

Greater Cambridge Local Plan

First Conversation, Call for Sites and Call for Green Sites Data

Report updated 16 October 2020

Note on updates: This report is updated monthly to accompany an updated dataset release. Information relating to sites may change during the plan making process and it is important that most relevant information is made available.

Contents

1. About this report.....	3
2. About the First Conversation and Call for Sites	4
3. Methodology	6
4. Summary of responses	10
4.1 First Conversation.....	10
4.2 Call for Sites.....	10
4.3 Call for Green Sites.....	10
5. Reach of the First Conversation.....	11
5.1 How many people were aware of the consultation?	11
5.2 Did we reach a representative demographic?	12
6. Responses to the First Conversation consultation	14
6.1 How many responses did we receive?.....	14
6.2 What did people tell us?.....	16
7. Response to Call for Sites.....	27
8. Response to Call for Green Sites.....	28
Appendix A: Number of responses received to each question	29

1. About this report

This report accompanies the publication of the following datasets relating to the development of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan:

- The full record of comments and feedback received during the Greater Cambridge Local Plan First Conversation consultation which ran from 13 January to 24 February 2020.
- The full record of sites submitted during the Call for Sites in 2019 (11 February to 25 March 2019), and the further Call for Sites as part of the First Conversation consultation.
- The sites submitted under the Call for Green Sites as part of the First Conversation consultation.

This report provides a note about the methodology followed in collecting and presenting the datasets, and a quantitative analysis of the data. It does not contain any response from the Councils to the comments received, nor an analysis of the sites in terms of their suitability for development.

In the case of the comments received as part of the First Conversation, a summary of the main issues raised by representations, and how they have been taken into account in the development of the Plan, will be published in the form of a Consultation Statement at the Preferred Options consultation stage.

In the case of the sites submitted under the Call for Sites, a full analysis of their deliverability and suitability will be published as part of the Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) at the Preferred Option consultation stage. Until sites are chosen as allocations in the Local Plan, they have no status as potential development sites.

The sites submitted under the Call for Green Sites will be appraised as part of the councils' green infrastructure evidence for the Local Plan – and their report will be published as part of the Local Plan evidence base.

All the datasets, including maps, can be viewed and downloaded from the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning service website in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan [Documents Library](#) and on the [First Conversation consultation and Call for Sites webpage](#). Sites can also be viewed on an interactive map on the [Site Submissions webpage](#).

2. About the First Conversation and Call for Sites

The First Conversation consultation and the Call for Sites form part of the established process for developing a Local Plan. The First Conversation forms part of the regulation 18 consultation stage (Issues and Options) under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The purpose of the consultation is to invite broad responses about what should be in the Local Plan, from residents and businesses as well as stakeholders and other organisations.

A Call for Sites is a way for landowners, developers, individuals and other interested parties to suggest sites for development, and to let us know when they may be available for development. This is a normal part of plan making. Government planning guidance advises that, 'if the process to identify land is to be transparent and identify as many potential opportunities as possible, it is important to issue a call for sites and broad locations for development'. We need to ensure that the sites eventually allocated within the Plan are deliverable which means, among other factors, that the landowner is open to developing it within the required timescales, so a Call for Sites is an important part of finding out what land may be available.

An initial Call for Sites was held in 2019 and was publicised via our database of people, organisations and agents who have registered for updates about the Local Plan, in addition to notifying consultees. We also issued a public notice, and publicised via the Councils webpages.

The First Conversation consultation followed a series of workshops with elected members, residents groups, landowners/developers, and other stakeholders in summer and autumn 2019. These tested and explore the potential 'big themes' for the Local Plan and helped to shape the issues and options that were presented for feedback in the First Conversation. More information on these workshops is available in the [Statement of Consultation](#) which accompanied the First Conversation consultation.

