p>the settlement?</p> <p>Support:20 Object: 2 Comment:7</p>	<p>development land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would be sensible otherwise buildings within a community could stand empty when they are adequate for purpose.</li> <li>• Whilst it might be important to allow for the creation of employment generating land it should be the policy of the Local Plan to promote the use and reuse of existing sites in preference to these.</li> <li>• Consideration should be made not only of existing buildings but also of existing permissions for development not enacted/yet undeveloped.</li> <li>• Developments, whether they be for employment or residential, should not be considered unless appropriate research has been carried out and the need ascertained that such premises are in fact required in the area.</li> <li>• Two representations state this should be in tandem with option Ai.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 13 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals for employment provision on the edge of existing settlements should be considered on their own merits without requirement to consider the merits of other locations which may or may not be being brought forward for development at the same time.</li> <li>• The presumption is that applicants have looked and cannot find anything. Or what is available is unsuitable.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrating a negative in respect of sites and buildings is a waste of time and resources. If there were suitable or more economic buildings available, then it is likely they would have been used.</li> <li>• Parish Councils should decide.</li> <li>• Applicants who wish to reuse previously developed land should not have to demonstrate lack of alternative sites. However applicants who wish to build on greenfield land should be turned down, whether or not there are alternative sites available.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 69:</b> <b>Extensions to existing businesses in the countryside</b></p>	
<p>What approach should be taken to extension of existing businesses in the countryside?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></li> <li>• This is required as existing firms should be allowed to grow to ensure a vibrant and mixed employment base in South Cambs.</li> </ul>



<p>1. continue to apply a generally restrictive approach, where proposals would have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances; or</p> <p>Support:17 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cambs is overdeveloped and new development, whether business or housing, should be discouraged.</li> <li>• Isolated development in the countryside, other than farming, is highly undesirable</li> <li>• We currently have too many vacant premises which businesses are not renting. This needs careful thought and investigation into why businesses are not using a rural site.</li> <li>• Need to keep a tight, but not unreasonable approach to these extensions</li> <li>• Extension of industry to village and greenfield sites needs to be resisted.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 4 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Comberton Parish Council</b> - Permit some growth as long as the scale and character are consistent with the local conditions and wishes of the community.</li> </ul>
<p>2. support expansion of existing firms where schemes are of an appropriate scale, do not have an adverse effect in terms of character and amenity, and can be justified through submission of a business case.</p> <p>Support:28 Object: 3 Comment:1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Such an approach needs careful consideration. Given the existing restrictions on development in South Cambs, a business case does have to be made.</li> <li>• This is in line with policies in the NPPF which urge LPA policies to be flexible to meet changing needs of local businesses.</li> <li>• Permit some growth as long as the scale and character are consistent with the local conditions and wishes of the community.</li> <li>• An overly restrictive approach to existing businesses in the countryside discourages investment and growth.</li> <li>• A flexible approach to the provision of employment provision in and adjoining villages should be taken to enable the relevant circumstances pertaining at the time of any application to be taken into consideration.</li> <li>• But there needs to be some kind of provision which would oblige businesses to stay put for a number of years. That would guard against firms extending and then making windfall profits by selling up and moving on shortly thereafter.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 14 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear what is 'appropriate' in this context. Businesses will have different views from local people about what is appropriate. Businesses are more likely to consider profits than the health of the environment or the well-being of local people.</li> </ul>



