

Appendix B: Summaries of Representations – Sites and Policy Areas

Contents

Cambridge Urban Area	3
S/NEC: North East Cambridge.....	11
S/AMC: Areas of Major Change	42
S/OA: Opportunity Areas in Cambridge	48
S/LAC: Other site allocations in Cambridge	69
The edge of Cambridge	90
S/CE: Cambridge East	100
S/NWC: North West Cambridge.....	117
S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke’s Hospital).....	123
S/WC: West Cambridge	156
S/EOC: Other existing allocations on the edge of Cambridge.....	162
New settlements.....	170
S/CB: Cambourne	177
S/NS: Existing new settlements	193

The rural southern cluster	207
S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton	216
S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus	220
S/RSC: Other site allocations in the rural southern cluster	249
S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster.....	272
Rest of the rural area	280
S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area	290
S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area.....	353

Cambridge Urban Area

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Cambridge urban area](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

28 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on development in the urban area of Cambridge, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific sites within the urban area. These comments have been moved to the relevant site specific policy: S/NEC: North East Cambridge and S/C/SCL: Land south of Coldham's Lane.

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

General support for developing in the Cambridge urban area, with particular support from Parish Councils, Huntingdonshire District Council and the University of Cambridge for: protection of the historic core, appropriate design for new developments, regeneration of areas that are not fulfilling their potential, re-use of brownfield sites (particularly existing buildings) and enabling a decrease in

climate impacts. Concerns from Teversham PC about the benefits of redeveloping particular sites if these facilities are lost or relocated to rural areas, and about the loss of green spaces for wildlife and quality of life. Concerns from Cambridge Past, Present & Future and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties about the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the scale of the proposed growth. Comments from Parish Councils, Cambridgeshire County Council and University of Cambridge about private car use, and use of alternative forms of transport. Site promoters' comments highlight the need for a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge and the problems of focussing on large sites. Comments that no reference has been made to the pandemic and its implications for future development. Support for protection of historic core, however, Historic England and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlight need to consider wider setting and views, and need for more detailed considerations and evidence.

Table of representations: Cambridge urban area

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Generally and broadly support these developments.	58043 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 58364 (Linton PC)
Support ambition for historic core to be protected and enhanced by appropriate new development of highest design quality and for regeneration of areas that are not fulfilling their potential.	58314 (University of Cambridge)
General support for development of sustainable brownfield sites in and around north east Cambridge, on the basis these will have the necessary infrastructure and a lower carbon footprint.	59469 (Shepreth PC)
Support for proposals making use of brownfield sites, as this will reduce pressure on rural areas. However, need to ensure have	59247 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
character and are not just blocks of flats that do not match the surrounding area.	
Agree new neighbourhoods should be delivered on brownfield sites such as North East Cambridge.	57320 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Question benefits of redevelopment of retail parks and football ground, as will have a detrimental effect on local facilities and will potentially result in current occupiers looking for new sites in rural areas.	59247 (Teversham PC)
Huge challenge to balance wildlife vs people in the urban area. More gardens (rather than relying on parks) are needed to support wildlife.	59247 (Teversham PC)
Loss of grassland has a negative impact on the environment and quality of life. Also results in concerns about flooding as loss of green areas for water to soakaway.	59247 (Teversham PC)
Support any potential for change of use of existing buildings.	59899 (Fen Ditton PC)
Support for good designed, active compact new developments, reuse of brownfield land, and continued development of larger neighbourhoods where possible.	60113 (C Blakeley)
Cambridge urban area needs to be sympathetically developed before considering greenfield sites in South Cambridgeshire.	56722 (Croydon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The urban area should be the focus for new homes (alongside new settlements).	56805 (M Colville)
Agree urban area should be focus for new developments, as this will enable the Councils to achieve their vision of a big decrease in climate impacts, minimising carbon emissions, and reduce reliance on the private car. Will have a positive impact on surrounding areas.	57320 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Concerned about the capacity of the urban area to accommodate the scale of the proposed growth – particularly inadequate space in historic streets and city centre for people to move about.	58252 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60189 (J Preston), 60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Adopted Local Plan includes a requirement for a Supplementary Planning Document to address capacity issues within city, but so far limited progress on its preparation.	58252 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Capacity issues need to be tackled, and only if they can be resolved should additional growth be allowed.	60189 (J Preston), 60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Over reliance on proposed development in urban area and to north east of Cambridge to support the housing needs arising from employment areas to south of the city.	58716 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Concerns that transport projects are being led by separate bodies and do not appear to be co-ordinated. Particularly concerned that many of the projects are designed to benefit Cambridge city alone, to the detriment of surrounding villages.	59041 (Great Shelford PC)
Unconvinced that realistic traffic modelling has been used – main roads into Cambridge already have high volumes and are gridlocked in the rush hour and at weekends. Additional development will have a big impact on these roads and the volume of traffic, even with wish to minimise car use.	59247 (Teversham PC)
The term ‘unnecessary private car use’ is very subjective, would recommend a clearer definition.	56926 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Need to link to Cambourne and East West Rail to maximise the benefits.	56926 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Need to recognise that some private car use will still be needed. Need to recognise the difference between car ownership and car usage. Try to discourage car usage, but accept there will be car ownership.	57648 (Histon & Impington PC)
Lack of secure parking will lead to on-street parking creating issues for emergency vehicles and inconveniencing those with	57648 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
restricted mobility or vision. Needs to be parking for trades people and to make deliveries.	
Agree Cambridge should be a place where walking, cycling and public transport is the natural choice and where unnecessary private car use is discouraged to help achieve net zero carbon.	58314 (University of Cambridge)
Welcome engagement with Network Rail to ensure that Cambridge South Station maximises use of active travel, provides sufficient drop-off/collection points, and does not cause a negative impact on surrounding area.	56926 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Recognise that locating development within Cambridge is sustainable, however too much emphasis on this location in the Local Plan as the focus on providing large sites could lead to problems with infrastructure provision and housing delivery.	57154 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57201 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
Should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities.	57154 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57201 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
More focus on home working since the pandemic, therefore less reliance on needing to be located close to urban areas and less need/desire to be located there.	57154 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57201 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No reference to the pandemic and opportunities for city centre residential and other uses resulting from changes in retail.	60189 (J Preston)
Health services and facilities – any new allocations must undertake an assessment of existing health infrastructure capacity and fully mitigate the impact on the proposed development through appropriate planning obligations. Early engagement needed with the NHS to agree the form of infrastructure required.	59140 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Site specific allocations should set out the principles for delivering improvements to general health and wellbeing, and promote healthy and green lifestyle choices through well-designed places.	59140 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Essential that all development is synchronised with the relevant infrastructure.	59150 (M Berkson)
<p>The following should be used as principles for selecting areas for sustainable development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • taking opportunities to regenerate areas that are not yet reaching their potential • development carefully designed to respect the historic character of the city 	57928 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Welcome the reference to the protection and enhancement of the historic core, but need to consider that the setting of Cambridge is broader than that and includes views into and across the historic city.	59599 (Historic England)
Agree that development must be carefully designed to respect the historic character of the city but this aspiration is not backed up by detailed plans or evidence.	60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Strategic Heritage Impact Assessment claim that "future growth in Cambridge has the potential to strengthen and reinforce these characteristics, enabling the City to meet contemporary environmental, economic and social drivers without undermining its economic identity" is not supported by evidence.	60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Green Belt assessment ignores historic environment designations.	60740 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Essential to consider transport issues in Cambridge, and to ensure that disabled individuals have the ability to access the city centre including parking for adapted vehicles.	58091 (R Wallach)
No new cultural provision included, or other city scale uses, therefore greater pressure on existing uses.	60189 (J Preston)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The map in Figure 14 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.	58110 (M Asplin), 58112 (M Asplin)
Should refer to 'regenerating or enhancing' rather than just 'regenerating' parts of the city that are not fulfilling their potential.	58346 (ARU)
<p>Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities • over reliance on proposed development in urban area and to north east of Cambridge to support the housing needs arising from employment areas to south of the city 	57154 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57201 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 58716 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)

S/NEC: North East Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/NEC: North East Cambridge](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

64 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the Cambridge urban area or edge of Cambridge headings as the comments were specific to North East Cambridge. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

The majority of comments received were in objection to development at North East Cambridge due to reliance on relocation of the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) and concerns for the environmental and wellbeing impacts of the relocation of the WWTP to a Green Belt site. Comments raised concern that the relocation of the WWTP was contrary to the protection and enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt, with the demolition of an operational sewage plant, and relocation causing the destruction of Honey Hill. Concerns for the Development Consent Order (DCO) process were also raised, particularly the deliverability of 4,000 homes being expected to be built in the plan period, given the dependence on a successful DCO, and viability concerns with potential impact on affordable housing and infrastructure delivery. Comments questioned whether the relocation of the WWTP was a 'requirement' of the plan or not, and due to these concerns thought that the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and this policy should be reconsidered. Some comments suggested that the Cambridge East site at the existing Marshall airport site, presented a realistic alternative for development on brownfield land.

Other comments were in objection to development at North East Cambridge, for reasons including: unsustainability of the location, lack of green open space provision, concern for over-reliance on existing provision such as Milton Country Park and Wicken Fen. Concerns were raised by The Wildlife Trust, Parish Councils, Cambridge Past, Present & Future, National Trust, Campaign to Protect Rural England, Save Honey Hill Group, Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations, Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties, some developers, and other individuals.

There was particular concern for the high density of the development, and heights that are unprecedented in the Cambridge area. However, Historic England were keen to continue to work alongside GCSP on areas that will need to be addressed, including heights, densities, mass, views, light, treatment of heritage sensitivities, including through recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment.

There was some support for the policy, with particular support from Historic England, Gonville & Caius College, Anglian Water Services Ltd, some Parish Councils and a number of developers for the following reasons: delivery in a sustainable location, good accessibility along the transport corridor, the exciting opportunity for regeneration, and delivery of a sustainable neighbourhood.

In addition to these representations, question 4 of the questionnaire was also related to the provision of housing, jobs, facilities and open spaces at North East Cambridge. Many responses voiced similar concerns that appeared in the representations to the policy, particularly in relation to the potential impact upon the environment and biodiversity due to the relocation of the WWTP onto a Green Belt site. Additionally, comments thought that the development should be built at lower density, with affordable homes to accommodate families, and provision of retail and leisure facilities within a 15-minute radius to support the local community without having to travel elsewhere.

