

## Appendix I – List of Revised Questions for inclusion in the Issues and Options consultation document

Current Page Number	Question Number in Council Draft 28.6.12 and PFH Draft 3.7.12	Replacement Questions
<b>3. Development Needs</b>		
11	Question 3:	<p>How much new employment do you consider the Local Plan should provide for?</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a. Lower jobs growth – 14,000 additional jobs over the Plan period (700 jobs per year)</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">b. Medium jobs growth - 23,100 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,200 jobs per year)</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">c. High jobs growth - 29,200 additional jobs over the Plan period (1,500 jobs per year)</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p>
15	Question 4:  Question 5:	<p>How much new housing do you consider the Local Plan should provide for?</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a. Lower housing growth - additional 4,300 dwellings (equal to 925 dwellings per year)</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">b. Medium housing growth - additional 7,300 dwellings (equates to 1,075 dwellings per year)</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">c. High housing growth - additional 9,300 dwellings (equate to 1,175 dwellings per year)</p> <p>Do you agree with the assumption that Northstowe will deliver about 7,500 new homes over the plan period, at approximately 500 homes per year?</p> <p>Please provide any additional comments.</p>
<b>4. Spatial Strategy</b>		
29	Question 14:	<p>Which of the following changes to the rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?</p> <p>Rural Centres:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a. Should Cottenham be added as a Rural Centre (up from a Minor Rural Centre)?</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">b. Should Fulbourn be deleted from the Rural Centre category and added as a Minor Rural Centre?</p> <p>Minor Rural Centres:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">c. Should the following be added as Minor Rural Centres?</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Milton</li> <li>- Swavesey</li> <li>- Bassingbourn</li> <li>- Girton</li> <li>- Comberton</li> </ul> <p>Better Served Group Villages:</p> <p>d. As an alternative to (c), Should there be a further sub division of village categories to create a new category of better served group villages?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Milton</li> <li>- Swavesey</li> <li>- Bassingbourn</li> <li>- Girton</li> <li>- Comberton</li> </ul> <p>e. If so, should the 3 Minor Rural Centres that score less than the Better Served Group villages be changed to fall within this new category? They are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Papworth Everard</li> <li>- Willingham</li> <li>- Waterbeach</li> </ul> <p>Other Group Villages and Infill Villages:</p> <p>g. Should these all remain in the same categories as in the current plan?</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p><i>NOTE: To be addressed with Question 15, and supported with graphic.</i></p>
30	Question 15:	<p>What approach do you think the Local Plan should take for a housing proposal within village frameworks on land not specially identified for housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Retain existing numerical limits for individual schemes</li> <li>b. Increase the size allowed for individual schemes.</li> <li>c. Remove scheme size limits for Minor Rural Centres so it is the same as Rural Centres</li> <li>d. Remove scheme size limits for all categories of village</li> </ul> <p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p><i>NOTE: Better Served Group Villages would be individual scheme sizes up to 20 in option A, and 30 in option B</i></p> <p><i>NOTE: Graphic with the number for different categories of village under the different options to be included.</i></p>

32	Question 16:	<p>Do you think the new Local Plan should:</p> <p>a. retain village frameworks and the current approach to restricting development outside framework boundaries as defined on the Proposals Map</p> <p>b. retain village frameworks as defined on the Proposals Map but include policies that allow small scale development adjacent to village frameworks where certain criteria are met, addressing issues including landscape, townscape, and access.</p> <p>c. delete the current village frameworks entirely and provide greater flexibility for some development on the edge of villages controlled through a written policy.</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>See also question 51 on approach to exception sites for affordable housing.</p>
32	Question 17:	<p>Are you aware of any existing village framework boundaries, where they no longer appropriately reflect the main built up area of the village?</p> <p>If so, please identify the change you think should be made to the framework boundary (please provide a map).</p>
<b>5. Development Options</b>		
35	Question 17	<p>Question 17:</p> <p>a. Which of the site options for housing do you support or object to and why?</p> <p>b. Are there any other sites which we should consider? (these can be sites already submitted through the “Call for Sites” process or new sites).</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p>
<b>6. Climate Change</b>		
55	<p>Question 18:</p> <p>(Combined with elements of Question 19 which would be deleted)</p>	<p>What approach do you think the Local Plan should take for the generation of renewable and low carbon energy?</p> <p>A. Include a criteria based policy seeking to maximise the generation of renewable and low carbon energy in the district and identifying the issues that would need to be addressed, and this would leave developers to make applications for their preferred areas.</p> <p>B. Include a criteria based policy as set out in option A, but specifically requiring a separation distance of 2 km between a proposed wind farm (2 or more wind turbines) and any residential property, to protect residents from disturbance and visual impact. If the applicant can prove this is not the case a shorter distance will be considered.</p>