	<p>The council should continue to support expansion only in exceptional cases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who determines whether they are an appropriate scale? Also financial motivations should not be a consideration</li> <li>• This option provides too much opportunity for those with financial incentives to exercise biased judgements on what is appropriate, and hence destroy valuable greenfield land.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The expansion of existing businesses in the countryside should be supported but 'not burdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations' (as stated in the NPPF).</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 2</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The approach has to be a combination of the two options. Do not allow willy-nilly development, but do allow schemes which are appropriate and do not have an adverse effect on the surroundings and amenities.</li> <li>• The answers will depend upon whether the village in question is in the Cambridge Green Belt or not. I would continue the restrictive approach for green belt villages and perhaps more flexibility elsewhere.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 70: Conversion or Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment</b></p>	
<p>A: Should the Local Plan continue to prioritise employment uses for rural buildings where traffic generation is not a problem?</p> <p>Support: 31 Object: 7 Comment: 4</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals should be considered on their merits. Traffic generation should only be one factor to be taken into account.</li> <li>• Plan should be supportive in all cases save extreme problems with traffic generation.</li> <li>• In general the use of agricultural buildings for small businesses seems to work.</li> <li>• Where agricultural buildings exist and it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need for these building for agricultural purposes either in the immediate or medium term, these buildings should be converted and reused to provide additional rural employment opportunities.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 17 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fen Ditton Parish Council</b> - Housing should be a</li> </ul>

	<p>priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where development is proposed in rural areas, permission should not be refused on the basis that the proposal does not promote sustainable forms of transport and reduction of car use.</li> <li>• This should not be prioritised. Each case should be considered on its merits. There are too many cases of very inappropriate re-use of farm buildings for activities related to employment.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has led to an oversupply of employment spaces in unsuitable or unattractive locations for businesses. There should now be a flexible approach that seeks to make provision as needed, for the use for either residential or employment, to be determined in consultation with the appropriate parish council.</li> <li>• The Parish Council should be consulted with, as an alternative use of the buildings may be more appropriate to the settlement.</li> </ul>
<p>B: Should the Local Plan support extensions where they enhance the design and are not out of scale and character with the location.</p> <p>Support:24 Object: 0 Comment:1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not have to enhance the design. Design requirements should not be imposed to restrict rural employment where statutory heritage or landscape designations are not affected, in line with NPPF</li> <li>• Local Plan should ensure that the size and design of any conversion is appropriate and in keeping with the overall character of the village, that appropriate transport opportunities exist and that traffic generation as a consequence of the development has no detrimental effect on the existing village community.</li> <li>• The Parish Council should be consulted and their views taken into account and not over-ruled.</li> <li>• Continue the restrictive approach for green belt villages and perhaps more flexibility elsewhere.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 12 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 71: Farm Diversification</b></p>	
<p>Do you consider that the Local Plan should continue to support farm diversification?</p> <p>Support:36 Object: 0 Comment: 3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be provision in the Plan for farm diversification especially through renewable energy technologies. There are many examples of how wind energy has helped farms and other businesses keep going by saving on their fuel costs.</li> <li>• Must develop existing asset base</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan should continue to support farm diversification, especially in the role of small scale bio-power schemes and economic development should continue to support farm diversification to assist the viability of agricultural businesses.</li> <li>• Support appropriate farm diversification providing the diverse additions have some synergy with farming. A list of 'excluded' schemes might be appropriate. Diversification takes many forms and should allow for the re-use of existing buildings, the establishment of new uses and the building of new floor space where that floor space is needed to enable a scheme to work functionally and financially.</li> <li>• Such diversification needs to be carefully monitored as it could turn out to be a Trojan Horse for relatively large retail establishments</li> <li>• <b>Support from 17 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to the prescriptive reference to 'working farm' as we believe there are many types of rural enterprises that fall within different categories that operate within the same challenging environment and pressures. We therefore believe this reference should be widened to the more suitable term 'rural enterprises'.</li> <li>• Consultation with the surrounding community is always a must, and due consideration must be given to their comments. Noise and traffic is also a huge factor.</li> <li>• depends entirely on the location of the site and the type of diversification</li> </ul>
<b>QUESTION 72: Retention of Employment Sites</b>	
<p><b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan continue to resist the loss of employment land to alternative uses: 1. in villages only;</p> <p>Support:9 Object: 1 Comment:5</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan must continue to resist the loss of employment land to alternative uses both in villages, and village edges.</li> <li>• One year's marketing does not seem long in this economic climate.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 8 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Western Colville Parish Council</b> – no.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local plan should continue to resist the loss of employment land except in circumstances when there is available land for employment nearby or where re-location of a business would bring clear benefits to the local community.</li> </ul>