Table of representations: S/NEC – North East Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
General support for the policy, including for the following reasons:	56567 (Croydon PC), 56806 (M Colville),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exciting opportunity for regeneration • Highly accessible site • Delivery of homes • Good public and active transport • A sustainable neighbourhood and location • Waterbeach and NEC transport corridor is a focus for growth • This brownfield site is in accordance with the NPPF approach to sustainable development. 	<p>56864 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 59268 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen), 59603 (Historic England), 59870 (East West Rail), 60114 (C Blakeley), 60150 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60264 (Gonville & Caius College), 60447 (Anglian Water Services Ltd), 60763 (U+I Group PLC), 58565 (Brockton Everlast)</p>
<p>Development in this location is unsustainable, and therefore the policy is not supported, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of new houses already committed in the adopted Local Plans is sufficient to meet objectively assessed need • contrary to climate change policies • contrary to biodiversity and green spaces policies • contrary to wellbeing and social inclusion policies • contrary to great places policy, particularly GP/GB: Protection and Enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt (due to relocation of WWTP) 	<p>59282 (National Trust), 60678 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties), 57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin), 57057 (The Wildlife Trust), 57471 (C Martin), 57649 (Histon & Impington PC), 58295 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58967 (Endurance Estate), 57643* (J Conroy), 57499 (A Martin), 59551 (CPRE), 60190 (J Preston), 59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited) 60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College), (59055 (Axis Land Partnerships), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group), 59900 (Fen Ditton PC), 60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60503 (A de Burgh), 56474 (M Starkie), 56478 (P</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no operational need to relocate the plant • lack of green infrastructure and open space provision • Site is too high in density • Do not support delivery of homes • Questionable deliverability and viability of homes in the plan period • Concern for relocation of the WWTP and impacts, including on the environment and wellbeing • Concern for DCO process and likely impacts, including on affordable housing delivery. 	Halford), 57664 (J Conroy), 60036 (T Warnock), 58417 (F Gawthrop), 59159 (M Berkson), 58063 (Horningsea PC), 56469 (A Martin),
Development at the Marshall airfield site should be built up before NEC. Marshall will be vacant by 2030, supposedly the construction of NEC will start in 2028. This would be a better option as at Marshall airfield there is one owner and no existing infrastructure, allowing it to be developed with real green spaces.	58353 (C Lindley), 57499 (A Martin), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
St John's College has welcomed the opportunity to engage throughout this process and looks forward to continuing engagement. It is important that developments that will not	58891 (St John's College Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
prejudice the ambitions of the plan continue to be considered on their own merits whilst the specific policies are evolving.	
The exclusion of a draft allocation for Cambridge Science Park North (CSPN) at this stage is regrettable and it is TCC's view that following a review of both the supporting evidence bases for the JLP and North East Cambridge Action Plan (NECAAP), that neither documents current aims are deliverable without CSPN being allocated.	59269 (Trinity College)
Request that GCLP policy for S/NEC is entirely consistent with NEC AAP. A simple policy that specifies reference to NEC AAP will enable GCLP policy to remain up to date, as and when changes are made through the examination and adoption process.	60150 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60763 (U+I Group PLC)
GCSPS have taken an inconsistent approach in terms of the scoring of North- East Cambridge site within the HELAA than they have for land adjacent to Rectory Farm. Land at Rectory Farm has been deemed unsuitable on the basis of additional traffic pressure on the A14, however Cambridge North- East, which is both a significantly larger development and closer to the A14 has been deemed suitable on transport grounds. It is	60264 (Gonville & Caius College)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
therefore unclear, why a different approach appears to have been taken between Cambridge North- East and land at Rectory Farm in this regard, which is not justified or sound in planning terms.	
No comment.	58365 (Linton PC)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Relocation of the WWTP / Delivery)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Object to the relocation of the WWTP as it is contrary to Policy GP/GB: Protection and Enhancement of the Cambridge Green Belt. Particular reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • destruction of Green Belt • impact on open spaces • impact on biodiversity • impact on surrounding SSSI's • loss of valuable farmland • impact on local communities • densification is against GP/GB • unsustainable location, creating a brownfield site 	<p>56469 (A Martin), 56474 (M Starkie), 56478 (P Halford), 57471 (C Martin), 57608 (J Pratt), 57664 (J Conroy), 58063 (Horningsea PC), 58115 (M Asplin), 58417 (F Gawthrop), 59159 (M Berkson), 59282 (National Trust), 59591 (CPRE), 59900 (Fen Ditton PC), 60036 (T Warnock), 60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60503 (A de Burgh), 60678 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • carbon cost of relocating WWTP • destroys buffer between ancient settlements and new developments • Cop26 and the pandemic should change the priority of the move • Destruction of Honey Hill. 	
<p>Object to parts of the policy. The area is described as a significant brownfield site. This is not correct as it is occupied by commercial buildings. It can only become brownfield if vacated by relocating the Cambridge Wastewater Treatment Plant to Honey Hill. The relocation depends on a successful DCO and therefore this policy cannot come into effect if the application fails. There is no operational need to relocate the plant, that would cost at least £227 million of taxpayers money. Other modern works in UK have been amended or built to minimise their odour and traffic footprint and allow a much smaller buffer zone. A realistic alternative would be to amend the works. Therefore, the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan and this policy should be reconsidered.</p>	<p>56474 (M Starkie), 56478 (P Halford), 57664 (J Conroy), 58417 (F Gawthrop), 59900 (Fen Ditton PC), 60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60503 (A de Burgh), 60678 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties), 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>NEC development is predicated on the move of the Waste Water Treatment plant. This was voted for by Councillors without due regard to its possible designation. Anglian Water nominated Honey Hill as the location in the Green Belt.</p>	<p>56469 (A Martin)</p>
<p>The map shown in the plan does not show the destruction of the Green Belt that the WWTP will have.</p>	<p>56469 (A Martin)</p>
<p>There is no mention of the WWTPR moving to Green Belt with the GCSP stating to clarify that the relocation of the Cambridge WWTP is not a “requirement” of the North-East Cambridge Area Action Plan. The plan should not be ambiguous. There is a regulatory requirement that the public and all consultees have sufficient information about any significant effects of the Local Plan in order to make a judgement. Horningsea PC believes that Councils are hiding behind the DCO. The public has the right to know why it is being expected to give up Green Belt (high grade agricultural land with important recreational value).</p>	<p>58063 (Horningsea PC), 59900 (Fen Ditton PC), 60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents’ Associations)</p>
<p>Greater Cambridge is reliant on 8,350 new homes being delivered at North-East Cambridge under Policy S/NEC. This is a significant level of housing to be provided on a brownfield site, part of which is contaminated and comprises a sewage works.</p>	<p>57155 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57204 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 57321 (Huntingdonshire DC), 60264 (Gonville & Caius College)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>There are likely to be significant costs associated with remediating the site and potential time delays on bringing development forward on the site. It is considered that the Council should look at providing more of a range of smaller and medium sites that have the ability to come forward at a faster rate than strategic sites of this size.</p>	
<p>Careful consideration should be taken to ensure the Councils have additional housing sites to meet housing needs if delivery slows as a result of the relocation of the WWTP. Need to ensure there aren't additional demands on the wider housing market in surrounding areas as a result of under delivery in Greater Cambridgeshire.</p>	57321 (Huntingdonshire DC)
<p>Whilst the approach to the Local Plan and North East Cambridge AAP/DCO is acknowledged, there is a risk that the relocation waste water treatment plant proposals could be delayed, which in turn will influence the remaining stages of the Local Plan process, should the Local Plan continue to be contingent on Anglian Water's DCO. The GCSP should consider accelerating the Local Plan ahead of the DCO if this begins hold up the progress of the Local Plan.</p>	58379 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Question the deliverability and viability of 4,000 homes being delivered within the plan period given relocation of WWTP and remediation which will be required as part of any development proposal. In view of the average length of time it takes to achieve a DCO consent and the significant remediation that will be required prior to the construction of housing, we have strong reservations with regards to the draft trajectory.</p>	<p>57337 (HD Planning Ltd), 58967 (Endurance Estate), 59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 60264 (Gonville & Caius College), 60297 (Miller Homes – Fulbourn site), 60304 (Miller Homes – Melbourn site)</p>
<p>This allocation may cause the plan to be vulnerable to challenge at Examination stage.</p>	<p>57337 (HD Planning Ltd)</p>
<p>Object to the assumed housing trajectory lead in time and build out rates for NEC.</p>	<p>59055 (Axis Land Partnerships)</p>
<p>This site is subject to significant constraints. We consider that the Councils should review both the overall quantum of residential development to be allocated to the NECAAP Area and the ability of the site to deliver within the Local Plan Period to 2041.</p>	<p>58402 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58967 (Endurance Estate), 59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 60252 (T Orgee)</p>
<p>Anglian Water claim in their submission to the Planning Inspectorate requesting a Scoping Opinion that it is local planning authority pressure for the developments in North East Cambridge which is forcing the move. However, in</p>	<p>59591 (CPRE)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>the Scoping Opinion for the proposed relocation prepared by the Planning Inspectorate, on page 6 of Appendix 2, the Shared Planning Service response states: “We would like to clarify that the relocation of the Cambridge WWTP is not a “requirement” of the North-East Cambridge Area Action Plan and must not be referred to as such. This is because we are not requiring the relocation, but the NEC AAP7 and the emerging joint Local Plan have identified the opportunity that the relocation creates for homes and jobs in the North-East Cambridge area.” So, we can only assume that the North East Area Action Plan can be progressed without the financially and environmentally costly move of the WWTP. This is very welcome news.</p>	
<p>Unsustainable as demolition of an operational sewage plant is not included in the sustainability appraisal.</p>	57471 (C Martin)
<p>Page 58 of the First Proposals says that an alternative to Policy S/NEC of retaining a consolidated waste water treatment works on its existing site (either as an indoors or outdoors facility) is not considered a “reasonable alternative” as it is not “deliverable or viable”. It is not clear what information has been taken into account when the Councils formed this conclusion and as a</p>	58967 (Endurance Estate), 59159 (M Berkson)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>result we have not been able to comment on this in any detail. We request further detail is provided to explain the Councils' decision making in this regard. We also note that Anglian Water's Initial Options Appraisal reported that it "would be technically feasible to consolidate the existing treatment assets and occupy a smaller area of the existing site" which appear to show that this policy option is possible.</p>	
<p>Concerns regarding the viability assumptions behind this site. The First Proposals Viability Appraisal by Aspinall Verdi makes a number of assumptions that we think are not reflective of the real world context in which it will come forward. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEC will be built out by a consortium of housebuilders, whereas it is far more likely a master developer model will be pursued. This has a substantial bearing on scheme viability given no allowance is made for the master-developer profit return. At the very minimum this needs to be tested as a scenario to stress test the assumptions made and ensure a robust approach. • The estimated market revenues require reconsideration. At an average of £452 per square foot these do not 	58967 (Endurance Estate)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>appear realistic for a development of this density and scale, where market saturation could become an issue. Again, sensitivity testing is required to ensure a robust approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The market revenues then have a knock-on impact on the affordable revenues, given they are based on the former. As a result, the modelled results show that the plot values of the social rent units are higher than First Homes (which are capped at £250,000 per plot). This does not seem correct and we would ask that more detail is provided around the calculation of affordable values and the evidence to support them. • The appraisal also includes zero S106 contributions, which should be included as a cost within any assessment of this nature. Please could information be provided as to why they are not included, or if they have been, where. <p>More information and viability evidence is also required in relation to:</p>	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>a) How the calculation of the residential coverage at 32,000sqft per net acre has been provided;</p> <p>b) how the included finance costs have been calculated;</p> <p>c) how the infrastructure costs at £30k per plot has been calculated; and</p> <p>d) how the abnormal costs of £1.15m been calculated and how these relate to any funding that the project has been granted.</p> <p>For a project of this complexity, more detail is needed to understand whether the assumptions are robust.</p>	
<p>Redevelopment of this site requires the relocation of the sewage treatment works and businesses. Development is therefore complex and highly likely to have delays and viability issues, resulting in reduction in affordable housing provided.</p>	60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)
<p>There is no mention in these plans of how relocation of the wastewater plant will address any of the concerns about all the sewage being dumped in the Cam or how Anglian Water proposes to make the River Cam clean and safe for all users.</p>	60239 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations)
<p>The spatial options review supporting the existing Local Plan (2018) identified a medium growth approach to NEC that did not require the relocation of CWWTP. This focused principally on</p>	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>employment, 15,000 jobs with homes in the region of 200 close to the station area and outside of the 500m odour buffer zone. These employment targets without the relocation of CWWTP match those of S/NEC in the First Proposals. It is recommended this option is represented as an alternative policy.</p>	
<p>Cambridge Airport now presents as a realistic alternative for major housing development on brownfield. The site fares well in the Sustainability Assessment and it has good links to employment sites. Furthermore, if careful planning was carried out, the 4,000 housing supply could be obtained by other locations, including the Cam airport, the Bio-medical campus and 1000 areas of Major Change.</p>	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
<p>The impact of large population increases in Greater Cambridge as a result of an unprecedented amount of new homes already in the pipeline, 30,000 + amounting to a 37% increase homes already existing in 2020, are yet to be known/tested and will not be known until mid-plan period and beyond. This high growth strategy may fail if sustainable solutions do not come to the fore in a timely way and the attractiveness of Cambridge for homes and business is eroded. The Aims of the Local Plan: 'Wellbeing</p>	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p data-bbox="203 256 1115 344">& Social inclusion' and 'Great Places' are of particular relevance and at risk here.</p>	
<p data-bbox="203 371 1115 903">If the vision for North East Cambridge level of densification etc., proves not to be popular and sustainable solutions to support the 31,000 homes already committed and yet to be built are not delivered, these homes, including the promise of affordable homes, may not be built in a timely way or the infrastructure promised realised. If Anglian Water's DCO is successful, long before any of the above are known or review of the impact of the high growth housing targets for Greater Cambridge are realised, relocation will have taken place with significant negative impacts on another area of Greater Cambridge in the Green Belt.</p>	<p data-bbox="1144 371 1592 403">56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)</p>
<p data-bbox="203 927 1115 1294">Omitting discussion of DCO planning process from the Local Plan seems quite extraordinary. Including NECAAP/S/NEC in the Local Plan First Proposals but excluding sufficient or significant information about the effects of the fulfilment of the Policy for effective public consultation at Reg 18 is contrary to the principals and regulations of the SA/SEA and will influence the Consultation and could be construed as effecting bias. This</p>	<p data-bbox="1144 927 1592 959">56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>anomaly is further exacerbated given that neither the emerging Local Plan nor NECAAP are dependent on the relocation.</p> <p>If it is regulatory to exclude reference to the site selected for relocation or subjecting the full effect of NECAAP to the SA/SEA within the emerging Local Plan, it is recommended in the interest of an informed and fair public consultation NECAAP is excluded from the Local Plan until after the outcome of the DCO is known and that an alternative is presented in the emerging Local Plan that can be subject to SA/SEA and an informed, evidence based public consultation at Reg 18.</p>	