		<p>C. What source of renewable and low carbon energy should the Local Plan consider and at what scale?</p> <p>D. Should the Local Plan identify future growth areas and new settlements as potentially suitable locations for the inclusion of renewable or low carbon district heating systems?</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p>
55	Question 20:	<p>To what extent should new development provide for on-site renewable energy generation?</p> <p>A: Should all new developments be required to provide on-site renewable energy? If so should 10%, 15% or 20% equivalent provision be required?</p> <p>B: Small scale developments of less than 5 dwellings or less than 500 m<sup>2</sup> of other floor space should be exempt?</p> <p>C: No requirements for renewable energy generation should be made.</p>
56	Question 21:	<p>Should the Local Plan enable the setting up of a Community Energy Fund that would allow developers to invest in offsite energy efficiency and renewable and low carbon energy projects to meet their carbon reduction targets?</p> <p>A: Yes?</p> <p>B: No? Alternatives?</p>
56	New Question under Issue 19	<p>Have the right issues for addressing climate change mitigation and adaptation been identified?</p>
58	Question 22:	<p>What sustainable building standards should be required in new developments?</p> <p>A: Developments should only have to comply with building regulations requirements for energy efficiency.</p> <p>B: All new buildings should comply with sustainable building standards. If so, should all new dwellings meet at least Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, and all non-residential schemes meet at least the BREEAM 'very good' standard?</p> <p>C: Zero carbon standard (Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5) should be required in larger scale developments?</p> <p><i>NOTE: Graphic in the document will clarify how this compares to proposed changes in building regulations</i></p>

		<i>and additional costs involved, and meaning of terms including BREEAM.</i>
61	New Question under issue 23a	Have the right approaches to managing, protecting and enhancing Water Quality been identified?  Are there any other issues which should be included?
61	Question 26:	Have the right approaches to managing water and drainage sustainably been identified?  Are there any other issues which should be included?
62	New Question under issue 25	Have the right approaches to managing flood risk been identified?  Are there any other issues which should be included?
<b>7. Delivering High Quality Places</b>		
64	Question 27:  Question 28:  Question 29:  New Question	Have the right design principles been identified to achieve high quality design in all new developments?  Do you think the Council should retain and update the District Design Guide?  Would you like your village to produce its own design guide? If so, please let us know which village so that we can discuss how to take this forward with the local Parish Council.  Please provide any additional comments on any of these questions.  Should the Local Plan provide guidance on design of streets to improve the public realm, including minimum street widths and street trees?
27	Question 30:  Question 31:  Question 32:	Delete  What approach do you think the Local Plan should take on public art?  Delete
<b>8. Protecting and Enhancing the Historic and Natural Environment</b>		
68	Question 34:	Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking to protect best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2, and 3a)?
69	Question 35:	The Local Plan needs to protect and enhance biodiversity, have we identified the right approaches?  Do you think the Council should retain and update the

		Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document?
70	Question 36:	Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring development to provide or contribute towards new or enhanced Green Infrastructure?  Are there other new Green Infrastructure projects that should be added?
74	Question 43:	Should the Local Plan seek to encourage the creation of community orchards, new woodland areas or allotments in or near to villages, and protect existing ones?
75	Question 44:	Should a policy be developed for the consideration of development proposals that seeks to maintain their importance for drainage, whilst supporting their use as a recreation and biodiversity resource?
76	Question 46:	Do you consider the Local Plan should protect undesignated heritage assets?  If so, are there any specific buildings or other assets that should be included?
77	Question 47:	Should the Local Plan include a policy to guide how listed buildings and buildings in Conservation Areas can be adapted to improve their environmental performance? If so, where should the balance lie between visual impact, and the benefits to energy efficiency?
<b>9. Delivering High Quality Homes</b>		
81	Question 47	Question 47: Which of the following options do you agree with? a. Provide no specific guidance on density. b. Include a policy with a density target of an average of 30 dph on a development but allowing for variation from site to site to reflect local circumstances. c. Include a policy with higher average target densities in the most sustainable locations and lower average densities in the least sustainable but allowing for variation from site to site to reflect local circumstances.  Please provide any comments.
84	Question 50	Question 50: How should the Local Plan address the need for affordable housing?  a. The target for affordable housing remains at 40% of the number of dwellings granted planning permission accompanied by policy provisions which explicitly allow greater flexibility to take account of current and changing market conditions over time. b. The target for affordable housing is reduced to 30% of the number of dwellings granted planning permission in relation to very large strategic scale sites