<p>2. include areas outside frameworks on the edges of villages.</p> <p>Support:21 Object: 0 Comment:2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan must continue to resist the loss of employment land to alternative uses both in villages, and village edges.</li> <li>Settlements without or with diminishing employment opportunities can become unattractive places to live, certainly add to transport issues, and can be 'storing-up' future social problems. Yes, there has already been too much employment land lost within villages.</li> <li>You are short of employment sites, should consider this expanded remit.</li> <li><b>Support from 11 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local plan should continue to resist the loss of employment land except in circumstances when there is available land for employment nearby or where re-location of a business would bring clear benefits to the local community.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support:0 Object: 6 Comment:10</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned the current policy provides no recognition that previously developed land, including under-utilised employment sites on the edge of Rural Centres (or other villages) that are relatively close to services and facilities, and make only a limited contribution to local employment, could have a significant role to play in the Development Strategy.</li> <li>A flexible approach to the provision of employment provision in and adjoining villages should be taken to enable the relevant circumstances pertaining at the time of any application to be taken into consideration.</li> <li>If there are sites with empty offices and the demand is such that these sites are likely to remain empty, they should be considered for housing development, before greenfield sites are considered.</li> <li>Barrington cement works is not an employment site under the terms of this policy, CEMEX has no comment to make on it because the policy can only relate to "active" existing employment sites, which Barrington cement works is not.</li> <li>Land in our villages should be used for the most appropriate uses at the time.</li> <li>Current approach that in principle seeks to retain employment sites but recognises that individual</li> </ul>

	<p>site, viability and environmental circumstances need to be taken fully into account, together with an assessment of community benefits that may flow from redevelopment for other uses, is considered to be reasonable. It should not be necessary to apply more detailed tests.</p>
<p><b>B:</b> Should the Local Plan include the alternative more detailed tests in Issue 72 for determining when alternative use of an employment site should be permitted?</p> <p>Support:25 Object: 8 Comment:5</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear viability evidence should be required before change of use is permitted.</li> <li>• Also should consider including these sites under the community assets register.</li> <li>• The Local Plan should resist the loss of employment land universally, unless it is proven to be unsuitable through the new tests.</li> <li>• Support this proposal as current test can be easily worked around by applicants.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 12 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We recommend that the Local Plan is explicit that previously developed land will be looked upon favourably.</li> <li>• It holds up businesses from making the necessary moves to enable them survive or even to grow. It is inconceivable that councils who do not have business expertise are creating problems for businesses that they are supposed to be helping.</li> <li>• The Council should accept the possibility that existing or proposed land may not come forward or be viable for economic development. A more complex, costly and time consuming test will only deliver further delays and probably no difference to the result.</li> <li>• The continued restriction of employment sites to B1/B2/B8 uses provides insufficient flexibility to enable vacant and underused sites to be re-used for other employment generating uses.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that in the event of a change of use to residential it should be for affordable homes only.</li> </ul>
<b>QUESTION 73: Tourist Accommodation</b>	
<p><b>A:</b> Should appropriately scaled development for visitor and holiday accommodation in villages, and the conversion or redevelopment of rural buildings in the countryside be supported?</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater flexibility as implied in B should only be considered if green belt or the setting of existing settlements is not compromised.</li> <li>• Yes, but with high quality and sensitivity to the context and environment</li> <li>• IWM Duxford support the development of local and regional visitor accommodation in the</li> </ul>