The First Conversation consultation was open for six weeks and invited comments on the main First Conversation (Issues and Options) 'document' which was published in a digital format as well as a PDF. This included the Call for Sites and Call for Green Sites questions. We also consulted on the following supporting documents during the consultation period:

- The Sustainability Appraisal of the First Conversation document
- The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report
- The Habitats Regulations Assessment Scoping Report

During the consultation period, extensive outreach and communications activities took place in order to engage our communities as fully as possible. The aims of the communications and engagement plan were:

- To spread the word about the new Local Plan, ensuring communities were well-informed about both the Plan process and the key issues
- To encourage participation and engagement through showing why the Local Plan is important and affects citizens' lives on the ground.
- To reach the not yet engaged – the majority of our community members who do not know about, or participate in, the process of plan-making.
- To help us understand what our communities think about the key issues and choices regarding the Plan – informing our decision-making and building the evidence base for why we choose to do what we do
- To ensure there is accurate and timely information accessible to all.

Activities included:

- Social media campaign including paid and organic posts across social media channels and into local groups
- Specially commissioned videos for social media and online
- Digital first format for the consultation content
- Pop-up roadshow to busy locations around the area, including supermarkets, stations and the football stadium
- Big Debate event featuring community groups in a 'pecha kucha' style format
- Publicity in local newspapers, community newsletters and similar
- Email to our databases and through other communications channels

An assessment of the reach of these activities can be found in Chapter 5.

3. Methodology

The 2020 First Conversation consultation, and the 2019 Call for Sites, gave community members and stakeholders a variety of ways to respond and provide comments, both formally and informally. This data release includes all forms of feedback and submissions received during these consultation periods. For the purposes of the data release these are differentiated as datasets corresponding to the different ways they were collected.

This section describes how responses were received, and how they have been collated and grouped for this data release.

Format of consultation questions and Call for Sites forms

The main First Conversation consultation sought responses to fifty questions. Some had a quantitative, ranking or Likert scale format where respondents were asked to respond to a yes/no question, to rank options in order of preference, or to indicate their level of agreement with a statement along a five point scale. Text comments could also be made to all questions, whether they also contained a quantitative or ranking element or not.

Two of the questions (questions 2 and 3) were the 'Call for Sites' and the 'Call for Green Sites'. Responses to these required a form to be completed including detail on the site, ownership and other information to allow the site's suitability to be assessed. The 2019 'Call for Sites' asked for sites to be submitted using the same form as was subsequently used in the 2020 First Conversation. The Planning Service requested that sites submitted in 2019 were not resubmitted in 2020, however a significant number of sites were resubmitted with updated information. For these sites, the updated information has superseded the earlier submission. The 2019 sites have been imported into the First Conversation dataset.

The supporting documents (Sustainability Appraisal, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and Habitats Regulations Assessment Scoping Report) were presented in PDF format and general comments were sought on a chapter by chapter basis without specific questions being asked.

Responses could be submitted via:

- 'Quick comments' (multiple choice questions and written comments up to 50 words with no attachments) the [Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website](#) – for the First Conversation questions only, and not the Calls for Sites or supporting documents
- Opus 2 Consult system – for all parts of the consultation including the Calls for Sites and supporting documents, with the ability to upload attachments and an unlimited word count

- Email – using a downloadable response form for all parts of the consultation including supporting documents. Specific forms were available for the Call for Sites and Call for Green Sites due to the complexity of the information requested. Responses could also be submitted via email without using a response form
- Post, using the downloadable response form or not, as desired

In addition, comments were received at events using ‘postcards’ which were completed by members of the public, or onto which verbal comments were transcribed by team members staffing the event. For transcribed comments, a separate postcard was completed for each person spoken to.

Comments on social media were also monitored but it is extremely difficult to create an accurate record of all comments received relating to the Local Plan during the consultation period. Comments on Council-run channels have been collated as far as possible and substantive points raised are being considered as part of the plan-making process, but are not published in this dataset. An overview of these comments, and how they have been taken into account, will be provided in the Statement of Consultation at the next stage of Local Plan consultation.

