

# Proposed list of material amendments to Greater Cambridge Local Plan - First Proposals and its supporting documents arising from committee processes

18.10.21

## Formatting note for proposed amendments

Proposed amendments are formatted as follows:

- Description of the action undertaken is set out in *Italics*.
- Text included within a committee stage document is in normal type.
- Text inserted into a committee stage document is in normal, underlined type.
- Text removed from a committee stage document is in ~~normal, strikethrough type~~.

## Material amendments – to form part of aligned out of cycle member decisions

Member decision amendment reference	Proposed amendment
MAT001	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>Vision</i>  <i>Page 20</i></p> <p><i>Change vision wording amended as follows:</i>            "New development must <del>reduce</del> <u>minimise</u> carbon emissions and reliance on the private car".</p>
MAT002	<p><i>An FAQ is proposed rather than amending the plan document, which is considered to provide an appropriate explanation of the methodology.</i></p>
MAT003	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>S/DS Development Strategy</i>  <i>Why is this policy needed?</i>  <i>Page 35, 4th paragraph</i></p> <p><i>Amend paragraph to read:</i>            "The emerging Local Plan proposes a range of new employment space which together with the existing allocations that we are carrying forward, will support our key economic clusters, ensuring we provide a good range in the type, size and location of sites that respond to the needs of businesses as identified in our evidence. For example, new sites at Babraham Research Campus and the Cambridge Biomedical Campus will provide additional space for life science businesses to cluster and grow. ICT and professional services businesses will have the opportunity to locate to North East Cambridge as well as a range of other sites within new and existing communities across Greater Cambridge. At Cambridge East we will be looking to ensure that the site's manufacturing legacy is not lost, and we are proposing to allocate additional space for manufacturing space close the Swavesey junction on the A14. This allocation would also cater for the need for warehousing businesses which provide important support to all of our key sectors. <u>Providing a healthy supply of land for business use should also help ensure land is affordable for all business sectors, including those which cannot afford higher cost space.</u>"</p>

Member decision amendment reference	Proposed amendment
MAT004	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>S/DS: Development Strategy</i>  <i>Why is this policy needed?</i>  <i>Page 38, 5th paragraph</i></p> <p><i>Amend paragraph to read:</i>  “Our evidence shows that our villages should play only a limited role in meeting future development needs to support delivery of a range of smaller sites and support the vitality of our villages. Alongside rolling forward a number of existing housing sites, we have identified a limited number of new sites for housing at our more sustainable villages. <u>We have taken a design-led approach to identifying housing capacity at these sites</u>”.</p> <p><i>Strategy Topic Paper</i>  <i>Part 2, Introduction</i>  <i>Page 98, paragraph 3</i>  <i>Text inserted as follows:</i>  “In the sections below we set out our preferred policy approach to the sites included within the preferred option development strategy, including why we have selected them, <u>and site capacity and delivery estimates.</u></p> <p>...</p> <p><u>This is supplemented by the following appendices, which have informed the approach set out in Part 2.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Appendix 2A: Review of Adopted Allocations in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018)</u></li> <li>• <u>Appendix 2B: Assessment of Extant Planning Permissions and Adopted Allocations for Communal Accommodation (use class C2)</u></li> <li>• <u>Appendix 2C: Review of sites to inform identification of new allocations</u></li> <li>• <u>Appendix 2D: Review of arguments made by promoters of employment sites.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>The approach taken to identifying the site capacity estimates included in the sections below has been design-led, informed by a range of factors including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>the capacity information provided by the site promoter</u></li> <li>• <u>a typology approach developed to support the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment, August 2021 (p24) which set a range of densities for different development forms and settlement types</u></li> <li>• <u>consideration of site-specific constraints, including drawing on urban design expertise in specific instances emphasising that a design-led approach to site capacity has been taken.”</u> </li></ul>
MAT005	<p><i>Strategy Topic Paper</i>  <i>Part 2, Introduction</i>  <i>Page 98</i></p> <p><i>Add additional text as follows to Strategy Topic Paper (and FAQ), to explain why sites previously not included in plans have been included as proposals.</i></p> <p>“Part 1 set out the overarching proposed Preferred Option development strategy, including establishing the principle of development in broad locations. Part 2 Detailed sets out our approach to site allocations supporting the preferred spatial strategy.</p> <p><u>We need to explore development needs and opportunities afresh for each plan review, and consider what is the appropriate development strategy.</u></p> <p>More than 700 sites were tested by the councils through the Greater Cambridge Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (2021) (HELAA), in a wide range of locations across Greater Cambridge. The testing of sites through the sustainability appraisal and for inclusion in the First Proposals development strategy has focused on sites informed by the emerging preferred strategy option, and the testing carried out via the HELAA as to where a site was suitable, available and achievable for development.</p> <p>In the sections below we set out our preferred policy approach to the sites included within the preferred option development strategy, including why we have selected them, along with site capacity and delivery estimates. This is supplemented by the following appendices, which have informed the approach set out in Part 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 2A: Review of Adopted Allocations in the Cambridge Local Plan (2018) and the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2018)</li> </ul>