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Climate change)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policy CC/NZ.	57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policy CC/CS	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
<p>Discussion with Anglian Water on how they might reduce the environmental footprint and physical area of their existing site could still yield some land for industrial and housing development. The Anglian</p>	59551 (CPRE)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Water site would form a convenient barrier between new developments and the A14.	
The existing site at Fen Road, Chesterton continues to be a source of ongoing local water quality and environmental health problems due to inadequate foul drainage provision. There have been a number of reports of foul sewage from the site discharging into the River Cam, causing chronic on-going pollution. The relocation of the existing Milton sewage works and extensive redevelopment of North East Cambridge presents the opportunity to incorporate mains drainage connection into the Fen Road site.	59720 (Environment Agency)
The intention of the policy is to set out the place-making vision and a robust planning framework for the comprehensive development of this site. There are both environmental risks and opportunities to developing this site sustainably. Ensuring sustainable water supplies, improving water quality and the effective remediation of land contamination will be key considerations in achieving this. The proposed policy direction anticipates the site (once developed in full, which will extend beyond the Local Plan period of 2041) will deliver 8,350 new	59720 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
homes. The IWMS Detailed WCS will need to provide evidence the new homes (and employment) can be sustainably supplied with water in time for the development phases.	
Since the site election for relocation by AW there has been no public consultation on the consequences or environmental effects of the Councils pursuing NECAAP /S/NEC in the context of the relocation to Honey Hill, nor has any alternative vision for NECAAP been presented in the emerging Local Plan First Proposals.	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Biodiversity and green spaces)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The AAP has fundamentally failed to provide for the strategic greenspace that the new population will require, with lacking open space provision and green infrastructure.	57057 (The Wildlife Trust), 57471 (C Martin), 57649 (Histon & Impington PC), 58295 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58967 (Endurance Estate), 59282 (National Trust)
The Local Plan HRA identifies the need to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces and not rely on existing provision such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milton Country Park • Wicken Fen 	57057 (The Wildlife Trust), 58282 (H Smith), 58295 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
It is essential that this policy and the AAP provide for sufficient strategic natural greenspace, which would also benefit other nearby communities with deficiencies in natural greenspace.	
Natural England's ANGSt would require NEC to have a 100ha site within 5km.	58295 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
<p>S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BG/GI • BG/RC • BG/PO • BG/EO 	57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin), 58967 (Endurance Estate), 59282 (National Trust) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Highly likely that 20% on site biodiversity net gain will be unachievable and will be dependent on off-site land acquisition or biodiversity credits.	58967 (Endurance Estate)
Allocation policy wording needs explicit objectives, or clear links to other policies on BNG and environmental design.	58984 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)
The proposal to create a country park as mitigation appears to be an underhand attempt at carbon offsetting on what is much needed, productive, carbon sequestering farmland.	59900 (Fen Ditton PC)
Formal sports pitches are required onsite	58282 (H Smith)
Cemetery provision is required	58282 (H Smith)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Welcome changes made to green space provision, following the consultation of the AAP.	60678 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Wellbeing and social inclusion)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policy WS/HS	57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Great places)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The site is too high in density with large scale overdevelopment of housing focused on a relatively small site.	57499 (A Martin), 58967 (Endurance Estate), 59551 (CPRE), 60190 (J Preston)
High density and heights are unprecedented in the Cambridge area raising significant challenges in terms of townscape impacts and the sites ability to deliver sustainable development.	58967 (Endurance Estate), 59282 (National Trust)
The development appears characterless and lacking in a practical base for a thriving community, so close to the expanded A14.	59551 (CPRE)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>S/NEC Policy is contrary to Policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GP/LC • GP/GB • GP/QP • GP/HA 	<p>57608 (J Pratt), 58115 (M Asplin) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)</p>
<p>This has potential to be a showcase development if done right. The plan should create high-density dwelling with plenty of green space (of varied kinds), recreation and entertainment facilities. The co-location of retail and dwelling provision should be used to enhance vibrancy</p>	<p>57711 (J Pavey)</p>
<p>Care is needed to ensure mistakes of the development around Cambridge Rail Station are not repeated.</p>	<p>56806 (M Colville)</p>
<p>Early residential phases provide opportunity for redevelopment whilst still being able to respond to local character. They have the potential to create a scheme of high design quality that would make a significant contribution to the emerging city district at Cambridge North. They will both generate the critical mass that generate exciting new places.</p>	<p>59268 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)</p>
<p>It will be important that the policy ensures the protection and enhancement of the historic environment including the</p>	<p>59603 (Historic England)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>conservation areas, river corridor and wider city scape. We welcome the preparation of an HIA for the site although as previously discussed we have raised some concerns about some aspects of the HIA. The HIA should inform the policy wording in the Plan as well as the NEC AAP.</p> <p>Look forward to ongoing work over the coming months as the revised Draft Local Plan and AAP are developed. Areas that will still need to be addressed include detailed consideration of heights, densities, mass, views from Anglesey Abbey, views from the south, revised wirelines/photomontages of reduced heights, consideration of issues such as light etc and the general treatment of the edge of City site including heritage sensitivities along the river corridor and from other assets.</p> <p>Ensure Historic environment considerations are included in policy, including recommendations of HIA. On-going discussions in relation to detail.</p>	
<p>The area is within close proximity to three conservation areas and villages; green infrastructure and numerous historical assets. The historical setting of Cambridge will be impacted.</p>	

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Jobs)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
A focus on employment growth in the area and improved sustainable public transport from within Cambridge City, Greater Cambridge and the wider region as an alternative is recommended.	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57643* (J Conroy)
The policy should consider a "Plan B" with fewer dwellings, less commercial especially as the policy also fails to consider the changed working and living conditions resulting from the Covid 19 pandemic.	56474 (M Starkie) 56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Can't assume everyone will work from home.	57649 (Histon & Impington PC)
Working and living patterns were different before the global pandemic so should be considered in the plan.	58063 (Horningsea PC)
Acknowledgment that the Local Plan will not have included projected new employment numbers on recently acquired sites west and east of Milton Road.	58565 (Brockton Everlast)
Early residential phases provide opportunity to meet identified need for commercial uses.	59268 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)
Support densification of existing employment uses.	59900 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The further expansion of the Trinity Science Park further exacerbates the need of housing in Cambridge and is unnecessary.	58417 (F Gawthrop)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Do not support delivery of homes at North East Cambridge.	57643* (J Conroy)
How many dwellings in Cambridge are a) student accommodation and b) vacant investment properties? If either of these figures are significant and/ or increasing I believe the Local Plan should consider ways to restrict both moving forward. If investors and colleges snap up a high % of property within Cambridge then that pushes residents out & drives the need to build more.	58065 (Horningsea PC)
Support high density development approach within North East Cambridge.	58565 (Brockton Everlast)
DCO process is likely to negatively impact on affordable housing.	58967 (Endurance Estate), 59091 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
Early residential phases provide opportunity to meet identified need for mixed tenure, Build to Rent housing.	59268 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for some increases in affordable and social housing on land outside existing and in revised WWTW buffer zone since this will assist shortages in both LA's.	59900 (Fen Ditton PC)
Should offer a residential opportunity for those employed in the technology sectors around Cambridge, including a significant component of affordable housing for market sale, market rent, shared ownership, and social housing.	60046 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)
We would note that Policy 1 of the NEC AAP proposed Submission states 'approximately 8,350 new homes, 15,000 new jobs', as opposed to 'up to' as set out in S/NEC. S/NEC policy should therefore be amended to refer to 'approximately' and provide a clearer link to NEC AAP	60150 (U&I PLC and TOWN), 60763 (U+I Group PLC)
Challenge the densification strategy, because these dwellings will not be attractive to people beyond young workers, i.e. those in stable relationships seeking family accommodation.	56837 (Save Honey Hill Group)

S/NEC – North East Cambridge (Infrastructure)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
This many jobs and homes will create an increase in traffic as people will not necessarily work here, and people who work here	57603 (A Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
will travel in. Not necessarily walking or cycling. Property on this site will attract investors and people who commute to London.	
Support a bus and rail network for convenient use.	56567 (Croydon PC)
Road access to Fen Road, Chesterton should be safeguarded	58282 (H Smith)
The housing mix for the North East Cambridge Area Action Plan will generate approximately 1,362 early years' children, 790 primary-aged pupils (3.8FE) and 205 secondary-aged children (1.4FE). This would require two primary schools on site with early years' provision and additional sites allocated for full day care provision. The Council will confirm its education requirements later in the planning process when the housing mix is finalised. School playing fields should be located on-site to ensure that high-quality PE curriculum can be delivered without the requirement to travel.	56927 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Council should have regard to the NPPF requirements to allow for sufficient choice of school places (particularly para 94) and provide new school places directly linked to the need from housing growth.	
CMS would be instrumental in diversifying educational opportunities for this new community, the rest of Cambridge and	57476 (ESFA -Department for Education), 57493 (ESFA – Department for Education)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>the wider sub-region. Cambridgeshire County Council has provided a letter of support, and would also consider supporting alternative sites for CMS provided they are equally accessible by public transport and offer equally good connectivity for students travelling from a wide area. If a site for CMS within the NEC allocation were secured, the department would work closely with the councils to ensure the development accorded with the NEC Trip Budget, making sustainable transport the most attractive option for students and staff.</p>	
<p>NEC relies on a trip budget to manage its transport impacts on the Milton Road Corridor. This means, any new development has to achieve a 0% car driver mode share with the trip budget not allowing any further car trips to be generated. Despite the very good non-car accessibility of the area, this is a very challenging target.</p> <p>Or: Any new development has to commit to reducing the car mode share for existing developments in the area in order to give these new developments some headroom in which they can generate some car trips, albeit the overall car mode share will be significantly less than current mode shares. The issue here is</p>	58967 (Endurance Estate)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>how new developments are meant to have control over the travel patterns and what would be the mechanism for new development's planning permission that secures this?</p>	
<p>Question of practical monitoring and enforcement of the vehicular trip budget. The monitoring itself would be technically complex, but assuming that it detects that the trip budget for the overall area has been exceeded, how would the system identify the perpetrator?</p>	58967 (Endurance Estate)
<p>Trip budget applies to the pre-Covid conventional weekday AM and PM peak hours. Whether this is still the right approach given the very different working patterns that have emerged since Covid is still up for debate. Since May this year, the Department for Transport has advised on the use of their 'Uncertainty Toolkit' to assess uncertainty over future travel demand, and the use of different future scenarios so decision-makers can see the implications of applying differing assumptions on how travel patterns and characteristics may now change over time. Neither the Local Plan transport evidence base nor the NECAAP consultation mention using this Uncertainty Toolkit.</p>	58967 (Endurance Estate)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Development in this location combined with the committed development at Waterbeach will put enormous pressure on existing infrastructure in this area.	59282 (National Trust)
It is also strange that proximity to the existing Guided Busway is given as a positive factor. Are the people living here expected to commute to St Ives? Because from Milton the busway ceases and its vehicles run on the city streets.	59551 (CPRE)
Given its proximity to the existing railway, EWR Co requests that a requirement is included within the proposed wording of the policy allocation to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route alignment nor the delivery of EWR.	59870 (East West Rail)
Without significant interventions such as those which may be delivered by Cambridge Science Park North (Land East of Impington (HELAA site 40096)), a reduction in vehicle trips at CSP, sufficient to allow the delivery of the wider NECAAP will be difficult to deliver.	60687 (Trinity College)

S/AMC: Areas of Major Change

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/AMC: Areas of Major Change](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

21

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

General support for the approach towards the identified Areas of Major Change Cambridge urban area, with some suggesting modifications to the approach. These include the inclusion of F1 (education uses) proposed by the Education and Skills Funding Agency - Department for Education. Another comment indicated the need for the policy guidance of these areas to be informed by the impact of both existing and committed housing development.