First Conversation: responses through www.greatercambridgeplanning.org

Responses made through the Shared Planning Service website were all to a specific question. Providing a name or contact details was optional to reduce barriers to participation. It is therefore not possible to know how many individual respondents submitted comments, but the total number of comments received is known. In verifying this data for presentation and release, it is clear that there are some text comments that are identical and from the metadata associated with them, it is clear that these were submitted twice by the same person.

Where an exactly identical text comment was received more than once, the duplicate has been cleansed from the data release. Due to the complexity of the information required, questions 2 and 3 could not be completed on the Shared Planning Service website and respondents were directed to the Opus 2 Consult system and to the downloadable forms if they wished to respond to these questions.

The comments received through the [Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website](http://www.greatercambridgeplanning.org) have been published in Excel format.

Responses through Opus Consult

Responses made directly using Opus Consult could also only be made to specific questions. On the Opus Consult system, respondents must be registered and logged-in to submit a response. It is therefore possible to differentiate between the

number of respondents, and the number of representations (comments to different questions) that were submitted.

Some respondents on Opus Consult were agents representing multiple clients. In many cases these respondents submitted an identical response multiple times on behalf of different clients. These are considered as separate representations as they were submitted on behalf of separate respondents. For the purposes of plan-making and responding to issues raised in the consultation, it is the content of representations, not the amount of them, that will be evaluated.

The responses received directly into Opus Consult, both for the First Conversation and the Call for Sites/Call for Green Sites, have been published on that system and can be viewed on the [Greater Cambridge Local Plan Documents Library](#) and [First Conversation consultation and Call for Sites](#) webpages. Responses have also been collated into Excel format. Call for Sites and Call for Green Sites submissions can also be viewed on our interactive mapping [Site Submissions webpage](#).

Responses via email

Responses were also received via email in a variety of formats. Email responses varied greatly in format. In some cases, respondents used the downloadable response forms provided, which could be completed by hand or digitally, and emailed back. This form encouraged respondents to indicate which consultation question they were responding to. However, many respondents did not directly indicate that they were answering a specific question in their email response. Responses via email included plain text in the body of an email, and lengthy submissions from agents and landowner representatives including multiple attachments.

All email comments, and Call for Sites/Call for Green Sites forms, were entered into the Opus Consult database by the officer team, for the purposes of keeping a complete record that can be analysed for plan-making. Where a respondent explicitly identified which consultation question, or questions, their response referred to, their response (or the appropriate part of their response where a number of questions were covered) has been entered into Opus Consult against that question.

Where a respondent did not indicate clearly which question they were answering, the content of these 'non-specific' responses was assigned to 'Question 51' in the database. This holds these non-specific responses to ensure they can be taken into account. In the analysis of their content for plan-making purposes, the comments made will be evaluated alongside the question to which they appear most appropriate.

Feedback on postcards at events

These comments did not respond to a specific consultation question and for the purposes of quantitative analysis these have therefore been kept as a separate dataset. As with non-specific email responses, for the purposes of plan-making and responding to issues raised in the consultation, the content of these comments will be 'assigned' to the question that is felt to be most relevant.

Cross referencing sites and representations

All representations (comments on individual questions) entered into the Opus 2 Consult system have a unique representation ID number. This ID number can be found in the Excel spreadsheets as well to aid cross-referencing.

All sites have a unique reference number (URN) which has been assigned by the Planning Service as well as an Opus 2 Consult reference ID. These can be used to cross reference between the online mapping system and the full documentation about the site held on the Opus 2 Consult system.

Estimating site capacity

As part of the Call for Sites form, site promoters were requested to submit their estimate of the capacity for residential, employment or other development on the site. Not all promoters provided this information. To assist with evaluation of the sites, where no capacity estimate was provided, the Planning Service has estimated the site capacity based on the following ratios:

- Residential development – an average density of 40 homes per hectare
- Employment development – a floorspace ratio (plot ratio) of 50%. This means that 50% of the site area is assumed to be developed into net lettable floorspace.