Member decision amendment reference	Proposed amendment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix 2B: Assessment of Extant Planning Permissions and Adopted Allocations for Communal Accommodation (use class C2)</li> <li>• Appendix 2C: Review of sites to inform identification of new allocations</li> <li>• Appendix 2D: Review of arguments made by promoters of employment sites.</li> </ul> <p>The approach taken to identifying the site capacity estimates included in the sections below has been design-led, informed by a range of factors including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the capacity information provided by the site promoter</li> <li>• a typology approach developed to support the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment, August 2021 (p24) which set a range of densities for different development forms and settlement types</li> <li>• consideration of site-specific constraints, including drawing on urban design expertise in specific instances</li> </ul> <p>Part 2 is structured by the following broad areas of supply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge urban area</li> <li>• The edge of Cambridge</li> <li>• New Settlements</li> <li>• The rural southern cluster</li> <li>• Rest of the rural area.</li> </ul>
MAT006	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  2.1 How much development, and where?  Page 22, Figure 4: Illustrative map showing locations of proposed new development</p> <p><i>Figure revised to differentiate between locations proposed for densification: "additional new homes on existing allocated site - no expansion of site boundary", and locations proposed for increased delivery rates: "faster delivery of homes already planned"</i></p>
MAT007	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  Edge of Cambridge, Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus  Policy Direction  Page 89, First bullet of list</p> <p><i>Amend text as follows:</i>  Significant Green Belt enhancement in adjoining areas of White Hill and Nine Wells will be required, to provide green infrastructure and biodiversity improvements supporting the objectives of the Strategic Green Infrastructure Initiative 3: Gog Magog Hills and chalkland fringe. <u>These areas would remain within the Green Belt and are included in the Area of Major Change to highlight that future proposals for built development on the allocated areas must also include green infrastructure and biodiversity improvements within this adjoining open area.</u></p>
MAT008	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  Edge of Cambridge, Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus  What alternatives did we consider  Page 92, Alternative 2</p> <p><i>Revise text as follows:</i>  "2. A larger land release reflecting the proposal (referred to as Cambridge South) <u>by a group of landowners with the support of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus – This alternative is not the preferred approach, due to the level of harm to Green Belt, landscape and biodiversity</u>".</p>
MAT009	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  The City of Cambridge, Page 52</p> <p><i>Rename section on the 'The City of Cambridge' to 'Cambridge urban area'.</i></p>