		<p>and in those parts of the district with low house prices and remains at 40% elsewhere. Such a change could allow flexibility to increase the level to 40% across the district in response to changing market conditions over time.</p> <p>c. The threshold for seeking affordable housing provision could be increased to 3 dwellings or another higher number. What number would you prefer and why?</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p>
85	Question 51	<p>Question 51: What approach do you think the Local Plan should take to exception site affordable housing?</p> <p>a. Allow the minimum amount of market housing necessary on exception sites to make the affordable housing viable?</p> <p>b. To provide more market housing to support local communities, the Local Plan could allow a greater amount of market housing on exception sites to support the provision of a significant amount of affordable housing.</p> <p>c. To allow greater flexibility in the occupation of exception site affordable housing to include the needs of a group of neighbouring villages.</p> <p>Please provide any additional comments.</p> <p>See also question 16 on approach to village frameworks.</p>
91	Question 57	<p>Question 57: What approach should the Local Plan take to working at home?</p> <p>a. Not include a policy on working at home and rely on the other policies of the Local Plan and the NPPF to consider proposals.</p> <p>b. Include a policy on working at home stating that proposals will be approved unless there would be an effective loss of residential use, or there would be unacceptable impacts on factors such as residential amenity, local character, heritage assets, and traffic and parking.</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p>
94	Question 59	<p>Question 59: What approach shall the Local Plan take to the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?</p> <p>Do you agree with the following approaches:</p> <p>a. Set a target to provide 85 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller occupation over the period to 2031, which means we need to provide an additional 50 permanent pitches by 2031.</p>

		<p>b. Not set a target for Travelling Showpeople occupation and rely on an additional windfall site coming forward over the plan period.</p> <p>c. Explore with adjoining local planning authorities the extent to which local needs can be met in adjoining districts.</p> <p>d. The Local Plan require that site provision be made for Gypsy and Traveller occupation in all new settlements, and other allocated and windfall developments of at least 500 new homes.</p> <p>Please provide any comments.</p>
<b>10. Building a Strong and Competitive Economy</b>		
100	<p>Question 61:  (Combined with Question 60, which is deleted)</p>	<p>The Local Plan aims to meet in full the forecast employment growth in South Cambridgeshire depending on the option selected, by providing a supply and range of employment sites over the Plan period.</p> <p>Should employment provision be planned for:</p> <p>A: Cambridge Northern Fringe East, and densification on the Cambridge Science Park?</p> <p>B: On new allocations on the edge of Cambridge which have previously been designated Green Belt (See identified broad locations in the Strategy Chapter)</p> <p>C: Both Option A and Option B</p> <p>D: Neither Option A or Option B</p>
100	Question 63:	Should the existing employment allocation at North of Hattons Road Longstanton be carried forward into the Local Plan?
100	Question 64:	Are there any other areas that should be allocated in the Local Plan for employment?
104	Question 71:	Should additional areas at Eternit UK between Meldreth and Whaddon, and the area of existing / former buildings at Barrington Cement Works (both around 10 hectares), be included?
105	Question 72:	<p>What approach should the Local Plan take to the scale of employment development in villages?</p> <p>a. Continue to Restrict to small scale development (employing 25 people and the size limitations: Offices (B1a): 400 m<sup>2</sup>, High tech / R &amp; D (B1b): 725 m<sup>2</sup>, Light Industry (B1c):800sq m<sup>2</sup>. General Industry (B2):850 m<sup>2</sup>. Warehousing (B8):1,250 m<sup>2</sup>).</p>