Redaction and personal data

All submissions including attachments have been redacted of personal data in line with our privacy statements. The names of persons submitting representations, and landowner details in the case of the Call for Sites, have not been published in this data release.

4. Summary of responses

4.1 First Conversation

We received 7,874 individual answers to questions (representations) asked in the consultation. This excludes submissions to questions 2 and 3 (Call for Sites and Call for Green Sites). Of these:

- 1,020 were submitted through the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website as 'quick comments';
- 6,588 were received through Opus 2 Consult or via email;
- 226 comments were taken on postcards at events.

4.2 Call for Sites

We received 675 site submissions covering 16,359 hectares of land. Based on the figures submitted by site promoters, and GCSP estimates where promoters did not provide estimates, these sites would hold capacity for between 170,000-220,000 homes, and over 6,000,000m² of employment floorspace. As part of the First Conversation consultation, the Planning Service shared initial estimates that 5,000-30,000 new homes may be required during the Plan period so it is evident that only a small fraction of this capacity will be required.

For comparison, for the equivalent Calls for Sites as part of the development of the adopted 2018 Local Plans for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, we received around 400 site submissions, and we considered many more sites that were identified through other methods. Sites that were considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs) for both Councils comprised around 5,000 hectares of land. Around 966 hectares were allocated for development in the two adopted Plans.

4.3 Call for Green Sites

21 sites were submitted, including the whole of the Cambridge Green Belt and Cambridge Airport as well as the 'Cambridge Great Park' concept. The total area of sites submitted is therefore very large – 28,876 hectares. The Green Infrastructure evidence base study currently in progress has also been seeking community views about where green infrastructure should be protected and expanded and results of this study will be published in due course.

5. Reach of the First Conversation

5.1 How many people were aware of the consultation?

We used many channels and methods to reach out to communities and stakeholders. These different channels, and the numbers reached by each are summarised below.

Notifications to our mailing lists at the start of the consultation:

- Statutory consultees on the Cambridge City database (103) and South Cambridgeshire database (279)
- Individuals who had opted in to receive emails about the Local Plan, or general planning matters, on the Cambridge City database (312) and the South Cambridgeshire database (195)
- Residents associations (144) and Parish Councils (105)
- We emailed all elected members and staff at both Councils
- We also encouraged other service areas to use their databases to spread the word.
- While there is a level of likely duplication across databases, which it is not possible to estimate, several hundred people across the Greater Cambridge Area will have been directly contacted via email
- We sent letters to those statutory consultees and opted-in individuals on our database, where we do not have an email address contact for them.

Website hits

5,392 users visited the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning website during the consultation period, and there were 4,810 unique pageviews of the [Greater Cambridge Local Plan landing page](#).

Social media

- YouTube: 28,580 video views with an average watch time of 91% - i.e. almost all of these views saw the entire video.
- Facebook: a reach of over 150,000 unique users and over 57,000 engagements to 50 organic and promoted posts by the Council comms teams.
- Instagram: a reach of 138,072 users for 5 posts by Council comms teams.
- Twitter: over 150 tweets, including 37 from Council accounts.

Events

- Members of the public engaged at pop-up events¹: 6,089
- Attendees at the Big Debate: 300

¹ This is the number of people to whom we handed a postcard.

- Meetings at which Local Plan issues were discussed and presented – these included residents association meetings attended by elected members, community meetings facilitated and a specific drop in event for members of the Gypsy and Traveller community.

Other

- A public notice was posted in the Cambridge Independent
- Posters were displayed at Council venues and other community venues
- Articles about the consultation were printed in the City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils' resident magazines which are distributed to every household
- A news release was distributed which resulted in local media coverage at several points in the consultation.