Member decision amendment reference	Proposed amendment
	Move West Cambridge site from City of Cambridge chapter to Edge of Cambridge Chapter, with associated amendments made to the wording and structure of the First Proposals.
MAT010	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>New Settlements</i>  <i>Policy S/NS: Existing new settlements</i>  <i>Why is this policy needed</i>  <i>Page 102, 1st paragraph</i></p> <p><i>Amend paragraph as follows:</i>          "To provide a context for the ongoing development of existing planned new settlements during the plan period. Early phases of Northstowe are under construction. The new settlements on Land north of Waterbeach and at Bourn Airfield have gained, or the Council has resolved to grant, planning permission. However, for all three new settlements there will be detailed stages of the planning process happening over years to come. The policy context provided by the 2018 Local Plan is still needed. <u>Planning permissions for the new settlements of Waterbeach and Bourn Airfield include trip budgets and processes in place to monitor transport impacts to ensure that transport impacts are mitigated as each stage of development is built. This approach will continue to apply.</u>"</p>
MAT011	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>New Settlements</i>  <i>Policy S/SCP/WHD Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge</i>  <i>Why is this policy needed</i>  <i>Page 102, 1st paragraph</i></p> <p><i>Add additional paragraph:</i>  <u>'The Red Lion Pub and Chapel of the Hospital of St John the Baptist Listed Buildings are located in the south west part of the proposed policy area, and the design of any development will need to protect and enhance their historic significance.'</u></p>
MAT012	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>S/RRA/MF Land at Mansel Farm, Station Road, Oakington</i>  <i>Proposed Policy Direction, Page 127, 3rd bullet:</i></p> <p><i>Amended 3rd bullet as follows:</i>          'Site in very close proximity to Cambridgeshire Guided Busway stop, providing excellent public transport access <u>to Northstowe and Cambridge</u> and enhancing the approach to the stop for pedestrians, providing the exceptional circumstances required for Green Belt release.'</p>
MAT013	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area</i>  <i>What alternatives did we consider, Page 140:</i></p> <p><i>Amend text to clarify approach to alternatives:</i>          'Papworth Hospital          1. Having no policy – This alternative is not the preferred approach, as due to the scale of the now redundant site, a policy context is required.          2. Allocate hospital area for residential development – This alternative is not <u>considered a reasonable alternative</u> <del>the preferred approach</del> due to the desire to maintain employment levels in the village with the loss of the hospital.          3. Allocate hospital area for employment without the preference for healthcare uses – This alternative is not <u>considered a reasonable alternative</u> <del>the preferred approach</del> due to the opportunities provided by the current site, and local workforce.'</p>
MAT014	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>Policy CC/FM: Flooding and integrated water management</i>  <i>Proposed Policy Direction, Page 156, 1st paragraph:</i></p> <p><i>Amend paragraph to read:</i>          'Potential flood risk from <u>to</u> developments will need to be fully addressed <u>including demonstrating development is resilient or adaptive to flooding.</u> Flood management</p>

Member decision amendment reference	Proposed amendment
	policies will require that the risk of flooding is not increased elsewhere as a result of new development. The plan will set out the approach to runoff rates, including that peak runoff rate should be no greater for the developed site than it was for the undeveloped site. '
MAT015	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>Biodiversity and green spaces</i>  <i>Policy BG/GI</i>  <i>Policy Direction</i>  <i>Page 173</i></p> <p><i>Text amended as follows:</i>          "To support successful delivery of green infrastructure, the policy will require proposals to demonstrate that green infrastructure has been planned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• as an integral part of the development, so that it informs the overall development design. <u>This should include identifying, retaining and enhancing existing natural features of value.</u></li> <li>• Across all phases of development</li> <li>• To be successful for the lifetime of the development, including providing plans for management, maintenance and funding."</li> </ul>
MAT016	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>Wellbeing and social inclusion introduction</i>  <i>Page 188, 1st paragraph:</i></p> <p><i>Amend paragraph to read:</i>          'In response to the First Conversation consultation on how the plan could achieve 'good growth' you told us that we should be locating development in sustainable locations. We should be delivering a range of housing, including affordable, with access to safe and affordable sustainable transport. We should support communities to thrive <u>and increase their resilience</u>, providing community and shared spaces, and protecting valuable open spaces. We should ensure people have access to education and health services. We should make places inclusive, proving employment and training opportunities, and provide space for cultural activities and for social enterprise. We should also help people live healthy lives, such as providing opportunities to grow local food.'</p>
MAT017	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>J/RC: Retail and centres</i>  <i>Why is this Policy Needed, Page 248, 5th paragraph:</i></p> <p><i>Amended paragraph to read:</i>          'The introduction of a new Use Class (Class E – Commercial, Business and Service) into national planning policy means that some use changes can be made potentially without planning permission, such as shops becoming financial services, offices, or even light industrial uses. In some circumstances changes to residential uses is possible through permitted development rights. Our policies will need to adapt to these changes, and we will be looking to do all we can to continue to protect the vibrancy of our centres. This includes considering whether we should apply to government to introduce article 4 directives in certain areas. <u>This process allows planning authorities to have greater controls over change of use in key areas, such as where this is having wholly unacceptable adverse impacts on the vitality of a primary shopping area, but they are challenging to secure.'</u></p>
MAT018	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>J/RC: Retail and centres</i>  <i>What will this policy do, Page 247, 1st paragraph:</i></p> <p><i>Amended paragraph to read:</i>          'This policy will cover the treatment of retail, leisure (arts, culture and entertainment) and other city centre proposals in Cambridge (<u>including its district, local and neighbourhood centres</u>), and the towns and villages of South Cambridgeshire, as well as out-of-town development.'</p>
MAT019	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>J/RC: Retail and centres</i></p>