There was strong opposition from Fen Ditton PC regarding the offsetting of development with a country park on productive, carbon sequestering farmland. Equally, one member of the public objected to the omission in Figure 16: Map showing proposed Areas of

Major Change in Cambridge urban area not displaying reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works in a similar manner to the NEC area, to provide proper context for **North East Cambridge (Policy S/NEC)** in terms of future land use and corresponding Green Belt cost or should exclude both until DCO approved. One member of the public questioned why Cambridge Local Plan Policy 18: Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change, with its important safeguards, was not being brought forward. Equally, another member of the public supported Policy 18 not being taken forward. East West Main Line Partnership's current proposal to approach Cambridge from the South is based on the opportunity for major developments throughout the Southern Fringe, contrary to Cambridge Local Plan Policy 18: Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change limiting such development.

Station Areas West and Clifton Road (S/AMC/Policy 21) was supported, however Trinity Hall and Jesus College objected to the current boundary which should be reviewed to include land to the north of Station Road and south of Bateman Street. Historic England noted the area and surrounding area contained several heritage assets and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change (S/AMC/Policy 12) was supported with Croydon PC recommending underutilised areas like The Beehive and the Grafton Centres be used for housing. Historic England noted the area was within the Kite conservation area and there were several listed buildings in this area. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

South of Coldham's Lane (S/AMC/Policy 16), one member of the public supported the area's development. Historic England noted the Mill Road conservation area adjacent to the north west boundary of the site and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Table of representations: Policy S/AMC - Areas of Major Change

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Supports the policy	56865 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
Continuation of AMCs noted	56928 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Support for the proposal not to carry forward the Southern Fringe Areas of Major Change	56967 (Trumpington RA)
No Comment	57406 (Huntingdonshire DC), 58366 (Linton PC)
AMCs should allow the potential inclusion and acceptability of F1 (formerly D1) uses. Education use within these policies would create a more positive policy context for education provision.	57478 (ESFA - Department for Education)
Consideration of the impact of existing/ committed housing in plan in the urban area should inform the policy guidance established for AMCs.	57665 (J Conroy)
Object that suggested mitigation by proposal to turn irreversibly the “Proposed Area of Major Change” into some kind of greenwashed country park. This appears to be an underhand attempt at carbon offsetting on what is much needed, productive, carbon sequestering farm land.	59901 (Fen Ditton PC)
Map Fig 16 should also display for reference the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works in a similar manner to the NEC area, to provide proper context for the	58116 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
S/NEC Policy in terms of future land use and corresponding Green Belt cost or should exclude both until DCO approved.	
Why is Policy 18 southern fringe not being brought forward; there is no explanation. Is this because GCSP considers that its job is now done and/or is picked up by the brought forward Policy 17, relating to the biomedical campus (now proposed as Policy S/CBC)?	58889 (A Sykes)
Support Policy 18 southern fringe not being brought forward. In particular, East West Main Line Partnership's current proposal to approach Cambridge from the South is based on the opportunity for major developments throughout the Southern Fringe, contrary to your revised policy of limiting such development.	59173 (M Berkson)

S/AMC/Policy 21: Station Areas West and Clifton Road

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the carry forward of this site	59110 (Pace Investments)
Clifton Road Industrial Estate (HELAA site 48068); USS is preparing a strategy for the delivery of the redevelopment of the Clifton Road Industrial Estate and supports the site as an AMC.	57268 (Universities Superannuation Scheme -Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Object to policy wording; The boundary if the AMC should be reviewed to include the Land to the south of Bateman Street to make sure its long-term future is properly considered to best support the Cambridge Station Area as part of a coordinated and considered AMC.</p>	<p>58054 (Trinity Hall)</p>
<p>Object to policy wording; The boundary if the AMC should be reviewed to include the Land to the north of Station Road to make sure its long-term future is properly considered to best support the Cambridge Station Area.</p>	<p>59066 (Jesus College)</p>
<p>Parts of this area are located within the New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Area. Cambridge Station is also listed at Grade II. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. Any development would need to preserve or where appropriate enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and Development should conserve/ sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of</p>	<p>59604 (Historic England)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
an asset). Prepare an HIA and use findings to inform policy wording.	

S/AMC/Policy 12: Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton Area of Major Change

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Areas of old-fashioned retail, like the Beehive and the Grafton Centre should be used for housing. They are currently very underutilised for retail purposes.	56719 (Croydon PC)
There is a high chance of change re Fitzroy/Burleigh Street/Grafton as the Grafton Centre has a currently unknown future.	57651 (Histon & Impington PC)
Parts of this area lie within the Kite conservation area. There are also several listed buildings in this area including the grade II* Arts Theatre Workshop and store and 38 Newmarket Road and 17 Fitzroy Street, both listed at grade II. There are also several listed buildings nearby. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the	59605 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
policy wording. Prepare an HIA and use findings to inform policy wording.	

S/AMC/Policy 16: South of Coldham's Lane

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the site's development	58058 (B Marshall)
There are no designated heritage assets on this site, but the Mill Road conservation area lies adjacent to the north west boundary of the site. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording	59606 (Historic England)

S/OA: Opportunity Areas in Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/OA: Opportunity Areas in Cambridge](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

38

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

General support for the approach towards the identified Opportunity Areas in Cambridge. Those who supported included Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC, Cambridgeshire County Council, Croydon PC and Cambridge Past, Present & Future. The policy was also supported along with public realm improvements by Trinity Hall, Jesus College and Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen. One member of the public also suggested these sites include passivhaus housing, more green spaces and smaller shops.

Histon & Impington PC questioned the evidence to support the Plan's claim that there is already sufficient land assigned for job creation is in the correct place. They noted the business park to the North of Waterbeach on the A10 is still only partially occupied several years after it was opened: many businesses consider the location that far out of Cambridge to be unacceptable. One member of the public objected to the omission in Figure 17: Map of proposed opportunity areas in Cambridge urban area not displaying reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works in a similar manner to the NEC area, to provide proper context for **North East Cambridge (Policy S/NEC)** in terms of future land use and corresponding Green Belt cost or should exclude both until DCO approved. Jesus College indicated Land to the North of Station Road, Cambridge is also a potential allocation for employment in the Local Plan.

Newmarket Road Retail Park (S/OA/NR) was supported by Railpen with Croydon PC recommending underutilised areas like The Beehive and the Grafton Centres be used for housing. Cambridgeshire County Council highlighted the site is within the St. Matthew's Primary School catchment and is a restricted site and cannot expand. The intention to 'improve... infrastructure delivery' in the OAs could enable longer-term solutions for the school's needs, e.g., new-build and relocation as part of the holistic approach outlined. The Education and Skills Funding Agency - Department for Education states the site should allow the potential inclusion of F1 (education use). One member of the public stated any replacement uses should ensure leisure and retail amenities still exist for a growing population. Cambridge Past, Present & Future stated Land at Cheddars Lane should be included in the Opportunity Area. Historic England noted the proximity of several designated heritage assets and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Fen Ditton PC noted Newmarket Road retail and Beehive areas both fulfil an important function for residents and questioned why the Tesco site had been excluded. The sites' accesses should also be investigated due to road congestion. The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties agreed that Newmarket Road Retail Park and the Beehive Centre are not the best use of this land. The retail park model places great emphasis on access by car, disadvantages small independent businesses, and contributes to the decline of high streets. They supported redevelopment of these areas to meet identified needs.

Beehive Centre (S/OA/BC) was supported by Railpen with Croydon PC recommending underutilised areas like The Beehive and the Grafton Centres be used for housing. Cambridgeshire County Council highlighted the site is within the St. Matthew's Primary School catchment and is a restricted site and cannot expand. The intention to 'improve... infrastructure delivery' in the OAs could enable longer-term solutions for the school's needs, e.g., new-build and relocation as part of the holistic approach outlined. The Education and Skills Funding Agency - Department for Education states the site should allow the potential inclusion of F1

(education use). One member of the public stated any replacement uses should ensure leisure and retail amenities still exist for a growing population. Historic England noted the site is immediately adjacent to the Mill Road Conservation Area and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Abbey Stadium (S/OA/AS) is supported by Grosvenor Britain & Ireland as an Opportunity Area, however the Plan needs to provide a solid planning policy framework to secure the future of the Club either on site or at a relocation site. Fen Ditton PC assumed a Green Belt relocation site would include worse access links. The RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area had no opinion about Abbey stadium as an opportunity site but had significant concerns regarding any relocation of the stadium to a site near the A14 J.35 with regards to potential adverse impacts on Little Wilbraham Fen SSSI; and noted no such proposed allocation within the First Proposals document. One member of the public noted Abbey Stadium as an opportunity for sustainable development and use of new cycle path access. While another member of the public had concerns about additional access routes into the site, as there is already access from Newmarket Road and Cut Throat Lane. Historic England noted several designated heritage assets immediately opposite the site and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties noted Abbey Stadium provides community support and is popular with local residents, however the stadium's location results in significant impact to local residents on match days. Any proposed change of use should consider the entire local impact of the new proposed change of use, specifically how visitors are likely to travel to the site, and how public transport use can be integrated into any change of use.

Brydell Partners indicated **Shire Hall/Castle Park (S/OA/CH)** should not be overly restrictive and include flexibility. Historic England noted the site includes a variety of designated heritage assets including Cambridge Castle Mound, a scheduled

monument, Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording. Cambridgeshire County Council, the landowner clarified the extent of the site being vacated and marketed.

Historic England noted **Mitcham's Corner (S/OA/Policy 22)** includes parts of the Central and Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Areas. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Regarding **Eastern Gate (S/OA/Policy 23)**, a member of the public voices their concern to see the north area of St Matthew's Piece and the allotments on New Street identified as 'opportunity areas'. As protected open spaces there should be no question of any 'opportunity' to build on these valuable green spaces. For the avoidance of doubt these areas need to be removed from the classification of an 'opportunity area' and re-classified as untouchable protected open space for the health and well-being of the local community. Metro Property Unit Trust support the continuation of the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area and recommends the SPD is updated to reflect developments that have since come forward, and to confirm the St Matthews Centre site as a proposed site.

The Friends of St Matthew's Piece require the provisions of the **Eastern Gate (S/OA/Policy 23)** to explicitly protect and preserve the northern half of St Matthew's Piece and its invaluable trees. This area still lies within the boundary of the 'Eastern Gate Opportunity Area'. Any ambiguity must be explicitly removed for both for the northern half of St Matthew's Piece and Abbey Ward's New Street Allotments (there are no allotments at all within Petersfield). Reassurances are sought to acknowledge these crucial points have been heard and understood by the Local Plan Team as part of your consultation. Historic England noted the site includes parts of contains parts of the Riverside and Stourbridge Common and Mill Road Conservation Areas. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen supported the proposed retention of **Mill Road Opportunity Area, Mill Road (S/OA/Policy 24)** including the Travis Perkins site on Devonshire Road. The policy should however explicitly attach positive weight to development that helps to meet aims of the Opportunity Area policy. Historic England noted the site includes parts of the Mill Road, Kite and Glisson Road Conservation Areas. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

This policy approach in **Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre (S/OA/Policy 25)** was supported by Trinity Hall, Jesus College and Pace Investments. Historic England noted the site includes parts of the Central and New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Areas and is adjacent to the Botanic Gardens and Emmanuel College. It recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

The University of Cambridge questioned why the Old Press Mill Lane site was designation as an Opportunity Area under **Old Press/Mill Lane (S/OA/Policy 26)** and as a site allocation. Historic England noted the many listed buildings on site and recommended an Historic Impact Assessment to inform policy wording.