5.2 Did we reach a representative demographic?

We sought, and received responses from individuals and a range of public, private and charitable organisations. We also allowed anonymous comments via the Local Plan website for the first time, and we did not require personal details to be given for responses on postcards or noted down in person at events, in an effort to lower the barriers to participation as we know that providing personal details can stop some people from taking part. This was justified as the consultation is still at an early stage and there is discretion about how we gain input from the community.

We asked respondents to complete a voluntary survey to tell us some information about themselves so we could evaluate the diversity of respondents. We received 193 responses to ten questions; not all respondents completed every question. The analysis below is of completed responses to each question and does not include those who skipped that question. Key findings were:

- The age demographic skewed broadly older although we did receive a small number of responses from under 18 year olds. The chart below shows the age of respondents compared to data for the whole of Greater Cambridge (source: Cambridgeshire Insight population projections). An older demographic is typical of participation in public consultations similar to this and the number of younger people in Greater Cambridge according to census data skews younger due to the large number of students in the population. The proportion of respondents aged 30-50 was broadly proportional to the general population but it is clear that reaching young people continues to be a challenge.
- Respondents were mainly white but although 12% identified as mixed or non-white in their ethnic background. This is exactly the same proportion as exists within the general population for Greater Cambridge, according to Census 2011 data, showing that we reached out well to those from varied ethnic backgrounds.

- Around half of respondents (53%) identified as having no religion with a further 16% answering 'prefer not to say'. 28% reported as Christian.
- 22% of respondents identified as having a physical or mental health condition or illness expected to last 12 months or more. 13% of Cambridge residents and 13.9% of South Cambridgeshire residents reported a limiting long term illness or disability in the 2011 Census so this suggests that the consultation was particularly effective at reaching those with physical or mental health conditions.
- 89% of respondents were from a CB postcode.

This data will now provide a benchmark against which we can measure engagement during the subsequent stages of Plan preparation.

6. Responses to the First Conversation consultation

6.1 How many responses did we receive?


We received responses and comments to the consultation through a number of channels:

Means of responding	Number of responses
Responses using the Local Plan website comment forms	1,020
Responses using the Opus 2 Consult system or submitted via email (excluding Call for Sites and Call for Green Sites	6,588
Call for Sites (including late site submissions up to 16 October 2020)	675
Call for Green Sites	21
Feedback postcards from events	226

We also received general notes and feedback from the meetings held during the consultation period, which are not counted as responses in the table above.

The total number of responses (each response being an answer to a single question, multiple answers may have been submitted by the same respondent to different questions), was 7,874, excluding Call for Sites and Call for Green Sites submissions. A table collating the number of responses to each individual question can be found in Appendix A.

The chart below shows the percentage of the total number of responses received for each question (excluding questions 2 and 3, the Calls for Sites questions).



The questions which received the most responses in total were:

- Q42: Where should we site new development? [a question which asked the respondents to rank possible options].
- Q8: How should the Local Plan help us achieve net zero carbon by 2050?
- Q39: How should we encourage a shift away from car use and towards more sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, cycling and walking?

There were differences in the popularity of questions between website commenters (mostly individuals and not planning professionals, statutory consultees or agents/landowners) and email and Opus 2 consult respondents. Website commenters were much more interested in some questions than others, while overall, email and Opus 2 respondents commented more evenly across all the questions.


For website commenters, the following four questions gained substantially more comments than the others:

- Q42: Where should we site new development? [a question which asked the respondents to rank possible options].
- Q8: How should the Local Plan help us achieve net zero carbon by 2050?
- Q36: How should the Local Plan ensure the right infrastructure is provided in line with development?
- Q12: How should the Local Plan help us improve the natural environment?

6.2 What did people tell us?

This section contains the analysis to the questions which had a quantitative element. These are the questions which asked respondents to tell us what they thought using a Likert scale, or to rank a range of options in order of preference.

Question 4: Do you agree that planning to 2040 is an appropriate date in the future to plan for?




43 website comments and 165 Opus 2 Consult/email responses were received to this question.