Member decision amendment reference	Proposed amendment
	<p><i>Proposed Policy Direction, Page 247, 6th paragraph:</i></p> <p><i>Policy Direction amended to read: "Where planning permission is required, continue to resist the loss of retail or other town centre uses in <u>existing centres and</u> primary shopping areas where it would undermine their vitality or ability to serve local communities, and require proposals to support the character safety, and vibrancy of existing centres and village high streets.'</i></p>
MAT020	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>Policy H/BR: Build to Rent homes</i>  <i>Proposed Policy Direction, Page 282, 2nd paragraph:</i></p> <p>Amend paragraph to read:  'The policy will require that proposals for Build to Rent developments, or the amount of Build to Rent within a mixed tenure development, do not create an over-concentration of this tenure in a local area, are distributed across the development (if part of a wider mixed use or mixed tenure development), and meet specific criteria in terms of ownership and management, covenants, and tenancies. <u>Reflecting the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy, planning applications would need to evidence how the scheme would support the creation of successful places and promote mixed and balanced communities. As we prepare the draft local plan, we will explore whether it is appropriate for more specific policy requirements to be included that address the level of provision of Build to Rent dwellings, which could include the amount of build to rent as a proportion of all dwellings and the scale of development to which it would apply. Policies for new communities will include guidance regarding individual sites in the context of issues such as housing need, potential community impacts, and to ensure an appropriate balance with other tenures within an overall development and the surrounding area. No more than 10% of the total housing on a mixed tenure development of 500 or more dwellings should be Build to Rent.'</u></p> <p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>Policy H/BR: Build to Rent homes</i>  <i>Why is this policy needed, Page 282, final paragraph:</i></p> <p>Replace paragraph to read:  As National planning policy <u>guidance states that 20% is generally a suitable benchmark for the level of Affordable housing Private Rent homes to be provided on a in any Build to Rent development scheme. It therefore follows that Build to Rent developments are unlikely to achieve the 40% affordable homes as required on other major residential developments. Given this and that Build to Rent developments will only provide one tenure of affordable housing, it is therefore necessary the proposed policy direction does not change the overall requirement for 40% affordable housing on major multi-tenure development sites, as set out in proposed Policy H/AH: Affordable housing. It may also be appropriate to limit the proportion of Build to Rent homes within new developments in order to secure the provision of affordable housing to meet our identified need and provide mixed and balanced communities. Any such limits however would still needs to enable the resulting number of Build to Rent homes to be sufficient to be viably delivered and managed viably. Appropriate policies will be considered when preparing the draft Local Plan, including considering site-specific approaches reflecting the Greater Cambridge Housing Strategy. The draft North East Cambridge Area Action Plan already takes this approach by proposing that no more than 10% of the total housing across the Area Action Plan should be Build to Rent.</u></p>
MAT021	<p><i>First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>H/SS: Residential space standards and accessible homes</i>  <i>Proposed Policy Direction, Page 275, 5th paragraph:</i></p> <p><i>Amend paragraph to read:</i>  '5% of affordable homes on new developments that include 20 or more affordable homes will be required to be Building Regulations M4(3) 'wheelchair user' dwellings, to be provided as Building Regulations M4(3)(a) 'wheelchair adaptable' dwellings unless the Council has identified a need for Building Regulations M4(3)(b) 'wheelchair accessible' dwellings. Exceptions only where it can be demonstrated that there is no evidence of need such as rural exception schemes addressing specific needs.'</p>