		<p>b. A more flexible approach that development should be in keeping with the category, character, function and of the settlement.</p>
105	Question 73:	<p>What approach should the Local Plan take to employment development on the edges of villages?</p> <p>a. Flexibility to utilise previously developed land adjoining or very close to the village frameworks of any villages.</p> <p>b. Flexibility to utilise green-field land <u>adjoining</u>, 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 4].</p> <p>c. Also should applicants be required to demonstrate there is a lack of suitable buildings and sites within the settlement?</p>
106	Question 74:	<p>What approach should be taken to extension of existing businesses in the countryside?</p> <p>A: continue to apply a generally restrictive approach, where proposals would have to demonstrate exceptional circumstances; or</p> <p>B: 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>
106	Question 75:  Question 76:	<p>Should the Local Plan continue to prioritise employment uses for rural buildings where traffic generation is not a problem?</p> <p>Should the plan support extensions where they enhance the design and are not out of scale and character with the location?</p>
108	Question 78:  Question 79:	<p>Should the local plan continue to resist the loss of employment land to alternative uses?</p> <p>A: in villages only</p> <p>B: include areas outside frameworks on the edges of villages.</p> <p>Should the Local Plan include the alternative more detailed tests in issue 71 for determining when alternative use of an employment site should be permitted?</p>

110	Question 85:	<p>What should be the floorspace threshold above which retail impact assessments are required?</p> <p>A: 2500m<sup>2</sup> - large superstore</p> <p>B: 500m<sup>2</sup> - village scale supermarket</p> <p>C: 250m<sup>2</sup> - typical village shop</p> <p><i>NOTE: floorspace figures are gross not net.</i></p> <p><i>NOTE: Examples of specific supermarkets and their sizes will be included in the main document.</i></p>
<b>11. Promoting Successful Communities</b>		
111	Question 87:	Do you agree 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?
115	Question 86:	Should the Local Plan seek to protect where possible local services and facilities such as village shops, pubs, post offices, libraries, community meeting places, health centres or leisure facilities?
118	Question 92	<p><b>DELETE:</b></p> <p>Regarding Grosvenor's proposals for a community stadium at Trumpington Meadows, what is your view on the following issues:</p> <p>Do Grosvenor's proposals accord with the definition of a community stadium?</p> <p>Do you support all or parts of the community stadium and sporting village proposals put forward by Grosvenor?</p> <p>Do you support Grosvenor's proposals for enabling development (i.e. the provision of housing to generate the necessary funding to build the stadium)?</p> <p>If proposals for enabling development are not supported, how else can a community stadium be funded / delivered?</p> <p>Should any other sites considered by Grosvenor be considered as potential sites?</p> <p>Are there any other reasonable locations to be explored?</p>
<b>12. Transport and Infrastructure</b>		
130	Question 105:	Should the local plan include the principles regarding sustainable travel outlined in issue 92, and are there any additional issues that should be included?

134	Question 109:	<p>Should the Local Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Specify minimum size dimensions for garages to count towards parking standards, to ensure they are large enough to easily accommodate modern cars and storage needs.</li> <li>b. Not address the issue of residential garage sizes.</li> </ul>
136	Question 110:	<p>What approach should the Local Plan take towards cycle parking standards?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Retain the current minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development.</li> <li>b. Continue to set minimum cycle parking standards for different types of development, but develop new higher levels of provision.</li> <li>c. Remove cycle parking standards, but include a policy requiring cycle parking provision, adopting a design-led approach</li> </ul> <p>Are there any alternative policies or approaches you think should be included?</p>
<b>13. Site Specific Policies</b>		
141	Question 115	<p><b>DELETE:</b></p> <p>Question 115: Do you agree that the current policies for development of the following sites should be carried forward to the new Local Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Cambridge Northern Fringe West (Orchard Park)</li> <li>b. North West Cambridge - Huntingdon Road to Histon Road (NIAB2)</li> <li>c. Former Bayer Cropscience Site, Hauxton</li> <li>d. Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals</li> <li>e. Conservation Area and Green Separation at Longstanton (Northstowe)</li> <li>f. Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope</li> </ul> <p>Please provide any additional comments.</p>
143	Question 117	<p>Question 117: What approach should the Council take to the potential for housing development on land North of Newmarket Road at Cambridge East? Should the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Conclude that development cannot be relied on and the site be treated in the same way as Cambridge Airport?</li> <li>b. Rely upon the policies of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan to determine planning applications for development?</li> <li>c. Include a new policy for the site in the Local Plan allocating the land for a housing-led development?</li> </ul>

		Please provide any additional comments.
147	Question 121	<p>Question 121: What approach should the Local Plan take to the Fen Drayton LSA Area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Continue to support the redevelopment of existing buildings on the former Fen Drayton LSA site to support on-site experimental or other forms of sustainable living?</li> <li>b. How do you think the former Fen Drayton LSA should evolve?</li> </ul> <p>Please provide any additional comments.</p>