

GCLP Webinar 2 'Jobs and homes'

Responses to questions submitted during the live session.

Question 1

Please explain calculation for Medium + target for growth

The 'medium +' housing growth level is the level of housing associated with the medium job's growth level, incorporating the assumption that all the additional homes generated by forecast jobs above those supported by government's minimum Standard Method homes will be provided in full within Greater Cambridge. A full explanation of this is set out at section 4 of our [Strategy topic paper](#).

Question 2

There are an additional 2,000 homes shown as 'existing' on the Waterbeach Development.

Outline planning permission for up to 6,500 dwellings (including up to 600 residential institutional units), business, retail, community, leisure and sports use, a hotel, schools, and open spaces, was granted in September 2019 on the western part of the site. On the eastern part of the site, the South Cambridgeshire District Council's planning committee in January 2021 gave officers delegated powers to approve an outline planning application for up to 4,500 dwellings, business, retail, community, leisure and sports uses, new primary and secondary schools and sixth form centre, and public open spaces, subject to the completion of a s106 agreement. The total number of dwellings following the consideration of the planning applications is therefore 11,000 dwellings.

The First Proposals does not add to this, but our evidence says that it is reasonable to assume that annual delivery rates at Northstowe and Waterbeach will be higher than so far relied on, meaning that more of the planned homes will be completed in

the plan period, with less to follow after 2041. This was guided by our Housing Delivery Study, which indicated that for new settlements a maximum of 300 dwellings a year can be relied upon, therefore additional 50 dwellings a year to the 250 dwellings a year already including in the Greater Cambridge Housing Trajectory (April 2021).

Question 3

Is it correct that if the number of jobs exceeds the number planned in First proposals, the number of homes planned will have to increase?

This question has been answered live

Question 4

Are there proposals to remove sites from the 135 hectares supply of land already allocated for economic development in the current Local Plan?

This question has been answered live

Question 5

Surely there are planning controls on jobs directly as well as homes. This is not something that we have to accept - we can control it?

Similar questions were discussed in the live webinar.

Question 6

Is there a Save Chat / Q&As facility?

This note captures and responds to the additional questions which were not answered live.

Question 7

Thank You Stephen, that's helpful a number of us including a local SCDC rep. seems to have passed us by.

No response needed.

Question 8

The number of homes and sensitivity of sites, surely, we should err on caution as change in working practices (post Covid) will surely likely make a difference in demand for city-based homes.

It is too early to know yet what the eventual impact of COVID-19 will be on the needs of our communities in the period up to 2041, which is the period we are planning for. The data we used to inform our economic forecasting is all pre-COVID-19 because we do not yet have comprehensive economic data regarding the impacts, and many of the impacts are still unfolding. Ahead of the Draft Plan publication we will revisit our employment and housing evidence to reconfirm our needs for jobs and homes, drawing on the latest available information.

Question 9

Is planning for fewer jobs an option, i.e., limiting employment land available, so that jobs are diverted to other areas (levelling up)?

This question has been answered live

Question 10

Is it not the case though that it is necessary to put up a plan that is sustainable- given uncertainties for housing demand - (City Based) and water shortages means the numbers proposed are not sustainable - a case surely to at least go for medium growth level not medium Plus- the impact in shorter term e.g., requirement of AW to relocate and as it turns out Green Belt within GCP is irreversible - if not required longer term terrible sacrifice?

A considerable amount of evidence has been prepared to support the plan which considers a wide range of sustainability issues, in order that growth can be delivered sustainably.

The medium plus was selected as the preferred approach because it would have the effect of providing opportunities for workers in the additional jobs beyond the standard method to live close to where they work. This approach is more consistent with the local plan theme of net zero carbon and provides greater certainty that the homes would be delivered. More information on this issue can be found in the Strategy Topic Paper, available in the [Local Plan document library](#).

Question 11

The national policy constraints on the Local Plan are understood. They entail significant risks which is our responsibility to point out and seek mitigation for. Employment growth led housing development risks of market driven growth - and not providing truly affordable housing due to people coming from elsewhere to get attractive jobs pushing up housing prices - plus buy to let and overseas investment - and the absence of proposals for housing at "social" not "affordable" rents plus doing away with the right to buy. Hence the great unease about the Local Plan which is captive to central government growth obsession - despite its adverse effect on "levelling up".

This is more a comment than a question. The First Proposals includes proposals to address a range of issues, and we would encourage people to take part.

Question 12

Do you have an overlay with employment shown with housing growth?

In 2020, we published the [Strategic Spatial Options Methodology document](#), which in appendix 8 provides a series of maps regarding housing and employment. There is also considerable information on employment sites in our Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study, available to view in the [Local Plan document library](#).

Question 13

Can you tell us what employment numbers are already in the current plan and the difference between the 58,500 proposed?

The adopted Local Plans cover the period between 2011 and 2031 and anticipated 44,100 jobs over that 20-year period. However, evidence indicates that employment growth has been faster than anticipated. These issues are explored in detail in our Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study, available to view in the [Local Plan document library](#).