Most people agreed with this question, among respondents across all channels. 50% either agreed or strongly agreed with the question.

14% of website commenters (6 in total) and 96% of Opus 2 Consult/email respondents (165) left a written comment.

Question 5 - Do you think we have identified the right cross-boundary issues and initiatives that affect ourselves and neighbouring areas?




16 website comments and 110 Opus 2 Consult/email responses were received to this question.

More people agreed than disagreed with the question, with 45% answering ‘agree’ or strongly agree overall. Website commenters were less decided, but few website comments were received to this question. but 31% answering ‘neither agree nor disagree’ and 19% ‘disagree – no-one strongly agreed or strongly disagreed. There was no significant difference between anonymous and named responses.

56% of website commenters (9 in total) and 91% of Opus 2 Consult/email respondents (100 in total) left a written comment.

Question 6 - Do you agree with the potential big themes for the Local Plan?



12 website comments and 142 Opus 2 Consult/email responses were received to this question.

Most respondents agreed, with 52% either agreeing or strongly agreeing overall. It drew few neutral answers, and a significant minority of website commenters disagreed.


67% of website commenters (8 in total) and 86% of Opus 2 Consult/email respondents (166) left a written comment.

Question 7 – How do you think we should prioritise these big themes?

Overall, climate change was ranked highest by respondents, with 46 responses placing it highest, followed by wellbeing, which was ranked highest by 19 respondents. Great Places was ranked highest by 9 respondents and Biodiversity and Green Spaces ranked highest by 8 respondents.

Most respondents (37) ranked Great Places as their lowest priority.

Question 10 – Do you think we should require extra climate adaptation and resilience features to new developments?




19 website comments and 136 Opus 2 Consult/email responses were received to this question.

Most respondents agreed, with 51% either agreeing or strongly agreeing overall. Among web respondents, 89% strongly agreed.

68% of website commenters (13 in total) and 93% of Opus 2 Consult/email respondents (126) left a written comment.

Question 15: Do you agree that we should aim to increase tree cover across the area?




29 website comments and 156 Opus 2 Consult/email responses were received to this question.

There was strong agreement to this question, with 80% either agreeing or strongly agreeing overall. Among web respondents, 97% strongly agreed.

76% of website commenters (22 in total) and 85% of Opus 2 Consult/email respondents (156) left a written comment.

Question 24: How important do you think continuing economic growth is for the Local Plan?




35 website comments and 144 Opus 2 Consult/email responses were received to this question.

Most respondents felt that continuing economic growth was important, with 49% either agreeing or strongly agreeing overall.

71% of website commenters (35 in total) and 98% of Opus 2 Consult/email respondents (141) left a written comment.

Question 29 – How flexible should we be about the uses we allow in our city, town and district centres?




8 website comments and 77 Opus 2 Consult/email responses were received to this question.

Most respondents felt we should be flexible, with 64% overall answering very or somewhat flexible. Website commenters strongly felt that some, but not a lot of flexibility was preferable, although there were relatively few respondents to this question.

88% of website commenters (8 in total), and 57% of Opus 2 Consult/email respondents (77) left a written comment.

Question 32 - Do you think we should plan for a higher number of homes than the minimum required by government, to provide flexibility to support the growing economy?




14 website comments and 225 Opus 2 Consult/email responses were received to this question.

Overall, more respondents agreed than disagreed with the question, with 49% of comments answering either strongly or somewhat agree. However website commenters were heavily split, with 43% strongly disagreeing, and 29% strongly agreeing.

71% of website commenters (10 in total) and 96% of Opus 2 Consult/email respondents (217) left a written comment.

Question 39 - Should we look to remove land from the Green Belt if evidence shows it provides a more sustainable development option by reducing travel distances, helping us reduce our climate impacts?




26 website comments and 154 Opus 2 Consult/email responses were received to this question.

