

**Local Plan Examinations  
Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**Matters and Issues for South Cambridgeshire Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter SC3 Delivering High Quality Places**

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Chapter 5

**SC3.A Policy HQ/1: Design Principles**

- i. Should criterion (d) also make reference to density?
- ii. Should criterion (f) also refer to the provision of safe opportunities for horse riding?
- iii. Should criterion (k) make specific reference to the Lifetime Homes and Lifetime Neighbourhoods criteria?
- iv. Would the intention of criterion (n) be better expressed if the words "which avoids" were replaced by "or development which would create"?
- v. What is the proposed timescale for the review of the District Design Guide SPD as paragraph 5.9 indicates that this is intended to provide further guidance to Policy HQ/1?

**SC3.B Policy HQ/2: Public Art and New Development**

- i. Should paragraph 3 refer to the possibility of pooled contributions for public art (up to a maximum of five) to enable fewer but more significant items of public art to be achieved in a particular locality where appropriate?
- ii. Paragraph 5.13 indicates that support for the policy will be provided in in a Public Art SPD. Is this a reference to the extant SPD which was adopted in 2009?

**Local Plan Examinations  
Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**Matters and Issues for South Cambridgeshire Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter SC4 Natural and Historic Environment**

[South Cambridgeshire Local Plan (2013) Chapter 6: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment (Policies NH/1 to NH/15)]

**Issues:**

**SC4A**

Does the Plan adequately set out a strategic approach, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure as required by paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)?

- i. Does the Council consider that the following documents taken as a whole meet the requirement in paragraph 73 of the Framework that planning policies should be based on robust and up-to date assessments of the needs for open space and sports and recreation facilities?
  - (a) The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy
  - (b) The Open Space and Recreation Strategy (October 2011)
  - (c) The Greater Cambridge Area Encompassing Cambridge City Council & South Cambridgeshire District Council Playing Pitch strategy 2015-2031 (May 2016), and
  - (d) The Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council Indoor Sports Facility Strategy 2015-2031 (May 2016 Version 14)
- ii. Is the Current Landscape Character Assessment sufficiently up to date to support Policy NH/2?
- iii. Is the text of Policy NH/4 sufficiently strong? Should the word "clearly" be replaced by "demonstrably and significantly"?
- iv. As above should the wording of Policy NH/7 also be strengthened?
- v. Would the Biodiversity SPD referred to in Policy NH/7 replace the extant 2009 SPD. Does the Council have a timetable for its preparation and has the compilation of the list of known veteran trees commenced?
- vi. Should the protection and enhancement of the River Cam corridor be the subject of a separate policy?

**SC4B**

Do the Policies in Chapter 6 of the Plan accord with Section 9 of the Framework which relates to protecting Green Belt land?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

- i. Is the wording of Policy NH/8 consistent with paragraph 90 of the Framework which refers to “not inappropriate” development in the Green Belt rather than “appropriate” development?
- ii. Is Policy NH/8 more restrictive than the policies in the Framework which do not directly relate to development on land beyond the Green Belt boundaries?
- iii. Is the wording of Policy NH/9 consistent with the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point of Policy 89 of the Framework?
- iv. Given that the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and recreation is not inappropriate development within the Green Belt should Policy NH/10 be more specific as to which purposes (objectives) of the Green Belt set out in paragraph 80 of the Framework would be prejudiced by cumulative sports and recreation facilities?

**SC4C**

Do all of the sites designated by Policies NH/11, NH/12 and NH/13 meet the objectives/criteria relevant to the respective designations for safeguarding the land in respect of future development?

- i. Does the wording of Policy NH/12 properly reflect paragraph 78 of the National Planning Policy Framework as any future proposal for development within a Local Green Space (LGS) would be subject to the very special circumstances test once a LGS has been designated? (For the benefit of doubt, the annotation “LGS designation” in the questions below refers to *proposed* designations in the Plan)
- ii. Should Policies NH/11 and NH/12 be more flexible in order to enable schools to develop existing playing fields with the re-provision of open space as an integral part of the overall development?
- iii. Is the designation of Land South of 26 Church Street and Rectory farm, Great Shelford as Protected Village Amenity Area (PVAA )necessary as the area is already protected through other designations?
- iv. Would Church Lane, Little Abington meet the criteria in Policy NH/11 for designation as a PVAA as the site is brownfield land containing farm buildings which are generally in a poor state of repair?
- v. Does the frontage along London Road/High Street, Fowlmere meet the criteria set out in Policy NH/13 for designation as an Important Countryside Frontage?
- vi. Should the boundary of the LGS designation at The Rouses, Bassingbourn be amended to exclude the land between Clear Farm and Knutsford Road which sits immediately to the south of the playground and Riverdale House and extends southward to the point where the overall site widens considerably to the west? Would this area, which is an agricultural field, meet the criteria for designation as a LGS particularly in terms of being demonstrably special and of particular local significance? Would the designation of this

