

# **INDEPENDENT EXAMINATIONS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS CAMBRIDGE CITY and SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

## **INSPECTORS**

Cliff Hughes BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI  
Terence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMi  
PROGRAMME OFFICER Gloria Alexander  
LDF Public Examinations Office, PO Box 700, Cambridge City Council, Cambridge, CB1 0JH  
Tel: 01223 457349 or 07546 260323  
Email: gloria.alexander@cambridge.gov.uk

---

Our Ref: GA/NWC/Insp3  
Your Ref:

4<sup>th</sup> December 2008

Miss Sara Cass  
Cambridge City Council

Mrs Caroline Hunt  
South Cambridgeshire District Council

Dear Miss Cass and Mrs Hunt

### **North West Cambridge Area Action Plan DPD Examination**

As you know, the Inspectors requested that a further option for the extent of the development footprint for the AAP should be considered as part of the examination.

This option is illustrated on the accompanying map. It adopts the University's suggested footprint in the western and north-western parts of the area, and the AAP footprint in the southern area adjacent to the Madingley Road Park & Ride site. It is suggested that the University's development boundary be used in the area of the SSSI in this option, for reasons given below.

The reasons for the Inspectors' request that this option be considered is to ensure that a sound DPD is eventually adopted, and that the adopted DPD is proof, as far as possible, against a legal challenge. The footprint of the AAP as submitted includes land north of the Park & Ride site: this land is excluded from the University's suggested development area. The University's footprint includes a strip of land between the M11 and the AAP footprint. It also includes additional land north and west of the Travellers' Rest Pit SSSI. Both development footprints and their constituent parts are supported by substantial evidence, including evidence of need and of the desirability of making best use of land resources. Consequently, although the Inspectors have not reached a conclusion yet, it is possible that, in order to be found sound, the DPD would need to include all of the pieces of land where there is a difference between the Councils and the University.

The exclusion of any of the areas of difference runs the risk of a conclusion being reached that the AAP is unsound and cannot be made sound.

Accordingly the Inspectors request the Councils' Officers to convey the views of the Inspectors to Members. It seems to the Inspectors that the best way to progress the examination would then be for the further option here described to be the subject of a Sustainability Assessment and a consultation exercise. It can then be taken into account in the Inspectors' further examination of the AAP.

The Inspectors do not make this request lightly, recognising the resource implications, but take the view that all the work that has so far gone into the production of the AAP should not be put in jeopardy by a possible finding of that the DPD is unsound.

Yours sincerely,

Gloria Alexander  
Programme Officer

Enc.

CC: Mr Lindsay Dane, University of Cambridge