More respondents answered 'Yes' than 'No' overall, with 44% answering yes. However this was heavily skewed by the large number Opus 2 Consult/email responses of which 45% answered 'Yes' while of the relatively smaller number of website comments, 65% answered 'No'.

69% of website commenters (18 in total) and 95% of Opus 2 Consult/email respondents (147) left a written comment.

Question 40 - How flexible should the Local Plan be towards development of both jobs and homes on the edge of villages?




21 website comments and 164 Opus 2 Consult/email responses were received to this question.

There were a large number of Opus 2 Consult/email responses which did not answer the quantitative element to this question. Of the responses received, overall flexibility was favoured, with 41% supporting a highly or somewhat flexible approach. This resulted from the larger number of Opus 2 Consult/email responses, as from website commenters, 48% favoured keeping the current approach and 24% restricting further, with only 28% supporting flexibility in some form.


57% of website commenters (12 in total) and 98% of Opus 2 Consult/email respondents (160) left a written comment.

Question 42 - Where should we site new development?



119 website comments and 224 Opus 2 Consult/email responses were received to this question.

Densification was ranked as the preferred location by 35% of respondents overall. There was little disagreement between respondents on different channels. Where respondents would least like to see development was somewhat more divided. Overall, the edge of Cambridge in the Greenbelt, and dispersal in new settlements, were least favoured, but website commenters strongly disfavoured greenbelt sites while Opus 2 Consult/email respondents strongly disfavoured new settlements.



7. Response to Call for Sites

We received 675 site suggestions totalling 16,359 hectares of land as of 16 October 2020.

Respondents were asked to provide estimates of the capacity for new residential and non-residential development on each site. Not all promoters provided this information, and some promoters provided a range of figures for their site. To assist with evaluation of the sites, where no capacity estimate was provided, the Planning Service has estimated the site capacity based on the following ratios:

- Residential development – an average density of 40 homes per hectare
- Employment development – a floorspace ratio (plot ratio) of 50%. This means that 50% of the site area is assumed to be developed into net lettable floorspace.

The estimated capacity of sites is as follows:

Residential capacity

- Suggested capacity for new homes (estimated by promoter, low end of range): 171,877
- Suggested capacity for new homes (estimated by promoter, high end of range): 180,426
- GCSP estimate of new homes capacity for sites where promoter did not provide an estimate: 38,200

The figures above do not include promoter estimates of 310 care home beds (on 4 sites), and two sites where more complex considerations prevent an estimate being made at this stage.

Non-residential capacity

- Suggested capacity for non-residential floorspace (estimated by promoter, low end of range): 5,793,976m²
- Suggested capacity for non-residential floorspace (estimated by promoter, high end of range): 5,823,976m²
- GCSP estimate of non-residential capacity for sites where promoter did not provide an estimate: 668,200m²

The figures above do not include one site which was promoted for two alternative options: for 8,000-10,000m² non-residential floorspace if developed as a mixed use site in conjunction with residential; or for 20,000m² of non-residential floorspace if developed for non-residential uses only.

8. Response to Call for Green Sites

21 sites were submitted, including the whole of the Cambridge Green Belt and Cambridge Airport as well as the 'Cambridge Great Park' concept. The total area of sites submitted is therefore very large – 28,876 hectares.

The Green Infrastructure evidence base study currently in progress has also been seeking community views about where green infrastructure should be protected and expanded and results of this study will be published in due course.

Appendix A: Number of responses received to each question

Question number	Question text	Website comments	Opus 2 Consult/email responses	Total
1	How do you think we should involve our communities and stakeholders in developing the Plan?	7	125	132
2	Call for Sites	N/A	656	656
3	Call for Green Sites	N/A	21	21
4	Do you agree that planning to 2040 is an appropriate date in the future to plan for?	43	165	208
5	Do you think we have identified the right cross-boundary issues and initiatives that affect ourselves and neighbouring areas?	16	110	126
6	Do you agree with the potential big themes for the Local Plan?	12	180	192
7	How do you think we should prioritise these big themes? Rank the options below (Top – Most Preferred; Bottom – Least Preferred)	12	142	154
8	How should the Local Plan help us achieve net zero carbon by 2050?	89	181	270
9	How do you think we should be reducing our impact on the climate? Have we missed any key actions?	16	150	166
10	Do you think we should require extra climate adaptation and resilience features to new developments?	19	136	155
11	Are there any other things we should be doing to adapt to climate change?	10	108	118
12	How should the Local Plan help us improve the natural environment?	57	139	196