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

parcel of land be consistent with achieving sustainable development in the area?  
(NH/12-016)

- vii. Would Camping Close, Bourn meet the designation criteria for LGS given its overall size, its agricultural nature and the protection which is already afforded to the site through its relationship to designated heritage assets including a conservation area? In this regard, should consideration therefore be given to amending the boundary so as to designate a smaller parcel of land in close proximity to Camping Close? (NH/12-022)
- viii. Would the LGS designations relating to (a) Land north of Jeavons Lane, north of Monkfield Way, Cambourne (NH/12-025), (b) Land south of Jeavons Wood Primary School, Cambourne (NH/12-26), (c) Cambourne Recreation Ground, Back Lane, Cambourne (2) (NH/12-027), Land east of Stirling way, Cambourne (NH/12-028), (d) Land east of Sterling way, North of Brace Dein, Cambourne (NH/12-029), (e) Land north of School Lane, west of Woodfield Lane, Cambourne (NH/12-030), (f) Land east of Greenbank, Cambourne (NH/12-031), (g) Land north of School Lane, west of Broad Street, Cambourne (NH/12-032) (h) Cambourne Recreation Ground, Back Lane, Cambourne (1) (NH/12-033) (i) Land north of Great Common Farm, west of Broadway, Cambourne (NH/12-034), (j) Large areas within village and around edge of village, Cambourne (NH/12-035) and (k) Honeysuckle Close and Hazel Lane green space, Cambourne (NH/12-036) meet the designation criteria for LGS as the LGS sites are, in most cases, extensive tracts of land and the defined development frameworks already afford protection against future development?
- ix. Should the boundary of the LGS designation relating to the land south of Barton Road, Comberton be amended so as to exclude the private garden of no. 36 Barton Road having regard to the designation criteria for a LGS particularly in terms of local or historical significance, recreational value or tranquillity?  
Should the designation also include all of the land within the current PVAA but exclude the brownfield land? (NH/12-038)
- x. Should the LGS boundary of the Recreation Ground and Playing Fields, Cottenham be amended so as to exclude the land comprising an extension to the recreation ground on the grounds that the site is featureless and is not demonstrably special to the local community? (NH/12-049)
- xi. Should the boundary of the LGS designation for Land in Front of Village College, Cottenham be amended so as to exclude the residential garden land and College Farm to the north-west of the site which already benefits from designated heritage asset protection as it is within a conservation area? (NH/12-050)
- xii. Would the land at Greenacres, Duxford meet the designation criteria for LGS as it represents a relatively small area of grass verge in private ownership which is to be fenced to restrict public access and could potentially be developed for additional housing as it is surrounded by the residential properties in Greenacres? (NH/12-055)
- xiii. Should the boundary of the LGS designation for the End of Mangers Lane, Duxford be amended so as to include the paddock areas but exclude all of the residential garden land? Would the land remaining meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of being demonstrably special and of particular local significance? (NH/12-056)