<p>Support:19 Object: 6 Comment:6</p>	<p>countryside thus encouraging visitors to stay in locations outside of the larger city centres and contribute to the rural economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from Cambridge Past, Present and Future and Conservators of the River Cam.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - support both allowing appropriately scaled accommodation for visitor and holiday accommodation in villages and conversion/redevelopment of rural buildings.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 7 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, the problem is "appropriately scaled" developers may well abuse these rules as well.</li> <li>• Focus for hotels should be new settlements.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> – South Cambs needs to undertake a needs assessment for hotels</li> <li>• <b>Objection from 1 Parish Council (Papworth Everard).</b></li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be considered in the light of an appropriate business plan else there's a danger that approved holiday let become non-viable and an alternative residential use is sought.</li> <li>• Holiday accommodation can provide a boost to the rural economy but the properties may also be suitable for affordable housing.</li> <li>• Should only be where local facilities are provided (i.e. shop/good public transport etc).</li> </ul>
<p><b>B:</b> Should the Local Plan provide greater flexibility for new visitor accommodation by allowing redevelopment of any previously developed land in the countryside for small scale holiday and visitor accommodation?</p> <p>Support:11 Object: 6 Comment:9</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subject to the wording, could provide greater flexibility to allow options to be explored on sites using sensitive design and consideration of local impacts and needs rather than simply restricting development where it does not meet overly prescribed criteria in non site-specific lists.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - support.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 5 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs a clear definition of what is meant by "small scale".</li> <li>• would be open to abuse - by questioning what is "small scale" and by such developments acting as "thin ends of wedges"</li> <li>• <b>Objection from 1 Parish Council (Papworth Everard).</b></li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tourism takes many forms and should allow for the reuse of existing buildings, the establishment</li> </ul>

	<p>of new uses and the building of new floor space where that floor space is needed to enable a scheme to work functionally and financially.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It all depends on location and type of holiday accommodation.</li> <li>• It's effectively a re-use albeit change of use so holiday lets etc. can be supported but with the same business plan proviso.</li> <li>• Previously developed land should be used for housing rather than for tourists/visitors.</li> <li>• Planning policy must be set and conditions attached, that limits opening times to certain times of the year.</li> <li>• How is holiday accommodation tested in relation sustainability?</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 74: Tourist Facilities and Visitor Attractions</b></p>	
<p><b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan contain a policy supporting the development of appropriate tourist facilities and visitor attractions?</p> <p>Support:29 Object: 4 Comment:5</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visitor attractions can be of benefit to the local community both as visitors and employees.</li> <li>• It is the more important in times of economic stringency, when people look for interesting things to do closer to home.</li> <li>• Only if they exploit an existing attraction.</li> <li>• Need to consider traffic generation</li> <li>• IWM Duxford and National Trust support the development of tourist facilities and visitor attractions in the countryside.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - support.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 11 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no need for a local Plan generic solution</li> <li>• Should not support further flux of tourists into this area</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tourism takes many forms and should allow for the reuse of existing buildings, the establishment of new uses and the building of new floor space where that floor space is needed to enable a scheme to work functionally and financially.</li> <li>• Should recognise the importance of the natural environment and landscape setting in attracting and enhancing the experience of visitors and tourists to the district.</li> </ul>