13	How do you think we should improve the green space network?	10	137	147
14	How do we achieve biodiversity net gain through new developments?	5	151	156
15	Do you agree that we should aim to increase tree cover across the area?	29	156	185
16	How should the Local Plan help us achieve 'good growth' that promotes wellbeing and social inclusion?	37	203	240
17	How do you think our plan could help enable communities to shape new development proposals?	10	90	100
18	How do you think we can make sure that we achieve safe and inclusive communities when planning new development?	11	145	156
19	How do you think new developments should support healthy lifestyles?	11	173	184
20	How do you think we should achieve improvements in air quality?	15	132	147
21	How should the Local Plan protect our heritage and ensure new development is well-designed?	27	86	113
22	How do you think we should protect, enhance and adapt our historic buildings and landscapes?	5	81	86
23	How do you think we could ensure that new development is as well-designed as possible?	10	114	124
24	How important do you think continuing economic growth is for the next Local Plan?	35	144	179

25	What kind of business and industrial space do you think is most needed in the area?	4	95	99
26	Do you think we should be protecting existing business and industrial space?	3	76	79
27	How should we balance supporting our knowledge-intensive sectors, with creating a wide range of different jobs? What kind of jobs would you like to see created in the area?	6	59	65
28	In providing for a range of employment space, are there particular locations we should be focusing on? Are there specific locations important for different types of business or industry?	4	101	105
29	How flexible should we be about the uses we allow in our city, town, district, local and village centres?	8	77	85
30	What approach should the next plan take to supporting or managing tourism in Cambridge and the rural area?	8	67	75
31	How should the Local Plan help to meet our needs for the amount and types of new homes?	37	190	227
32	Do you think we should plan for a higher number of homes than the minimum required by government, to provide flexibility to support the growing economy?	14	225	239
33	What kind of housing do you think we should provide?	7	175	182
34	How should we meet the need for additional Gypsy, Traveller and caravan sites?	11	45	56

35	How should we ensure a high standard of housing is built in our area?	9	107	116
36	How should the Local Plan ensure the right infrastructure is provided in line with development?	69	119	188
37	How should we encourage a shift away from car use and towards more sustainable modes of transport such as public transport, cycling and walking?	33	229	262
38	What do you think the priorities are for new infrastructure?	3	104	107
39	Should we look to remove land from the Green Belt if evidence shows it provides a more sustainable development option by reducing travel distances, helping us reduce our climate impacts?	26	154	180
40	How flexible should the Local Plan be towards development of both jobs and homes on the edge of villages?	21	164	185
41		0	105	106
42	Where should we site new development? Rank the options below 1-6 (1 – Most Preferred 6 – Least Preferred)	119	224	343
43	What do you think about densification?	27	105	132
44	What do you think about developing around the edge of Cambridge on land outside the Green Belt?	9	87	96
45	What do you think about developing around the edge of Cambridge in the Green Belt?	22	112	134
46	What do you think about creating planned new settlements?	20	96	116

47	What do you think about growing our villages?	20	179	199
48	What do you think about siting development along transport corridors?	20	133	153
49	Do you have any views on any specific policies in the two adopted 2018 Local Plans? If so, what are they?	11	120	131
50	What do you think should be in the next Local Plan? Are there issues, ideas or themes that you don't feel we have yet explored?	22	111	133
51	Generic question – email submissions which contained responses that were not explicitly answering one of the questions have been entered here.		423	