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

- xiv. Would the LGS designation of the allotment gardens on land at Meadow Drift, Elsworth be necessary or appropriate given that Policy SC9 of the Plan would provide adequate protection to the allotments from their loss or future development? (NH/12-057)
- xv. Would the land known as Glebe Field, Elsworth meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of being demonstrably special and of particular significance, and is currently protected by its designation as a PVAA? (NH/12-060)
- xvi. Should consideration be given to amending the boundary of the Field between Brockley Road and Brook Street, Elsworth LGS designation in light of the proposals for residential development on part of the site? (NH/12-062)
- xvii. Would the Land at south end of Brook Street, Elsworth meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of it being demonstrably special and of particular local significance as the site is unkempt, overgrown, well screened and has no public access, and the land already benefits from designated heritage asset protection as it is within a conservation area? (NH/12-063)
- xviii. Should the LGS designation for the Village Green, Eltisley be concurrent with the original land as mapped in the inclosure award of 17 March 1864? (NH/12-065)
- xix. Would the Paddock, Ditton Lane at the junction with High Ditch Road, Fen Ditton meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of being demonstrably special and of particular significance, and is currently protected by its designation as an Important Countryside Frontage? (NH/12-068)
- xx. Should the land currently in use as allotments south of the recreation ground and immediately adjacent to the hammer head at the western end of Killingworth Way be excluded from the LGS designation for the Recreation Ground, Foxton on the basis that it is of an entirely different nature to the recreation ground and is not demonstrably special or hold a particular significance for the local community? Would the designation be consistent with sustainable development principles? (NH/12-070)
- xxi. Would the land at Green Area on Station Road, Foxton meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of particular local significance given that the Council's own assessment of the land in 2012 did not support its designation? (NH/12-073)
- xxii. Would the LGS designation relating to the land comprising the Field between Cox's Drive, Cow Lane and Land adjacent to the Horse Pond, Fulbourn be necessary as the land already benefits from designated heritage asset protection as it is within a conservation area? Would the designation be consistent with sustainable development principles as the site is located within the village development framework? (NH/12-074)
- xxiii. Should the LGS boundary designation relating to the Victorian Garden, Fulbourn be amended to exclude the area of land extending east across the frontage of private office accommodation which is fenced off from the Victorian Garden? (NH/12-075)
- xxiv. Should the land between Townley Hall and fronting Home End in Fulbourn be considered for LGS designation?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

- xxv. Would Lupin Field, Gamlingay meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of particular local significance as it represents an area of scrub and open grazing that is indistinguishable from other areas of open space around the village and only part of the area supports recreational activities and this is on a temporary arrangement? Further, the land is beyond the village development framework and would therefore be protected from future development which could result in coalescence with Dennis Green by Policy S/7 of the Plan. (NH/12-076)
- xxvi. Would The Craft, Guilden Morden meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of being demonstrably special and of particular local significance, and is currently protected by its designation as a PVAA? (NH/12-079)
- xxvii. Would the site at Church Meadow, Guilden Morden meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of being demonstrably special and of particular local significance? Would the designation be consistent with sustainable development principles in the area as the site is within the village settlement boundary? (NH/12-080)
- xxviii. Would the land between Swan Lane and Pound Green, Guilden Morden meet the designation criteria for a LGS as it is an agricultural field? (NH/12-081)
- xxix. Should the boundary of the LGS designation at Wellhouse Meadow, Haslingfield be amended to exclude the area previously known as The Manor Orchard which now relates to a private property which already benefits from designated heritage asset protection including its location in a conservation area? (NH/12-087)
- xxx. Should the boundary of the LGS designation at Wellhouse Meadow, Haslingfield be amended to exclude the area previously known as Granary Meadow which now relates to a private property which already benefits from designated heritage asset protection given its location in a conservation area and is also within a PVAA? (NH/12-087)
- xxxi. Should the boundary of the LGS designation at Wellhouse Meadow, Haslingfield be amended to exclude the area of residential land behind a 2m wall as the land is distinct in character from the orchard and meadow land, and in terms of its particular local significance? Would the designation be consistent with sustainable development principles in the area as the site is within the village settlement boundary? (NH/12-087)
- xxxii. Should the boundary of the LGS designation at Village Orchard, Kingston be amended to exclude the private house and garden which was included in the Parish Council's original submission? (NH/12-094)
- xxxiii. Should the area of the LGS designation at the Scout Camp Site, Church Lane, Little Abington be constrained to the part of the site which is within the conservation area? Should any weight be given to the lapsed planning permission (S/0893/11) which relates to part of the LGS designation in this regard? (NH/12-102)
- xxxiv. Would the land at Meadows, Bancroft Farm, Little Abington meet the designation criteria for LGS as it represents a significant area of open land/paddock in private ownership with little historical significance or recreational value and is surrounded by residential

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

development with access limited to a public right of way which crosses the site? (NH/12-104)