Table of representations: Policy S/OA – Opportunity Areas in Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Supports the policy	56866 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 56929 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 58326 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58665 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)
Support housing at the identified sites.	56529 (C Martin)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Newmarket Road Tesco site seems underutilised.	56529 (C Martin)
Please consider passivhaus standards and more green spaces, smaller shops incorporated into the design	56529 (C Martin)
Old fashioned/outdated areas should be developed to their full extent.	56721 (Croydon PC)
No Comment	57323 (Huntingdonshire DC), 58369 (Linton PC)
The plan states that there is already sufficient land assigned for job creation. Where is the evidence that this land is in the right place for that development to proceed? We note the Business park to the North of Waterbeach on the A10 is still only partially occupied several years after it was opened: many businesses consider the location that far out of Cambridge to be unacceptable.	57653 (Histon & Impington PC)
Support, including public realm improvements.	58055 (Trinity Hall), 58665 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen), 59071 (Jesus College)
Map Fig 17 should also display for reference the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works in a similar manner to the NEC area, to provide proper context for the S/NEC Policy in terms of future land use and corresponding Green Belt cost, or neither until the DCO is approved.	58119 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land to the North of Station Road, Cambridge - potential allocation for employment in the Local Plan.	59164 (Jesus College)

S/OA/NR: Newmarket Road Retail Park

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support this Opportunity Area	59051 (Railpen)
Areas of old-fashioned retail, like the Beehive and the Grafton Centre should be used for housing. They are currently very underutilised for retail purposes.	56719 (Croydon PC)
This site is within the St. Matthew's Primary School catchment which is a restricted site and cannot expand. The intention to 'improve... infrastructure delivery' in the OAs could enable longer-term solutions for the school's needs, e.g., new-build and relocation as part of the holistic approach outlined.	56929 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Site should allow the potential inclusion and acceptability of F1 (formerly D1) uses. Education use within the area can be a complementary use which increases footfall in retail areas.	57479 (ESFA - Department for Education)
Ensure leisure and retail amenities still exist for a growing population when considering any replacement work here	58248 (M Tansini)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land at Cheddars Lane is proposed to be included in the Opportunity Area.	58326 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
<p>There are no designated heritage assets within this site boundary.</p> <p>There are several designated heritage assets in proximity, Grade II listed: Seven Stars PH; Cambridge Gas Company War Memorial; The Round House PH, former The Globe PH, and Grade I listed: Chapel of St Mary Magdalene.</p> <p>The site also lies close to Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. We recommend you prepare an HIA, the recommendations of which should then be used to inform the policy wording.</p>	59610 (Historic England)
Newmarket Rd Retail and Beehive areas both fulfil an important function for residents. Excluding the TESCO site is bizarre. The interaction of these two areas with the City Centre and other existing and future retail centres in GC is hugely complex. The organisation of the sites' accesses should be investigated due to the congestion caused on Newmarket Rd and Coldhams Lane.	59902 (Fen Ditton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Agree that Newmarket Road Retail Park and the Beehive Centre are not the best use of this land. The retail park model places great emphasis on access by car, disadvantages small independent businesses, and contributes to the decline of high streets. We would welcome proposals to redevelop these areas to meet identified needs.</p>	<p>60680 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>

S/OA/BC: Beehive Centre

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Support this Opportunity Area</p>	<p>59051 (Railpen)</p>
<p>Areas of old-fashioned retail, like the Beehive and the Grafton Centre should be used for housing. They are currently very underutilised for retail purposes.</p>	<p>56719 (Croydon PC)</p>
<p>This site is within the St. Matthew's Primary School catchment which is a restricted site and cannot expand.</p> <p>The intention to 'improve... infrastructure delivery' in the OAs could enable longer-term solutions for the school's needs, e.g., new-build and relocation as part of the holistic approach outlined.</p>	<p>56929 (Cambridgeshire County Council)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Site should allow the potential inclusion and acceptability of F1 (formerly D1) uses. Education use within the area can be a complementary use which increases footfall in retail areas.	57479 (ESFA - Department for Education)
Ensure leisure and retail amenities still exist for a growing population when considering any replacement work here	58248 (M Tansini)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies immediately adjacent to the Mill Road Conservation Area. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. We recommend you prepare an HIA, the recommendations of which should then be used to inform the policy wording.	59611 (Historic England)
Newmarket Rd Retail and Beehive areas both fulfil an important function for residents. Excluding the TESCO site is bizarre. The interaction of these two areas with the City Centre and other existing and future retail centres in GC is hugely complex. The organisation of the sites' accesses should be investigated due to the congestion caused on Newmarket Rd and Coldhams Lane.	59902 (Fen Ditton PC)
Agree that Newmarket Road Retail Park and the Beehive Centre are not the best use of this land. The retail park model places	60680 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
great emphasis on access by car, disadvantages small independent businesses, and contributes to the decline of high streets. We would welcome proposals to redevelop these areas to meet identified needs.	

S/OA/AS: Abbey Stadium

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No additional access routes be created into the site, as there is already access from Newmarket Road and Cut Throat Lane.	58092 (S Schwitzer)
Support for the identification of an "Opportunity Area" at the Abbey Stadium, however the Plan needs to provide a solid planning policy framework to secure the future of the Club either on site or at a relocation site.	58259 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
Abbey Stadium is a great opportunity for sustainable development that can make use of new cycle path access	58861 (M Tansini)
No opinion about Abbey stadium as an opportunity site. However, we would have significant concerns regarding any relocation of the stadium to a site near the A14 J.35 with regards to potential adverse impacts on Little Wilbraham Fen SSSI and its sensitive priority spp. (including rare breeding birds). We are	58990 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)


Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>pleased to see that there is no such allocation proposed within the First Proposals document.</p>	
<p>There are no designated heritage assets within this site boundary.</p> <p>There are several designated heritage assets immediately opposite, Grade II listed: The Round House PH, former The Globe PH, and close to Grade I listed: Chapel of St Mary Magdalene.</p> <p>The site also lies close to Riverside and Stourbridge Common Conservation Area.</p> <p>Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. We recommend you prepare an HIA, the recommendations of which should then be used to inform the policy wording.</p>	59612 (Historic England)
<p>Abbey stadium relocation appears to assume a Greenbelt Site with worse access links.</p>	59902 (Fen Ditton PC)
<p>Abbey Stadium provides community support to both individuals and organisations in and around Cambridge and is popular with local residents. The stadium's location and associated infrastructure results in significant impact to local residents on</p>	60680 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>match days. Any proposed change of use should consider the entire local impact of the new proposed change of use, specifically how visitors are likely to travel to the site, and how public transport use can be integrated into any change of use.</p>	

S/OA/CH: Shire Hall/Castle Park

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Policy should not be overly restrictive and include flexibility to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • allow for improvements/enhancements of buildings and spaces and redevelopment, to be brought forward in different parts of the OA on different timescales; • make the best use of existing buildings/infrastructure; • encourage a creative approach to enhancing identity. 	<p>58680 (Brydell Partners)</p>
<p>Site includes a variety of designated heritage assets including Cambridge Castle Mound, a scheduled monument, Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Area, the grade II listed Caretaker's House and Social Service Department.</p> <p>The site is very close to other designated assets; the grade II listed Castle Brae, The Castle Inn and other grade II listed buildings on the other side of Castle Street.</p>	<p>59613 (Historic England)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>The grade II* churches of St Peters and St Giles are also close to the site.</p> <p>There may be non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments (NPPF footnote 68) adjacent to the Castle scheduled monument. The Castle Mound is a key vantage point across the City.</p> <p>We would want to see access to the castle mound maintained and enhanced. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. We recommend you prepare an HIA, the recommendations of which should then be used to inform the policy wording.</p> <p>We welcome the reference to heritage assets on p 66</p>	
<p>The extent of the site being vacated and marketed by the County Council is limited to the southern part of the area shown in Figure 21 (in letter attached).</p>	<p>60602 (Cambridgeshire County Council - landowner)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
 <p data-bbox="203 927 1122 1018">For clarity it only includes the extent of the land within the redline which was shown on our original submission Site Plan.</p>	

S/OA/Policy 22: Mitcham’s Corner

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p data-bbox="203 1230 1111 1374">This site includes parts of the Central and Castle and Victoria Road Conservation Areas and is very close to the grade II listed Victoria Bridge, Jesus Green Lock and Bridge, Jesus Green</p>	<p data-bbox="1144 1230 1503 1265">59614 (Historic England)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Lock House as well as a pair of K6 telephone Kiosks. Any development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. We recommend you prepare an HIA, the recommendations of which should then be used to inform the policy wording.</p>	

S/OA/Policy 23: Eastern Gate

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Very concerned to see the north area of St Matthew's Piece and the allotments on New Street are identified as 'opportunity areas'. As protected open spaces there should be no question of any 'opportunity' to build on these valuable green spaces. For the avoidance of doubt these areas need to be removed from the classification of an 'opportunity area' and re-classified as untouchable protected open space for the health and well-being of the local community.</p>	<p>56672 (L Tubb)</p>
<p>Support the continuation of the Eastern Gate Opportunity Area. The SPD should be updated to reflect developments that have since come forward, and to confirm the St Matthews Centre site as a proposed site.</p>	<p>58941 (Metro Property Unit Trust)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>This site includes parts of the Riverside and Stourbridge Common and Mill Road Conservation Areas and the grade II listed Church of St Andrew the Less. There is also a cluster of grade II listed assets to the north of the site centred on Abbey House. The area also includes the Grade II listed 247 Newmarket Road (Seven Stars Pub) and also the grade II listed Cambridge Gas Company War Memorial (in the area of public open space in front of Tesco). Any development of this area has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. We recommend you prepare an HIA, the recommendations of which should then be used to inform the policy wording.</p>	<p>59615 (Historic England)</p>
<p>The Friends of St Matthew's Piece therefore seek for the provisions of existing Policy 23 in the New Local Plan to explicitly protect and preserve the northern half of St Matthew's Piece and its invaluable trees. Although partly 'Protected Open Space', and not designated as a potential development site under the 2018 Local Plan, this area still lies within the boundary of the 'Eastern Gate Opportunity Area'. Any possible ambiguity must be explicitly removed for both for the northern half of St</p>	<p>60212 (Dr J. V Neal)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Matthew's Piece and also Abbey The Friends of St Matthew's Piece request Policy 23 explicitly protect and preserve the northern half of St Matthew's Piece and its invaluable trees. Although partly 'Protected Open Space', and not designated as a potential development site under the 2018 Local Plan, this area still lies within the boundary of the 'Eastern Gate Opportunity Area'. Any possible ambiguity must be explicitly removed for both for the northern half of St Matthew's Piece and also Abbey Ward's New Street Allotments (there are no allotments at all within Petersfield).</p> <p>For the forthcoming new Local Plan, the following existing Local Plan protections must be retained and/or strengthened:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the northern half of St Matthew's Piece is not a "potential development site" (superseding the 2011 Eastern Gate SPD) - a protected status that must be strengthened; 2. this must include retention of (or reduction to) the maximum building heights (2+1) along New Street - the northern boundary of St Matthew's Piece, as established in 1898; 3. retention of all the protected open space areas within the footprint of the 2018 'Eastern Gate Opportunity Area'. 	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Please provide reassurance that these crucial points have been heard and understood by the Local Plan Team as part of your consultation.	

S/OA/Policy 24: Mill Road

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Support the proposed retention of Mill Road Opportunity Area; Travis Perkins site on Devonshire Road continues to fall within this opportunity area.</p> <p>Policy should explicitly attach positive weight to development that helps to meet aims of the Opportunity Area policy.</p>	58665 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)
<p>The Mill Road Opportunity Area contains parts of the Mill Road, Kite and Glisson Road Conservation Areas. It also includes two grade II listed buildings or structures including a gas lamp and Cambridge City Branch Library. Part of Mill Road Cemetery, a Registered Park and Garden listed at grade II also lies within the opportunity area. Any development of this area has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. We recommend you prepare an HIA, the recommendations of which should then be used to inform the policy wording.</p>	59616 (Historic England)

S/OA/Policy 25: Cambridge Railway Station, Hills Road Corridor to the City Centre

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support	58055 (Trinity Hall), 59071 (Jesus College), 59117 (Pace Investments)
<p>The site includes parts of the Central and New Town and Glisson Road Conservation Areas. There are numerous listed buildings including the Grade II * Church of our Lady and the English Martyrs, Wanstead House and over 20 grade II listed buildings. The site also lies adjacent to the Botanic Gardens and Emmanuel College, both grade II* Registered parks and gardens. Development within this area therefore has the potential to harm the significance of these assets through development within their settings. We recommend you prepare an HIA, the recommendations of which should then be used to inform the policy wording.</p>	59617 (Historic England)

S/OA/Policy 26: Old Press/Mill Lane

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
It is unclear why the Old Press Mill Lane site is identified both as an 'Opportunity Area' and as a site allocation.	58324 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>This site is in the Central Conservation Area and includes over a dozen grade II listed buildings. The site is opposite the grade I listed Pembroke College and Pembroke College Chapel, grade I listed Church of St Botolph and adjacent to the grade II* Little St Marys Church. The site is close to numerous other listed buildings and the grade II Registered Park and Garden of Queens College. Development within this area therefore has the potential to harm the significance of these assets through development within their settings. We recommend you prepare an HIA, the recommendations of which should then be used to inform the policy wording.</p>	<p>59618 (Historic England)</p>

S/LAC: Other site allocations in Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/LAC: Other site allocations in Cambridge](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

48 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the Cambridge urban area heading as the comments were specific to S/C/SCL: Land south of Coldham's Lane. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Comments generally support the proposed approach to site allocations in Cambridge. However, Croydon PC suggest that more homes should be identified in Cambridge to reduce the homes identified in rural areas, whereas Save Honey Hill Group suggest that fewer homes should be identified in the urban area in light of the pandemic and need for more personal and recreational space. Site promoters' highlight that existing adopted allocations should be reviewed and not automatically carried forward, and Huntingdonshire DC highlight assurance is needed that additional sites will be found to meet housing need if the two allocations with uncertainty in delivery are carried forward. Support for the rejection of specific sites and de-allocation of sites from an individual and a residents association, and requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

Consideration of heritage assets, the protection of the mature tree on the edge of the site, and the impact on water/sewerage capacity are highlighted as issues for the new housing allocation at **Garages between 20 St Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge (S/C/SMS)**.