Member decision amendment reference	Proposed amendment
MAT022	<p><i>'First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version)</i>  <i>Policy I/EV: Parking and electric vehicles</i>  <i>Proposed Policy Direction, Page 306:</i></p> <p><i>Amended sub-heading to 'Cycle <u>and Mobility</u> Parking'.</i></p> <p><i>Amend 2nd paragraph under subheading as follows:</i>  <i>'Cycle parking areas will need to accommodate non-standard cycles, <u>mobility scooters</u>, electric cycles, accessories, and should make provision for cycle maintenance. Where garages are intended to accommodate parking for both cars and cycles, they will need to be provided to a minimum size to ensure they are fit for purpose. Security is an important issue, and spaces should be internal where practicable and appropriate.'</i></p>
MAT-E001	<p><i>Finalised Greater Cambridge Local Plan Preferred Options Transport Evidence Report (October 2021)</i></p>
MAT-E002	<p><i>Employment Land and Economic Evidence Base Study</i>  <i>Tables 46 to 51</i></p> <p><i>Amend table sources for tables 46-51 as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tables 46-48: Base inputs – CE; modelling – EEFM, GLH</li> <li>• Tables 49-50: GLH analysis of data presented in table 48; SM and CP scenarios – CE</li> <li>• Table 51: GLH analysis of data presented in tables 46-48</li> </ul>
MAT-S001	<p><i>Climate Change Topic Paper</i>  <i>CC/WE Water efficiency in new developments</i>  <i>Evidence Base section</i></p> <p><i>Amend to amplify the point regarding the importance of agricultural water abstraction within the overall water supply issue, using evidence from the Outline Water Cycle Study.</i></p> <p><i>Add text as follows:</i>  <i>'75% of agricultural usage is drawn from surface water rather than groundwater. The volume of water used for agriculture has quadrupled since 2000, and makes up 7% of all abstractions.'</i></p>
MAT-S002	<p><i>The following changes have been made to the Sustainability Appraisal.</i></p> <p><i>Chapter 4. Amendments to text in Chapter 4 to make reference to Strategic Spatial Options Supplement Reports that have now been finalised.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4.24 – removing reference to unfinished supplementary reports relating to the updated Strategic Spatial Options.</li> <li>• Updated paragraphs reflecting the final supplementary reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 4.26</li> <li>○ 4.27</li> <li>○ 4.29</li> <li>○ 4.33</li> <li>○ 4.122</li> <li>○ 4.131</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Page 158 Table 4.22: Summary of SA findings for the Growth around transport nodes: Cambourne Area site options</i></p> <p><i>Removed site 40473, and added site assessment of 56461, to reflect change in site area and from residential to employment proposal (consequential amendment to changes to HELAA). This change was also reflected in changes to the text in paragraphs 4.179, 4.181, 4.182, 4.184, 4.185 and 4.186.</i></p>

Member decision amendment reference	Proposed amendment
	<p><i>Page 175 paragraph 5.4</i></p> <p>Added additional text to paragraph:  <u>'The SA of the draft Local Plan will consider potential in-combination effects of the Local Plan with other relevant plans and programmes, including those being brought forward by other organisations and under separate planning processes, for example the relocation of the Cambridge waste water treatment plant.'</u></p> <p><i>Page 219: Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus</i></p> <p>Amended alternatives text (reflecting the modification proposed earlier in this table) to read:  'C. Alternative option: A larger land release reflecting the proposal (referred to as Cambridge South) by <u>a group of landowners with the support of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus</u> – This alternative is not the preferred approach, due to the level of harm to Green Belt, landscape and biodiversity.'</p> <p><i>Page 225: Policy S/EOC: Other existing allocations on the edge of Cambridge</i></p> <p>Amended alternative options text to reflect First Proposals Main Document (Committee stage version) to read:</p> <p>'B. Alternative option - No Policy – not considered a reasonable alternative this would not provide a context for the future development of these sites whilst they are still being developed. <del>The Councils considered a range of alternative sites around the edge of Cambridge, having regard to the overarching development strategy and the conclusions of the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (see Chapter 4)</del></p> <p><i>Page 253: Policy S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area</i></p> <p>Amended the policy options text, and included 'no policy' as a reasonable alternative as follows (reflecting the modification proposed earlier in this table):</p> <p>'B. Alternative – No policy. For the majority of policy areas, the alternative of no policy was <del>considered and rejected</del> <u>not considered the preferred approach, as a specific policy context is required so that on these sites development responds to specific local circumstances. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.</u></p> <p>C. Alternative – Allocate <del>Papworth</del> hospital area for residential development. <u>This is not considered a reasonable alternative due to the desire to maintain employment levels in the village with the loss of the hospital. This was rejected due to the desire to maintain employment levels in the village.</u> This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.</p> <p>D Alternative – Allocate hospital area for employment without the preference for healthcare uses. <u>This was rejected is not considered a reasonable alternative due to the opportunities provided by the current site, and local workforce. This option has not been appraised as it was not considered to be a reasonable alternative.</u></p> <p>The inclusion of Alternative B as a reasonable alternative means that an additional column has been added to Table 5.23 and an additional paragraph (paragraph 5.164 on page 256) has been added explaining the sustainability effects of the 'no policy' option as follows:</p> <p><u>'B. No Policy</u>  5.164 This option would not result in any sustainability effects as they would not alter the likely future baseline without the plan for the area to which they relate. Nevertheless, it is recognised that it would not provide the positive outcomes that option A would bring, particularly in terms of social and economic benefits in the rural area. In addition, relying solely on other local plan policies may hinder the evolution of the Imperial War Museum at Duxford and not having a policy relating to East of Bypass Longstanton, Papworth Everard West Central, Papworth Hospital, Fen Drayton and Histon and Impington Station Area could hinder provision of a balanced mix of development in these areas.'</p> <p><i>The changes set out above have also been reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal Non-Technical Summary</i></p>