- xxxv. Would the designation of the Recreational Ground, Russet Way, Melbourn as LGS preclude car parking for the owners of the land thereby prejudicing highway safety? (NH/12-112)
- xxxvi. Does the triangular parcel of land indicated in the LGS designation for Stockbridge Meadows, Melbourn form part of Stockbridge Meadows? If not, should it be deleted from the LGS designation? (NH/12-115)
- xxxvii. Would the site at Glebe Field, behind St Andrews Church, Orwell meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of being demonstrably special and of particular local significance, and which already benefits from designated heritage asset protection including its location in a conservation area? Would the designation be consistent with sustainable development principles in the area? (NH/12-128)
- xxxviii. Would the land at Station Road/Turn Lane, Over meet the designation criteria for a LGS in terms of its particular significance and its contribution to the amenity and character of the village given that it has lost its PVAA designation? Does the site also benefit from an extant planning permission? (NH/12-130)
- xxxix. Would Land to the rear of The Lane, Over meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of it being demonstrably special and of particular local significance? Should its PVAA designation also be removed on the basis that its role as an amenity area for the village and its contribution to the character of the village do not warrant such a designation? (NH/12-131)
- xl. Would the Wood behind Pendragon Hill, Papworth Everard meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of particular local significance and richness of wildlife? (NH/12-132)
- xli. Would Baron's Way Wood, Papworth Everard meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of particular local significance and richness of wildlife? (NH/12-134)
- xl.ii. Would Summer's Hill Open Space, Papworth Everard meet the designation criteria for LGS in terms of its size and extent? Would the fact that the land is also the subject of a section 106 obligation have any bearing on the designation? (NH/12-137)
- xl.iii. Should the boundary of the Papworth Hall, Papworth Everard LGS designation be amended so as to exclude the narrow finger of land between Papworth Business Park to the south and existing residential accommodation to the north as this area now comprises a private dwelling and garden? (NH/12-138)
- xl.ii. Would the strip of woodland along the northern edge of the LGS designation for the Village Playing Field, Papworth Everard meet the criteria in terms of recreational amenity or richness of wildlife? (NH/12-139)

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

- xliv. Would The Spike Playing Field, South Terrace, Sawston meet the designation criteria for LGS as it is land bequeathed to Sawston Church/Institute, and in terms of its recreational value? (NH/12-141)
- xlvi. Should the parcel of land at Millennium Copse, Sawston which has operated as a nursery facility for the benefit of a registered charity since 2000 be excluded from the LGS designation? (NH/12-143)
- xlvii. Would Butlers Green, Sawston meet the criteria for LGS designation in terms of its sustainable location for development? (NH/12-144)
- xlviii. Would the Ransom Strip, Craft Way, Steeple Morden meet the criteria for LGS designation as it is in private ownership with no public access? (NH/12-149)
- xlix. Would the Spinney, Thriplow meet the designation criteria for a LGS as it could prejudice access to Pegs Close? (NH/12-157)
  - I. Should consideration be given to exclusion of the 3.5m strip of land on the southern edge of the LGS designation relating to Open Land, Church Street, Thriplow as it provides the only means of access to land to the south-east and is in regular use by the owners who may require to resurface the land in order to maintain the access route? (NH/12-158)
  - li. Should the boundary of the Toft Recreation Ground LGS designation be amended so as to include the area of community land adjacent to the Recreation Ground, or alternatively, be designated separately as a LGS? (NH/12-161)
  - lii. Would the LGS designation at the Barracks Frontage, Waterbeach compromise the future achievement of sustainable pedestrian, cycling and public transport links between the proposed Waterbeach New Town, Waterbeach and Cambridge? Would the designation therefore be consistent with sustainable development principles? (NH/12-167)

**SC4D**

Does the Plan demonstrate a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of South Cambridgeshire's historic environment as required by paragraph 126 of the Framework?

- i. Should criterion 2(d) in Policy NH/14 refer to non-designated heritage assets in order to be consistent with paragraph 135 of the Framework?
- ii. Criterion 2(d) also refers to further supplementary planning documents in the context of non-designated heritage assets. Could the Council clarify the proposed scope of those documents?
- iii. Does Policy NH/14 provide the same degree of protection to non-designated (undesigned) assets as designated assets thereby conflicting with the Framework?
- iv. Do the last two sentences of paragraph 6.49 fully accord with paragraphs 132 to 135 of the Framework in terms of the consideration of harm to designated heritage assets?



**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

Could they be better worded in this regard?