Objection to employment allocation at **Land south of Coldham's Lane, Cambridge (S/C/SCL)** from The Wildlife Trust as includes development on a City Wildlife Site. Comments suggest site should be used to provide accessible green space. Comments highlight need for flexibility in the uses proposed to enable complementary uses to be provided. Support from the landowner/developer. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties have highlighted a number of concerns to be considered in the policy.

Historic England has highlighted consideration of heritage impacts as issues for the carried forward allocations at **Willowcroft, 137-143 Histon Road, Cambridge (S/C/R2)**, **Henry Giles House, 73-79 Chesterton Road, Cambridge (S/C/R4)**, **Camfields Resource Centre and Oil Depot, 137-139 Ditton Walk, Cambridge (S/C/R5)**, **Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road, Cambridge (S/C/R9)**, **Grange Farm, off Wilberforce Road, Cambridge (S/C/U3)**, **Police Station, Parkside, Cambridge (S/C/M4)**, **Fen Road, Cambridge (RM1 and Policy H7)**, **315-349 Mill Road and Brookfields, Cambridge (S/C/R21)**, **Clifton Road Area, Cambridge (S/C/M2)**, **82-88 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman Street, Cambridge (S/C/M5)**, **Station Road West, Cambridge (S/C/M14)**, **Betjeman House, Cambridge (S/C/M44)**, **Old Press / Mill Lane, Cambridge (S/C/U1)**, and **New Museums Site, Downing Street, Cambridge (S/C/U2)**.

Site promoter is seeking amendments to the carried forward allocation at **Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road, Cambridge (S/C/R9)** as consider it appropriate for a mix of uses and a higher number of dwellings.

Landowner is seeking amendments to the carried forward allocation at **Police Station, Parkside, Cambridge (S/C/M4)** to allow flexibility for a mix of uses. Also challenging the Building for Local Interest status.

Site promoter supports continued allocation of **Clifton Road Area, Cambridge (S/C/M2)** and would like to work with the Councils to gather evidence of deliverability.

Landowner is seeking amendments to the carried forward allocation at **82-88 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman Street, Cambridge (S/C/M5)** to include additional land.

Landowner is seeking amendments to the carried forward allocation at **Betjeman House, Cambridge (S/C/M44)** so that it is for commercial uses only.

Landowner supports continued allocation of **Old Press / Mill Lane, Cambridge (S/C/U1)** and **New Museums Site, Downing Street, Cambridge (S/C/U2)**, and requests that **1 and 7-11 Hills Road, Cambridge (E5)** is carried forward and not de-allocated.

Landowner requests that **Horizon Resource Centre, 285 Coldham's Lane, Cambridge (R11)** and **Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Foster Road, Cambridge (R16)** are carried forward and not de-allocated.

Table of representations: S/LAC – Other site allocations in Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Site allocations in Cambridge should be increased to reduce sites needed in the rural area.	56717 (Croydon PC)
Agree in principle with the allocations.	56855 (Save Honey Hill Group), 56867 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Low carbon methods such as conversions of buildings rather than demolition/new builds should be used.	56855 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Number of dwellings should be reduced in light of post covid working practices and need for personal and recreational space.	56855 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Allocations proposed to be carried forward from the adopted Local Plans should be reviewed and not automatically carried forward. Need to ensure deliverability and viability to enable there to be a reliable supply of sites with delivery through the plan period. New allocations needed to replace those that have been delivered.	57156 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57206 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Other small to medium sites within the surrounding larger settlements needed to ensure housing provision is not limited to a single form, and to maintain housing delivery.	57156 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57206 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
The map in Figure 22 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.	58123 (M Asplin)
No comments.	58372 (Linton PC)
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:	57156 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57206 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 57506 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner), 59050 (Emmanuel College), 59212 (Jesus College), 60659

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • other small to medium sites within the surrounding larger settlements needed to ensure housing provision is not limited to a single form, and to maintain housing delivery • need to focus on Cambridge as the most sustainable location • to support of ambition to regenerate brownfield land • need more allocations within Cambridge • to enable clustering and transformation of specific parts of Cambridge 	(Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner), 58945 (Metro Property Unit Trust)

New allocations – housing

S/C/SMS: Garages between 20 St Matthews Street and Blue Moon Public House, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to Conservation Area and grade II listed buildings. Development has the potential to harm the significance of adjacent heritage assets through development within their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording.</p>	59619 (Historic England)

Need to protect and fully preserve the mature tree at the eastern edge of the site.	60214 (JV Neal)
Need to take account of increased stress created by this development on water and drainage/sewerage.	60214 (JV Neal)

New allocations – employment

S/C/SCL: Land south of Coldham’s Lane, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Proposed use for commercial will not impact on existing education plans for the area.	56930 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Within Mineral Safeguarding Area for chalk, but as a former landfill site assumed that the mineral has already been extracted.	56930 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Objection to allocation of the site as it allocates development on a City Wildlife Site. Potential to provide accessible greenspace.	57069 (The Wildlife Trust)
Encourage flexibility in the policy as a range of complementary uses can often benefit industrial areas. Plan should support densification of industrial areas as a sustainable way of meeting increased demand for these uses.	57266 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Retention of significant green spaces within developed areas is vital for mental and physical wellbeing – site should be used for greenspace.	57612 (J Pratt)
Close to land identified as an opportunity for ecological development – risk of harm from pollution and traffic if this area is developed for large intensive commercial units.	58883 (M Tansini)
Concerns about supporting infrastructure if developed for industrial uses, as will add lorries to roads.	59247* (Teversham PC)
Support proposed allocation for commercial uses and opens space, and have recently submitted a planning application in accordance with the direction of the policy.	60508 (Anderson Group)
Previously objected to planning application for this site due to concerns over understanding of impacts (traffic, congestion, pollution, flooding, negative impact on biodiversity) and insufficient information on management and funding of proposed urban country park. Policy will need to address these issues.	60681 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Continuing existing allocations – housing

S/C/R2: Willowcroft, 137-143 Histon Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to Conservation Area. Development has the potential to impact on the Conservation Area and its setting. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the Conservation Area and the need for “Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting”.</p>	<p>59620 (Historic England)</p>

S/C/R4: Henry Giles House, 73-79 Chesterton Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>No objection to principle of development on this site. However, site is within a Conservation Area, adjacent to a Conservation Area, and opposite the river. Within this sensitive location, development has the potential to impact on the historic environment. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this</p>	<p>59621 (Historic England)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>informs the policy wording. Policy should reference historic environment and “Development should conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset)”.</p>	

S/C/R5: Camfields Resource Centre and Oil Depot, 137-139 Ditton Walk, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to Conservation Area. Development has the potential to impact the Conservation Area and its setting. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the Conservation Area and the need for “Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting”.</p>	<p>59622 (Historic England)</p>

S/C/R6: 636-656 Newmarket Road, Holy Cross Church Hall, East Barnwell Community Centre and Meadowlands, Newmarket Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
This site is identified as having uncertainty in delivery. Need assurance that additional sites will be found to meet housing need if this site is not carried forward.	57324 (Huntingdonshire DC)

S/C/R9: Travis Perkins, Devonshire Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the continued allocation of this site, but should be a mixed use allocation – can accommodate more dwellings and ideally suited for commercial uses as well. Important to have all types of commercial space in locations well served by public transport.	58673 (Socius Development Limited on behalf of Railpen)
No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to Conservation Area. Development has the potential to impact on Conservation Area and its setting. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the Conservation Area and the need for “Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise,	59623 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting”.	

S/C/U3: Grange Farm, off Wilberforce Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Site is within a Conservation Area. Development has the potential to impact on Conservation Area and its setting. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the Conservation Area and the need for “Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting”.	59624 (Historic England)

S/C/M4: Police Station, Parkside, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Supports continued allocation of the site for redevelopment, but wording should be amended to allow for a mix of uses (rather than just housing) to reflect its central location. Alongside	58209 (Cambridgeshire Constabulary)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
housing, proposed uses could include hotel, apart hotel or offices. Building of Local Interest status is challenged.	
Site is within a Conservation Area and adjacent to grade II listed buildings. Welcome reference to retention of Building of Local Interest. Development has the potential to impact on nearby heritage assets and their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the nearby heritage assets and “Development should conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset)”.	59625 (Historic England)

RM1 and Policy H7, Fen Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Wish to know more about the archaeological potential of this site and its potential significance before providing comments on suitability of the site, especially as any remains will not be able to be retained in situ. Site is adjacent to Conservation Areas. Development has the potential to affect heritage assets and their	59626 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording.	

Continuing existing allocations – mixed use

S/C/R21: 315-349 Mill Road and Brookfields, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Part of site within Conservation Area. Development has the potential to impact on Conservation Area and its setting. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the Conservation Area and the need for “Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting”.	59627 (Historic England)

S/C/M2: Clifton Road Area, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for continued allocation of the site – highly sustainable location, well connected to public transport, proposal to connect to Cambridge Rail Station. Preparing strategy for delivery of	57266 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial), 57269 (Universities Superannuation Scheme - Commercial)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
redevelopment of this site. Would like to work collaboratively with the Council to gather evidence to show delivery by 2041.	
This site is identified as having uncertainty in delivery. Need assurance that additional sites will be found to meet housing need if this site is not carried forward.	57324 (Huntingdonshire DC)
No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to Conservation Area. Development has the potential to impact on Conservation Area and its setting. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the Conservation Area and the need for “Development to preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting”.	59628 (Historic England)

S/C/M5: 82-88 Hills Road and 57-63 Bateman Street, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for continued allocation of the site for commercial led mixed uses, but it should also include 90 Hills Road. Important to have all types of commercial space in locations well served by public transport.	58060 (Trinity Hall)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Site is within Conservation Area and adjacent to grade II* Registered Park and Garden. Development has potential to impact on nearby heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the nearby heritage assets and “Development should conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset).”.</p>	<p>59629 (Historic England)</p>

S/C/M14: Station Road West, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Majority of site is within a Conservation Area and includes grade II listed railway station. Development has the potential to impact on nearby heritage assets and their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Policy should reference the heritage assets and “Development should conserve/sustain or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset).”.</p>	<p>59630 (Historic England)</p>

S/C/M44: Betjeman House, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for allocation of the site, but wish for it to be a commercial allocation only (with retention of Flying Pig). Proposed land uses should recognise key opportunities that can be provided by this site.	59125 (Pace Investments), 59404 (Pace Investments)
Site is within a Conservation Area and adjacent to grade II* Botanic Gardens, and grade II listed war memorial and milestone. Potential to affect the significance of these assets through development within their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording.	59631 (Historic England)

S/C/U1: Old Press / Mill Lane, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the continued allocation of the site - development will come forward during the plan period.	58337 (University of Cambridge)
Site within a Conservation Area, includes grade II listed buildings, and is adjacent to other listed buildings and Registered Park and Garden. Potential to affect the significance of these assets through development in their settings.	59632 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording.	

S/C/U2: New Museums Site, Downing Street, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the continued allocation of the site - development will come forward during the plan period.	58337 (University of Cambridge)
Site within a Conservation Area and includes grade II listed buildings, and is adjacent to other listed buildings. Potential to affect the significance of these assets through development in their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording.	59633 (Historic England)

Allocations not proposed to be carried forward – housing

R11: Horizon Resource Centre, 285 Coldham's Lane, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Requests this allocation is carried forwards – can be made available for residential development within the plan period as it has been declared surplus to operational requirements.	60660 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

R14: BT Telephone Exchange and Car Park, Long Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for deallocation of this site due to uncertainty about availability	56968 (Trumpington Residents Association)

R16: Cambridge Professional Development Centre, Foster Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for deallocation of this site due to uncertainty about availability	56968 (Trumpington Residents Association)
Requests this allocation is carried forwards – can be made available for residential development within the plan period as	60661 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
current temporary consent for office uses expires in 2026 and building is nearing the end of its economic life.	

