

Objective B: Housing

Proximity to Cambridge, limited land supply within the Development Framework and the constraints of a Conservation Area, drive house prices well beyond 5-6 times average local incomes. **This leads to a low supply of new homes, especially those regarded as “affordable”.**

This challenge is acute for the young and those facing diminished incomes on retirement or separation.

The survey completed as part of the plan preparation identified provision of more affordable homes within the village as a priority.



Extended Village Residential Framework: Preliminary Residential Site Selection

Preliminary Site Selection

The map above and table below show the effect of applying a sequence of sustainability tests, including the 800 metre easy walking distance - shown as a yellow ring - and protection of views including the Grade I listed All Saints Church shown as red sight zones, to various clusters of fields around the village.

Community Land Trusts acquire and develop land that is otherwise “undevelopable” passing a modest profit to the landowner but, because of lower land costs are able to deliver housing to local people at much lower prices than otherwise possible.

The pace of development will be constrained, in particular, by the need to invest in village infrastructure, so as not to exceed the absorptive capacity of the Cottenham Primary School, and to ensure the design mitigates other fears expressed in the NP survey. Separation between the sites will preserve views of open countryside.

Question H/1 Sites P, Q and R all have current applications for **100+ houses each. At this scale, they create significant traffic and other issues. They are close to the Primary School and Village Hall but distant from village shops etc.**

Question – would any of them be acceptable if they were for 50 or less houses?

Question H/2 Sites E, F, S, T and U are all in Green Belt and “untouchable” for development. **However, sites E and F are close to the village shops and facilities, including the schools**
Question – should we attempt to get E and F “developable” by a Community Land Trust?

Question H/3 Sites B, D and possibly C might be suitable. **Sites B and D are close to the village shops and facilities, including the schools**
Question – could parts of B and D each support 50 houses?

Cluster	Flood Risk	Green Belt	In LDF	In 800m	Vistas	Access	Traffic Impact	Aggregated?	Further review?
A	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	Broad Lane	High	No	No – flood risk to access
B	No	No	No	Yes	No	High St	High	No	Yes - Residential
C	No	No	No	Yes	No	Long Drove	Low	No	Yes - Residential
D	No	No	No	Yes	No	Beach Road	Low	No	Yes - Residential
E	No	2019rev?	No	Yes	No	Beach Rd	Low	No	2019
F	No	2019rev?	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	2019
G	No?	No	No	Yes	G2 Tower	No		No	No - Recreation
J	No	No	No	No	No	Beach Rd	Low	No	Yes industrial
K	No	No	No	No	No	20p Rd	Medium	No	Yes Industrial
P	Yes	No	No	No, 950m	G2 Tower	Rampton Rd	High	Yes	Under application
Q	Yes	No	No	No, 1,000m	Edge	Rampton Rd	High	Yes	Under application
R	No?	No	No	No, 900m	Edge	Oakington Rd	High	Yes	Under application
S	No	Yes	No	No, 900m	Edge	Oakington Rd	Low	No	No - Green Belt
T	No	Yes	No	No, 1,000m	Edge	Histon Rd	Medium	No	No - Green Belt
U	No	Yes	No	No, 1,100m	Edge	Beach Rd	Low	No	No - Green Belt
V	No	No	No	No	Countryside	High St	High	No	No – Conservation Area
W	No	No	No	No	Countryside	High St	High	No	No – Conservation Area