- v. Does the wording of Policy NH/15 fully reflect the approach of the Framework particularly in addressing the balance of climate change benefits against the potential harm to the heritage asset? Could the policy be better worded in this regard?
- vi. The Framework does not make direct reference to 'historic buildings' but rather the historic environment, listed buildings and heritage assets. Should the wording of Policy NH/15 therefore be revised to provide greater consistency with the Framework and the Council's Listed Buildings Supplementary Planning Document?
- vii. What would be the nature and status of the supplementary guidance referred to in paragraph 6.63?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**Matters and Issues for South Cambridgeshire Local Plan specific hearing sessions**

**Matter SC7 Building a Strong and Competitive Economy**

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Chapter 8

**Preamble**

- 1) Omission sites (i.e. sites which are being promoted as new allocations for employment use but have not been included in the Plan) have been considered/will be considered at a separate hearing and will not therefore be considered under this Matter.
  
- 2) The development of Green Belt land has already been considered in Matter 6: *Green Belt* (Policy S/4: Cambridge Green Belt) so this matter will not be an issue for discussion at this hearing other than for the issues that have arisen through the Council's proposed modifications:
  - a. *Policy E/2 Fulbourn Road East*. Modification PM/SC/8/C
  - b. Modifications PM/SC/8/A and PM/SC/8/B *New Policy E/1B: Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension*. **(This issue will only be debated in the event the Council decides to submit this allocation)**.  
Please check the Council's website after Full Council Meeting being held on 17 November 2016 to ascertain the latest position in regard to this provisional modification, in order to ensure that statements take into account the latest information.

**SC7A.1 Chapter 8: Opening Paragraphs 8.1 to 8.11**

- i. Does the Plan allocate sufficient space for B1(b) Research and Development uses on the edge of Cambridge?

**SC7A.2 Policy E/1: New Employment Provision near Cambridge-Cambridge Science Park**

- i. Could the Council give an update in respect of the extant planning permissions already in place with Cambridge Science Park?
  
- ii. Should the policy be more specific in terms of the nature of employment use and density requirements for employment development on the site?
  
- iii. Is there an over concentration of car parking provision at the Science Park?
  
- iv. Would the preparation of a masterplan assist in securing sustainable development on the site?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**SC7A.3 New Policy E/1B: Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension – Proposed Modifications PM/SC/8/A and PM/SC/8/B**  
**(This issue will only be debated in the event the Council decides to submit this allocation)**

- i. Could the exceptional circumstances necessary to release land from the green belt be demonstrated in relation to the campus extension development?
- ii. Would the development of the site have an adverse effect on biodiversity in this location?
- iii. Can surface water flooding issues be satisfactorily addressed?
- iv. Could the transport impacts which would arise as a consequence of the development of the site be satisfactorily mitigated?
- v. Would the proposal for the site to connect to the energy source at Addenbrooke's Hospital be both feasible and viable?
- vi. Would the site be of sufficient size to meet the needs of bio-medical and healthcare research in this locality?

**SC7B Policy E/2: Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn) – Proposed Modification PM/SC/8/C**

- i. Is the area of land allocated, as proposed to be modified (PM/SC/8/C – 4.3 ha), consistent with the need for employment uses in this location having regard to paragraph 2.36 in the supporting text to Policy S/5?
- ii. Is the proposed reduction in the size of the allocation (PM/SC/8/C) justified by the findings of the Inner Green Belt Boundary Study 2015?

**SC7C Policy E/3: Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses**

- ii. Could the Council clarify whether the outline planning permission for the Pampisford: West of Eastern Counties Leather site is still extant?

**SC7D Policy E/4: Allocations for Class B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses**

- i. Could the Council clarify whether phase 2 of the Papworth Everard: Ermine Street South has been commenced?

**SC7E Policy E/5: Papworth Hospital**

- i. Is the term "healthcare" sufficiently precise in this context? Should it be defined in the policy?
- ii. Is the 2 year marketing period set out in paragraph 2 of the policy realistic in the context of the closure/vacation timetable for the hospital as the construction phase of the replacement on the Addenbrooke's site is likely to be complete by early 2016? Has the marketing of the site already begun?

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

- iii. In paragraphs 3(a), (b) and (c) of the policy is the intention to preserve rather than maintain?
- iv. Should paragraph 3(d) also include the requirement to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Papworth Everard Conservation Area?
- v. Is paragraph 4 of the policy sufficiently flexible to enable the realistic prospect of viable re-use of redundant or derelict buildings on the site?