Allocations not proposed to be carried forward – employment

E5: 1 and 7-11 Hills Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Do not support the de-allocation of this site – 7-9 Hills Road has the potential for redevelopment during the plan period once the existing lease has expired, and 1-3 Hills Road will be brought forward for redevelopment in the early part of the plan period.	58337 (University of Cambridge)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Bellerbys College, Arbury Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40172) – should be allocated for residential development	57506 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)
Hawthorn Community Centre, Haviland Way, Cambridge (HELAA site 40166) – should be allocated for residential development	60659 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
St Matthews Centre, Sturton Street, Cambridge (New site 59405) – should be allocated for mixed use education and student accommodation facilities	58945 (Metro Property Unit Trust)
Emmanuel College Sports Ground, 15 Wilberforce Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40380) – should be allocated for residential development and open space	59050 (Emmanuel College)
Land on north side of Station Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40133) – should be allocated for employment uses	59212 (Jesus College)

Support for sites rejected

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Emmanuel College Sports Ground, 15 Wilberforce Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40380)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection as protected open space. • Comments made on HELAA assessment in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity, flood risk, landscape and townscape, and historic environment. 	57935 (E Davies), 57975 (North Newnham Residents Association)
<p>Triangle Site, Stacey Lane, Cambridge (HELAA site 40396)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection as protected open space. 	57935 (E Davies), 57975 (North Newnham Residents Association)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments made on HELAA assessment in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity, flood risk, landscape and townscape, and historic environment. 	
<p>Land off The Lawns, Cambridge (HELAA site 40425)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection as protected open space. Comments made on HELAA assessment in relation to biodiversity and geodiversity, flood risk, landscape and townscape, and historic environment. 	57935 (E Davies), 57975 (North Newnham Residents Association)
<p>Land south of 8-10 Adams Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40391)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection as development would affect the Conservation Area and bird sanctuary, and would be out of context with surrounding area. 	57935 (E Davies)

The edge of Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [The edge of Cambridge](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

31 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on development on the edge of Cambridge, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific sites within the urban area or at new settlements. These comments have been moved to the relevant site specific policy: S/NEC: North East Cambridge, S/CE: Cambridge East, S/NWC: North West Cambridge, S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus, S/WC: West Cambridge, S/CB: Cambourne, and S/NS: Existing new settlements.

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

General support for developing on the edge of Cambridge, but that encroachment into the Green Belt should be minimal and the setting of Cambridge needs to be preserved. Concerns about the effects on traffic congestion of new developments in this location, and the impacts on those travelling into Cambridge from the villages. Comments outline that there should be clear requirements for new developments in terms of open space, provision of services and facilities, and affordable housing. Site promoters' comments highlight that there are too few sites allocated to meet the long term demand, and that given the significant sustainable infrastructure on the edge of Cambridge there are more sites that could be allocated to provide sustainable developments. Site promoters' comments also highlight the need for a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge and the problems of

focussing on large sites. Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters. Comments that no reference has been made to the pandemic and its implications for future development. Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlight need particular concerns about assessment of Green Belt and heritage assets.

Table of representations: The edge of Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Generally and broadly support these developments.	56575 (Gamlingay PC), 58043 (Great and Little Chishill PC), 58374 (Linton PC), 59903 (Fen Ditton PC), 60115 (C Blakeley)
Too few sites allocated to meet long term demand – more land must be allocated if growth us to be effectively enabled for the wider benefits of residents and the economy.	58753 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 58974 (Jesus College, a private landowner, and St John’s College)
Given significant investment in new sustainable infrastructure, there is additional land on the edge of Cambridge that offers opportunity to accommodate demand in a sustainable and inclusive way.	58974 (Jesus College, a private landowner, and St John’s College)
Encroachment into the Green Belt must be minimal.	58374 (Linton PC), 59471 (Shepreth PC)
Preservation of semi rural quality of West Cambridge and Green Belt between the Backs and M11 is vital for unique setting of Cambridge.	57940 (E Davies)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for completion of new neighbourhoods on the edge of Cambridge as well as bringing forwards new opportunities for sustainable developments.	58343 (University of Cambridge)
Education – will work closely with Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire DC to develop action plans and policies for education provision to ensure timing of delivery, connectivity and integration into the community.	56931 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Health services and facilities – any new allocations must undertake an assessment of existing health infrastructure capacity and fully mitigate the impact on the proposed development through appropriate planning obligations. Early engagement needed with the NHS to agree the form of infrastructure required.	59145 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Site specific allocations should set out the principles for delivering improvements to general health and wellbeing, and promote healthy and green lifestyle choices through well-designed places.	59145 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Traffic congestion could prevent those in villages reaching education and work in Cambridge, therefore must be part of an integrated public transport system.	58374 (Linton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Recognise that locating development on the edge of Cambridge is sustainable, however too much emphasis on this location in the Local Plan as the focus on providing large sites could lead to problems with infrastructure provision and housing delivery.	57157 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57213 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
Should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities.	57157 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57213 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
Object to the high risk nature of the development strategy which is dependent on the delivery of some strategic, complex sites which are likely to have delays in delivery and viability issues. Need greater certainty regarding delivery within the plan period, and that those sites will provide affordable housing.	60698 (The White Family and Pembroke College)
To generate the investment for significant infrastructure and to meet the housing and employment needs, it is necessary to adopt a strategy that combines different locations for focussing growth. Directing development to edge of Cambridge is the only option likely to generate the quantity of land in a sustainable location that is suitable for development.	58391 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
More focus on home working since the pandemic, therefore less reliance on needing to be located close to urban areas and less need/desire to be located there.	57157 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57213 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)
Over reliance on proposed development on the northern edge of Cambridge compared to existing and proposed developments to south of Cambridge.	58724 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
Concentrating development in northern and eastern quadrants will have significant local benefits.	59182 (M Berkson)
Concerned about over development of the eastern edge of Cambridge and impacts on Teversham.	59251 (Teversham PC)
Green Belt assessment ignores historic environment designations and landscape character constraints.	60191 (J Preston), 60682 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Policies in the Local Plan must take a holistic view of the combination of different elements, including historic and natural environment that make up the character of Cambridge.	58328 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60191 (J Preston)
When identifying land for development, must consider how it performs against the functions of the Green Belt and also its built and natural heritage value.	58328 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Green Belt function of preventing urban sprawl to protect the setting of Cambridge is irreconcilable with continued development on the edge of Cambridge.	60682 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Councils should be committed to completing the new developments, with continued support beyond s106 funding to ensure community development and youth services.	56969 (Trumpington Residents Association)
No limit set out for individual scheme sizes on edge of Cambridge.	57981 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)
Should set out more clearly the requirements for new developments to provide open space, access and community areas. Lessons should be learnt from existing developments (e.g. GB1 and GB2), where proposals permitted are not compatible with aims of minimising transport and building new communities.	57981 (Cambridge Doughnut Economics Action Group)
Developments should be of a sufficient size to cater for daily needs and with good access to public and active transport.	60115 (C Blakeley)
Would like assurances that affordable housing in these new developments will include real social housing and key worker housing.	59251 (Teversham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Although no significant growth in the Green Belt surrounding Coton, the destruction of the rural environment and way of life of the village has been given low priority by South Cambridgeshire DC and Greater Cambridge Partnership (GCP) for many years. Arguments for protecting this area from development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • would be destruction of natural environment on a high point overlooking Cambridge • disregard for heritage of American Cemetery • breaching the Green Belt would open it up to further development • refusal by GCP to look at East West rail as a more sustainable form of travel and to look at adapting existing infrastructure 	57800 (Coton PC)
The map in Figure 25 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.	58126 (M Asplin)
No comment.	57325 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:	57157 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57213 European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 58724 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 58739 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58753 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities. • over reliance on proposed development on the northern edge of Cambridge compared to existing and proposed developments to south of Cambridge • edge of Cambridge is a sustainable location • site can be delivered within the first five years of the new plan period • too few sites allocated to meet long term demand • Local Plan's aims are not deliverable without additional sites to meet its future jobs requirements • need greater certainty regarding delivery within the plan period, and that those sites will provide affordable housing • will provide a sustainable expansion of a successful hi-tech research and development cluster 	<p>Council and a private family trust), 58974 (Jesus College, a private landowner, and St John's College), 60684 (Trinity College), 60698 (The White Family and Pembroke College), 60719 (Commercial Estates Group)</p>

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
North of Barton Road Landowners Group proposals for development of south west Cambridge (HELAA site 52643) – should be allocated for urban extension	58343 (University of Cambridge)
Land north of M11 and west of Hauxton Road, Trumpington (HELAA site 40048) – should be allocated for residential development, primary school, other uses and open space	58739 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)
Land south east and south west of Cambridge Biomedical Campus (HELAA site 40064) – should be allocated for mix of housing and employment uses with supporting facilities	58974 (Jesus College, a private landowner, and St John's College)
Land East of Impington (HELAA site 40096) – should be allocated for employment uses	60684 (Trinity College)
Land east of Gazelle Way and west of Teversham Road (HELAA site 40250) – should be allocated for housing and employment uses	60698 (The White Family and Pembroke College)
Land south of Fulbourn Road and north of Worts Causeway, known as Cambridge South East (HELAA site 40058) – should be allocated for housing and employment uses	60719 (Commercial Estates Group)

S/CE: Cambridge East

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/CE: Cambridge East](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

37 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the edge of Cambridge or new settlements headings as the comments were specific to Cambridge East. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

There was general support for the development at Cambridge East, particularly the relocation of the airport to allow for the delivery of a mixed-use site, providing open spaces, housing (including affordable housing), employment, retail, and cultural facilities with high quality and comprehensive transport networks. Supporters of the proposed policy direction included: Huntingdonshire DC, Cambridge Past, Present & Future, National Trust, Anglian Water Services Ltd, Marshall Group Properties, and some individuals. There was encouragement for transport improvements on already congested access routes, provision of public transport to improve connectivity, and support for separate designated cycle and walking infrastructure.

There was some concern for the relocation of the current airfield, particularly the uncertainty of timing of the relocation of airport and related uses, unforeseen delays in relocation affecting the delivery of housing within the plan period (including affordable housing), reliance on the GCP Cambridge Eastern Access scheme, and deliverability and viability development risks leaving the plan vulnerable at examination stage. Campaign to Protect Rural England were concerned with the loss of existing jobs on the site, with a large number of representations to question 3 also raising concern for the displacement of a skilled workforce and engineering jobs that had been part of the airport for decades.

Some comments including those from Historic England, Save Honey Hill, Cambridge Past, Present and Future, Parish Councils, and individuals were in opposition to the development as they thought the character and landscape of the surrounding areas should be retained with likely pressures on areas including Teversham village, the Green Belt land, Eastern Fens and Fen Ditton. This was also reflected in the responses to question 3 of the questionnaire.

In addition to these representations, question 3 of the questionnaire was also related to the provision of housing, jobs, facilities and open spaces at Cambridge East. Many responses voiced concerns for impacts on water supply and aquifers at high demand. Other responses raised concerns for the provision of biodiversity and green spaces through a range of landscaping of all scales.

Additionally, comments on question 3 thought that the development should be built with a range of well-designed and climate friendly homes (including affordable housing) to accommodate families with provision of a range of job opportunities, retail and leisure facilities within a 15-minute radius to support the local community without having to travel elsewhere. These responses also supported the need for design of safe, and cohesive communities that support the mental health and wellbeing of people living there.

Although responses to the policy were generally in support of improvements to existing road infrastructure and provision of public transport, cycle and walking infrastructure, a high number of responses to question 3 were concerned for impacts on infrastructure from development at Cambridge East. Some comments suggested that congestion will be increased even with improvements due to reliance on cars to travel into town by older people and disadvantaged groups and expressed the need for parking on-site for people who need a car. However, most responses to question 3 were in support of creating a car-free development and the provision of zero carbon transport options, with separate cycling and walking infrastructure. Lastly, some comments suggested the provision of a light railway, metro or underground as an alternative to bus use.