<p><b>B:</b> Could these be located in the countryside?</p> <p>Support:14 Object: 3 Comment:8</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not in the Cambridge Green Belt, elsewhere possibly, but the scope is limited.</li> <li>• Provision of transport accessibility and sustainable transport modes would need to be part of a joined up strategy with third party providers.</li> <li>• For instance for Parks and wildlife areas such as RSPB Reserves.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 8 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development in 'green belt' should be resisted. Conversion of existing buildings should be subject to expansion constraints of any other business.</li> <li>• No need for a Local Plan generic solution. Consider on a case by case basis with a full public planning process.</li> <li>• <b>Objection from 2 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to be in keeping with their settings.</li> <li>• A commercial viability test may need to be required.</li> <li>• Not to be applicable in Green Belt</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 75: The Retail Hierarchy</b></p>	
<p>Where should new retail and service provision occur?</p> <p>1. New retail provision and main town centre uses should be in scale with the position of the centre in the retail hierarchy as follows: Town centres: Northstowe; Rural Centres village centres; All other villages.</p> <p>Support:25 Object: 2 Comment:2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hierarchy correct - development within any one should be appropriate for the situation.</li> <li>• Need to maintain town/village high streets as shopping centres, rather than out of town supermarkets</li> <li>• There is an urgent need to regenerate village high streets.</li> <li>• A major issue is adequate parking and applications for extensions of car parking in village centres should be sympathetically considered.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 12 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> - Cambourne should be identified as a town centre. If major developments come forward, adequate shops and facilities must exist to serve the population's day-to-day needs, without the need to travel. Retail diversity and distinctiveness, with a mix of retail units and scope for independent trading is also important. The City Council suggests that South Cambridgeshire District Council considers Option 136 of the Cambridge's Issues and Options Report as an</li> </ul>

	<p>approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing supermarket provision within the south of the District is currently limited. As a Rural Centre, Sawston is the most appropriate location to meet such requirements sustainably, reducing travel in the south of the District.</li> <li>The Council's retail evidence base should be updated to ensure the Plan is based on a robust, up-to-date evidence base.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be no names designated in this policy as other developments may grow within the plan period may grow to a size to be considered as a town ahead of Northstowe.</li> </ul>
<p>New facilities should be provided differently – if so, how?</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 2 Comment:2</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More jobs should be located in Cambridge City or beside transport hubs.</li> <li>Would not support out of town complexes.</li> <li>Has to be a commercial decision not well taken at District Council level.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 2 Object: 1 Comment: 5</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilities should be provided as the developments are built.</li> <li>2 sites suggested south of Sawston for convenience retail.</li> <li>Rural retail has an important place within the rural economy and such uses, which require a rural location, should not be precluded through restrictive policies which aim to focus retail provision within larger settlements.</li> <li>Large retail and services centres should be provided by town centre retail parks and centres and not on the outskirts, which would take business away from the City and town centres.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 76: Assessing the impact of Retail Development</b></p>	
<p>What should be the floorspace threshold above which retail impact assessments are required? 2500m2 - large superstore</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 1 Comment:0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence has been presented as part of the Council's evidence base to justify a lower threshold and demonstrate that this would be 'proportionate' as required by the NPPF.</li> <li>Should use net sales floorspace in determining appropriate retail thresholds within any future policy since it is only the sales floorspace that generates the impact.</li> </ul>

<p>2. 500m<sup>2</sup> - village scale supermarket</p> <p>Support:10 Object: 0 Comment:1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small, village scale supermarkets can often improve the viability of village centres by increasing footfall. Large retail outlets selling a wide range of goods are more likely to stifle competition.</li> <li>• A threshold below 500 sq metres would put an unacceptable load on the planning staff with probably marginal value.</li> <li>• suggest for larger villages above 3,000 population</li> <li>• <b>Support from 6 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul>
<p>3. 250m<sup>2</sup> - typical village shop</p> <p>Support:24 Object: 0 Comment:0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small shops should be allowed to develop until they hit the threshold. Larger stores definitely need to be controlled.</li> <li>• Would allow consideration to be given to the impact of out-of-centre convenience stores on small local and village centres.</li> <li>• The assessment does not preclude having a new store - so give most a proper assessment and avoid problems.</li> <li>• for smaller villages below 3,000 population</li> <li>• <b>Support from 10 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 0 Comment:4</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge City Council - sensible that the floorspace threshold above which retail impact assessments would be required is lower than the NPPF level of 2,500 square metres given the rural nature of the district. Different threshold may be needed for larger development e.g. Northstowe.</li> <li>• There should be an impact assessment in villages for proposals for retail developments of the scale of the Tesco Express in Great Shelford.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 77: Meeting Retail Needs</b></p>	
<p>Should the Informal Planning Policy Guidance on foodstore provision in North West Cambridge be reflected in the new Local Plan?</p> <p>Support:7 Object: 4 Comment:4</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been looked at hard for a long time so it is time it entered Policy.</li> <li>• <b>Support from 2 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> - Cambridge Sub-Region Retail Study 2008 covers the period to 2021. The new Plan will cover the period to 2031. Many of the assumptions made in this study may be out of date. Need for new retail must be considered where new development is proposed.</li> <li>• Northern fringe of Cambridge already has 2 large</li> </ul>