**SC7F Policy E/6: Imperial War Museum at Duxford**

- i. Should the term "special case" in paragraph 1 of the policy be more clearly defined particularly in the context of the protection of heritage assets at the site?
- ii. Should paragraph 8.24 of the supporting text be included in the text of the policy?

**SC7G Policy E/7: Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals**

- i. Would the proposed green wedge on the western part of the Ida Darwin Hospital site be of sufficient size to effectively prevent the merging of Cherry Hinton and Fulbourn or should it be expanded to the east?

**SC7H Policy E/8: Mixed Use Development in Histon & Histon Station Area**

- i. Is there a realistic prospect of the potential redevelopment opportunities proceeding within the lifetime of the Plan?
- ii. Would the proposed mixed use development have to be residential development led in order to be viable?
- iii. Is there clear support for the redevelopment of the area from the principal landowners?
- iv. Would the Neighbourhood Planning process be a more suitable vehicle to pursue these proposals?
- v. What would be the scope of the Supplementary Planning Document?

**SC7I Policy E/9: Promotion of Clusters**

- i. Should paragraph 8.44 of the supporting text clarify that the reference to the 'NPPF' is taken directly from the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point of paragraph 21 of the document?
- ii. Should the policy refer to other factors which contribute to the success of employment clusters?
- iii. Could the Council clarify the reference to Policy E/4 in paragraph 8.47?
- iv. Paragraph 8.46 recognises that greater flexibility is needed to support the diversification of Cambridge's high technology cluster. However, paragraph 8.48 appears to introduce

**Local Plan Examinations**  
**Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

some uncertainty as to the ongoing support for the development of employment clusters? Is there a conflict in this regard?

- v. In addition to Northstowe, is there a case for the creation of other clusters beyond the immediate environs of Cambridge e.g. in Cambourne?

**SC7J Policy E/10: Shared Social Spaces in Employment Areas**

- i. Should the term "Small-scale" at the beginning of the policy text be replaced with the words "Appropriately-scaled" in order to give greater flexibility in the range of ancillary social focussed provision?

ii.

**SC7K Policy E/14: Loss of Employment Land to Non Employment Uses**

- i. Is the requirement for a minimum marketing period of 12 months too onerous? In this context should the demonstration of non-viability of an employment use be given greater weight in paragraph 1(a)?
- ii. Is paragraph 2 of the policy necessary as paragraph 1 relates to the redevelopment of existing employment sites?

**SC7L Policy E/15: Established Employment Areas**

- i. Is the Council satisfied that there is no business need to increase the number of Established Employment Areas within the lifetime of the Plan?

**SC7M Policy E/17: Conversion or Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment**

- i. Does paragraph 1(c) imply that the change of use or adaption of buildings could involve changes to the form, bulk and general design of the host building?

**SC7N Policy E/18: Farm Diversification**

- i. Is it the intention of the Plan not to allocate specific sites for farm diversification but rather to consider planning applications for farm diversification on their own individual merits?

**SC7P Policy E/19: Tourist Facilities and Visitor Attractions**

- i. Should criterion (c) be more positively worded in respect of the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area?
- ii. Should criterion (c) also refer the impact of a proposal on the operation and function of the area?
- iii. Should paragraph 8.64 acknowledge that the existing major tourist visitor attractions could experience significant expansion having regard to criterion (d) which refers to schemes being "in scale with their location"?
- iv. Could the Council clarify the purpose and intention of criterion (f)?

**Local Plan Examinations  
Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire**

**SC7Q Policy E/20: Tourist Accommodation**

- i. Should the final sentence of paragraph 8.66 be relocated in paragraph 3 of the policy text as it sets the time period limit for tourist accommodation lettings?

**SC7R Policy E/21: Retail Hierarchy**

- i. Would the proposed extension at West Cambourne have implications in terms of the existing retail offer in Cambourne?

**SC7S Policy E/22: Applications for New Retail Development**

- i. Is the Council satisfied that the evidence base supporting the policy is up to date and does not underestimate the retail needs within the development frameworks?
- ii. Would the locally set thresholds for retail assessments set out in the policy be proportionate in the context of paragraph 26 of the Framework?

**SC7T Policy E/23: Retailing in the Countryside**

- i. Could criterion 1(a) include the sale of food and drink for consumption on the premises?
- ii. Should the policy also make clear how the Council would respond to the expansion of existing retail outlets in the countryside?