Member decision amendment reference	Proposed amendment
	<p><i>In addition revisions have been made to the Sustainability Appraisal and Sustainability Appraisal Non-Technical summary to reflect the material amendments listed in this schedule, and also subsequent minor amendment/editing changes.</i></p> <p><i>See Annex 1: Greater Cambridge Local Plan: First Proposals Sustainability Appraisal (October 2021); and</i></p> <p><i>Annex 2: Greater Cambridge Local Plan: First Proposals Sustainability Appraisal Non-Technical Summary (October 2021)</i></p>
MAT-S003	<p><i>Housing and Economic Land availability Assessment Appendix 4 (Part B)</i></p> <p><i>Correct map added for OS009 in HELAA - Appendix 4 (Part B)</i></p>
MAT-S004	<p><i>Housing and Economic Land availability Assessment Appendix 1, 2 and 4 (Part B)</i></p> <p><i>40265 has been removed from Appendix 1, 2 and 4 (Part B) and has been added to Appendix 3 to explain it has planning permission and does not warrant assessment.</i></p>
MAT-S005	<p><i>Housing and Economic Land availability Assessment Appendix 3</i></p> <p><i>Add the following text to the start of appendix 3:</i>  <u>"The HELAA considered many sites identified from both the Call for Sites process and other sources of supply. In reviewing potential Other Sources of Supply sites an early screening process was undertaken to consider whether other locations merited testing. A number of locations were identified which were not considered suitable or available and did not merit more detailed assessment. Further investigation also revealed that some sites already had planning permission or were indeed under construction. A small number of Call for Sites records were discounted as they were duplicate records or had been superseded.</u></p> <p><u>It should be noted that this appendix does not list sites that were tested in full in the HELAA or provide reasons why a site has not been included in the local plan proposals. These issues are addressed in the Strategy Topic Paper and the Sustainability Appraisal which accompany the First Proposals."</u></p>
MAT-S006	<p><i>Housing and Economic Land availability Assessment Appendix 1, 2 and 4 (Part C)</i></p> <p><i>40473 has been removed from Appendix 1, 2 and 4 (Part C) and has been added to Appendix 3. Site 56461 has been added to Appendix 1, 2 and 4 (Part C)</i></p>
MAT-S007	<p><i>Housing and Economic Land availability Assessment Appendix 1, 2 and 4 (Part B)</i></p> <p><i>Site 51582 has been withdrawn. It has been removed from Appendix 1,2 and 4 (Part B) and added to Appendix 3.</i></p>
MAT-S008	<p><i>Housing and Economic Land availability Assessment</i></p>

Member decision amendment reference	Proposed amendment
	<p><i>Appendix 1, 2 and 4 (Part A)</i></p> <p><i>In document HELAA - Appendix 4 (Part A) - The planning permission field has been updated for 40214 to show that the site has planning permission</i></p>
MAT-EOO9	<p><i>See Annex 3: Finalised Greater Cambridge Local Plan Preferred Options Transport Evidence Report (October 2021)</i></p>