	<p>superstores (Bar Hill and Milton) and that there would not be a need for a further 2 medium sized stores.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further consideration should be given to local shopping provision, particularly south of the district (Sawston). Councils evidence base should be updated.</li> <li>• <b>Objection from 2 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why has this particular development been singled out?</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 78: Village Shops and Related Services</b></p>	
<p>Do you think that the Local Plan should support development of new or improved village shops and local services of an appropriate size related to the scale and function of the village?</p> <p>Support:73 Object: 2 Comment:5</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To assist regeneration of village high streets.</li> <li>• Important to support service provision for those less able to travel or who are reliant on public transport</li> <li>• The village shop forms a community hub</li> <li>• Support for a range of facilities in Caldecote.</li> <li>• The policy must take into consideration the impact that any such development may have on traffic.</li> <li>• It should be expected that any new developments should be able to link into the existing retail core with good pedestrian connections etc and that the Local Plan should assist with the development of these existing retail areas to maintain their viability and importance to village life.</li> <li>• The Plan should look to encourage the entrepreneurship of the members of the community wherever possible through flexibility and indeed presumptions in favour of such activities.</li> <li>• Will this be related to community right to buy?</li> <li>• <b>Support from 23 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a commercial decision not a planning one.</li> <li>• Any policy needs to consider not just the scale and function of the village but the wider rural catchment that it serves having regard to retail hierarchy. The scale of development within Rural Centres for instance should reflect the fact that such villages serve a wider rural catchment than just the villages themselves.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to define 'village shop'.</li> </ul>

<b>QUESTION 79: Retail in the Countryside</b>	
<p><b>Do you think that retail development in the countryside should be restricted?</b>  <b>1. As described.</b></p> <p>Support:35  Object: 3  Comment:2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrictions have to be made to see if the proposal is sustainable.</li> <li>To help maintain the financial viability of shops in the villages and to reduce car journeys.</li> <li>This will help to reduce traffic movements and avoid urbanisation of the countryside.</li> <li>Strongly support this, but "convenience goods ancillary to other uses" sounds open to abuse.</li> <li><b>Support from 15 Parish Councils</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed policy is too prescriptive. Flexibility is required.</li> <li>Local Plan should ensure it does not too greatly restrict the circumstances where this is supported but instead factors in significant flexibility to consider local needs and the benefits of rural employment and services.</li> <li>Waterbeach Parish Council - no objection to retail outlets of this nature, provided they are sustainable, reflect the character of the local area and are of an appropriate scale.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Larger garden centres have branched out (possibly by franchising) into the sale of goods which cannot possibly be described as "craft goods" and/or produced locally.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. To include additional facilities.</b></p> <p>Support:3  Object: 1  Comment:1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THIS OPTION:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan should ensure it does not too greatly restrict the circumstances where this is supported but instead factors in significant flexibility to consider local needs and the benefits of rural employment and services.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>However, if existing retail development is already in existence, support should be given to allow them to expand if not detrimental to facilities in surrounding villages, in accordance with the NPPF which is seeking to boost rural economy. Existing retail facilities need to be able to grow, especially if it is creating new job opportunities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Please provide any comments.</b></p> <p>Support:0</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not favour a general restriction, but the size of any development needs to be closely considered</li> </ul>

Object: 0  
Comment: 2

- retail development in the countryside should be restricted