Table of representations: S/CE – Cambridge East (Relocation of Airport and delivery of Cambridge east)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Support in general, for the proposed policy direction and relocation of the existing airport uses to Cranfield Airport to allow for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • affordable housing • mix of uses • employment • commercial • retail • open spaces • appropriate green infrastructure • cultural facilities • high quality and comprehensive sustainable transport connections • opportunity to meet growth aspirations. 	<p>56473 (M Starkie), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57327 (Huntingdonshire DC), 57607 (J Pratt), 57666 (J Conroy), 58404 (Marshall Group Properties), 58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59218 (M Berkson), 59285 (National Trust), 59904 (Fen Ditton PC), 60045 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum), 60251 (Tony Orgee), 60448 (Anglian Water Services Ltd), 59903* (Fen Ditton PC)</p>
<p>This is the only side of Cambridge that is not constrained and which can accommodate significant levels of housing and employment, whilst also being close to existing employment centres and transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>58391* (Marshall Group Properties)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Concern for the uncertainty of deliverability in the Development Strategy Topic Paper (2021) that states ‘this gives a reasonable level of confidence’ / ‘there should be sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the plan can be delivered by the time it reaches the later formal stages and so the position will be kept under review during the plan making process’.</p>	<p>59229 (Wates Development Ltd.), 59248 (Wates Developments Ltd.)</p>
<p>The relocation of the airport is a significant undertaking and an ‘option agreement’ does not provide sufficient justification that the site will be available by 2031.</p>	<p>60296 (Miller Homes – Fulbourn site)</p>
<p>Concern for the relocation of the Airfield, particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • uncertainty of timing of relocation of airport and related uses • unforeseen delays in relocation, affecting delivery of housing within the plan period (including affordable) • reliance on GCP Cambridge Eastern Access scheme • deliverability and viability development risks leaving plan vulnerable at examination stage. 	<p>575158 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57217 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 57336 (HD Planning Ltd), 60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)</p>
<p>The policy proposals should not depend on complete integration with or extension to the proposed North East Cambridge Area Action plan which predicates on the relocation of Cambridge</p>	<p>56473 (M Starkie), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57607 (J Pratt)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Waste Water Treatment Plant to an area of Green Belt at Honey Hill which is the subject of a Development Consent Order.	
Council should provide more of a range of smaller and medium sites to come forward at faster rate than strategic sites of this size.	575158 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57217 (European Property Ventures)
In the case that Marshalls Airfield does not relocate, alternative sites should be identified and reserved in the plan.	57327 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Contingency sites should be included at this early stage in the plan process to ensure deliverability over the plan period.	59229 (Wates Developments Ltd.), 59248 (Wates Developments Ltd.)
<p>Alternative proposal for land at Marshalls should be considered including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-wilding with 400 acres of country parks, planted woods, nature reserves • 1 acre 'Village Square' with communal inside and outside space • Natural skills centre for growing, land health, wildlife protection • 500 homes – genuinely zero carbon, good sized private and public gardens, minimum 50% affordable homes 	60683 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicles kept outside the village, existing local and new residents have access to shared EVs. • Protected wildlife corridor to Coldham's Common. 	
Oppose any larger release of land in the Green Belt; the Airport site is large enough for significant development.	57844 (D Lister), 58127 (M Asplin)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Climate Change)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cambridge East and other developments will create unsustainable demand on water during building and completion of new homes, from open and green spaces (needing water for plant/tree life).	60231 (H Warwick)
Relocation of the WWTP to Honey Hill will have carbon impacts.	56514 (C Martin)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Biodiversity of green spaces)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Maintenance of the green corridor providing green separation as adopted in the Local Plan should be retained (linking the countryside with areas such as Coldham's Common).	56473 (M Starkie), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57666 (J Conroy), 58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Relocation of the WWTP provides opportunity to deliver green infrastructure in Cambridge East including improved connectivity to recreation and open space.	60448 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
Relocation of the WWTP to Honey Hill does not accord with the policy intention to provide additional wildlife habitat as part of Eastern Fens GI initiative.	56473 (M Starkie), 57607 (J Pratt)
Recreational disturbance will cause significant risk to important species and designated nature conservation sites.	58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
New 'Country Park' provision should be in an area that can divert pressure from ecologically sensitive sites and to tie in with plans of environmental NGO's.	58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Biodiversity 20% targets should be referenced in supporting text, objectives and headline targets not only in the AAP but also in allocation policy relating to water demand, GI, SUDs and climate change/great places policies.	58995 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cambridge East should benefit local people with good quality green and community spaces.	60683 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Important to include space to grow food.	60231 (H Warwick)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Great Places)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cambridge East should be a distinct place with its own character.	60045 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)
Opposed to development due to loss of Green Belt.	59088 (F Gawthrop)
Should retain/maintain/extend the character of surrounding areas including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teversham village • The Green Belt (inc. at Honey Hill) • Eastern Fens • Fen Ditton 	56473 (M Starkie), 56514 (C Martin), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57468 (C Martin), 57607 (J Pratt), 57666 (J Conroy), 58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59634 (Historic England), 59904 (Fen Ditton PC)
Concern for the potential impact on heritage assets and their settings including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on-site Marshalls Airport Control and Office buildings (Grade II listed) 	59634 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teversham Conservation Area and associated listed buildings including Church of All Saints (Grade II listed) • Moated site at Manor Farm to east of site is a scheduled monument with the Manor Farmhouse (Grade II listed) • Several Grade II listed buildings to the south (Cherry Hinton Road) with St Andrews Church (Grade I listed). 	
<p>Should prepare an HIA to inform the policy wording and settle concerns for significant densities and heights on the edge of Cambridge. It should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the likely density and scale of development • implications of capacity, height and density on overall setting of the city (should provide evidence). 	59634 (Historic England)
Relocation of the WWTP to Honey Hill is too close to conservation areas and new development of Marleigh and Airport site.	56514 (C Martin)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Jobs)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Employment uses need to reflect post-Covid working and living conditions.	56473 (M Starkie)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for the new development enhancing access to services, facilities and employment opportunity of Teversham and RWS Ltd's site Land at Fulbourn Road.	56898 (RWS Ltd)
Where will skilled engineering staff from the existing airport find employment?	59553 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
Concern that the move of the Airport will result in a reduction in the range of job opportunities.	60251 (Tony Orgee)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Delivery of 2,900 homes out of proposed 7,000 by 2041: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is unambitious • should deliver more housing in the plan period. 	56473 (M Starkie), 56514 (C Martin), 56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57468 (C Martin), 57666 (J Conroy)
Concern for the deliverability of 350 homes per year from 2031/32 as set out in the assumed housing trajectory if Cranfield Airfield is available from 2030 at earliest.	59229 (Wates Development Ltd.), 59248 (Wates Developments Ltd.), 59060 (Axis Land Partnerships)
Homes built ahead of 2041 should prioritise affordable and social housing to ensure housing available for the employment mix proposed.	56473 (M Starkie)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Housing should be provided that is suitable for a range of users, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • young workers • key workers. 	<p>60045 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum), 60231 (H Warwick)</p>

S/CE: Cambridge East (Infrastructure)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Cycle and walking infrastructure should be fully optimised to enable safe foot-cycle access, including routes and locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • across Coldham's Common • National Cycling route No.11 • National Trails e.g., Harcamlow Way • SSSI Quy Fen • SSSI Wilbraham Fen • Wider network of PRow's. 	<p>56827 (Save Honey Hill Group), 57666 (J Conroy),</p>
<p>Transport assessment should be done for Newmarket Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if 7,000 homes and 9,000 jobs are planned • and should be in place/delivered before the development happens. 	<p>57657 (Histon & Impington PC)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Concern for the existing local infrastructure, transport connections and use of public transport on access roads due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • resulting traffic/congestion, • weather related dependencies on cars (rather than walking/cycling routes), • transport issues • rat-running on side streets • already dangerous roads on Airport Way (despite lowering the speed limit) • will there be another access off it (as well as from the Gazelle Road roundabout)? 	<p>57657 (Histon & Impington PC), 59771 (B Hunt), 60231 (H Warwick), 59088 (F Gawthrop), 56477* (M Mckenzie-Davie)</p>
<p>What public transport solutions will be provided to link new housing at Cambridge East to employment centres like CBC to private car use on roads at capacity?</p>	<p>57844 (D Lister)</p>
<p>Transport network should include provision of accessible and cheap public transport for essential car use e.g., people with disabilities.</p>	<p>59218 (M Berkson)</p>
<p>Connectivity and road links between Cambridge East and the three southern campuses should be improved. Particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road structure beyond the Robin Hood crossroads 	<p>59771 (B Hunt)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus (limited to Queen Edith's Way) • Access to Babraham and Genome Campuses via Lime Kiln Road. 	
Should consider access links in the North East corner of the Airport site to have direct access to the roundabout and avoid congestion.	59904 (Fen Ditton PC)
Some complicated scenarios relating to education provision to be considered.	56931* (Cambridgeshire County Council)
<p>Education needs required by proposed 2,900 dwellings until 2041:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2FE/two 3FE schools • further possible 3FE school (630 places) for 1,600 dwellings after 2041 • land allocated for full day care (Early Years provision) • land for secondary provision closer to 2041 and post 2041 residual build-out. 	56932 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Need for adoption of an up-to-date AAP for the Cambridge East development to:	56932 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> allow for coordination of delivery of education infrastructure. 	
<p>Challenges and costs of bringing Coldham's Lakes into public use is only likely to be viable as part of the Cambridge Airport development and could be used by new residents.</p>	58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
<p>Biomedical and high tech opportunities should be encouraged to relieve pressure on existing road networks in existing clusters such as Cambridge Science Park, Cambridge Business Park, Cambridge Biomedical Campus and by-passing the City Centre. Also, relieving pressure on Southern Fringe from expansion of Cambridge Biomedical Campus.</p>	59218 (M Berkson)
<p>Cambridge East should be connected directly to the City centre, Biomedical campus, North Cambridge and the Science Park, Eddington, and West Cambridge.</p>	60045 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)
<p>County Council Highways Committee determined that a separate and integrated policy should be created for Mill Road to prevent volumes of traffic and accidents. This should be noted in the policy on development to the East of Cambridge.</p>	60074 (C de Blois)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Opportunity to connect to the Wicken Fen Vision Area and create high quality green infrastructure, delivering high level ambitions of the Local Plan.	59285 (National Trust)
Why would Cambridge not need its own airport providing national and international travel for significant international business?	59553 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
The new wastewater plant will be able to support the water recycling needs of the mix of employment uses, services and retail.	60448 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

S/CE: Cambridge East (Other)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land at Cambridge Airport, Newmarket Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40306): The Preferred Options rightly recognises the importance of Cambridge East to the growth strategy of Greater Cambridge through the allocation of the site for a significant mixed-use development. Marshall strongly supports the principle that the Local Plan should allocate Cambridge East and optimise the potential of the land to meet housing, employment and cultural needs in the City. It presents the	58404 (Marshall Group Properties)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
opportunity to plan for forms of development that cannot be accommodated within the historic core and it is capable of providing the key missing links in a comprehensive sustainable transport network for the City.	
Continue to work with Marshalls, Hill and South Cambridgeshire DC to develop the community at Marleigh.	59903* (Fen Ditton PC)
Is Teversham going to remain a village and be screened from the noise and pollution generated by this development?	56477* (M Mckenzie-Davie)
<p>Ecological issues around Biomedical Site will have a negative impact on biodiversity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of insects and wildlife • loss of plants • loss of farming bird populations. 	60231 (H Warwick)
CE/R45: Land north of Newmarket spatial extents unresolved.	59904 (Fen Ditton PC)
Should link S/AMC/Policy 16: South of Coldham's Lane to S/CE: Cambridge East	58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Object to moving Newmarket Road Park & Ride as an alternative Greenbelt site will be needed.	59904 (Fen Ditton PC)
Wish to engage throughout progression of the Local Plan and development of Cambridge East (James Littlewood –	58531 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cambridge Past, Present & Future, Paul Forecast – National Trust, Martin Baker – Wildlife Trust BNC).	
Site is alongside A14 causing a problem with noise and pollution	57468 (C Martin)
Green belt is being imposed on with the WWTP	57468 (C Martin), 58127 (M Asplin)
Capital carbon / climate change impacts	58127 (M Asplin)
Cambridge East is more suitable in size and can provide sufficient and suitable housing	58127 (M Asplin)
Object to moving WWTW to Green Belt as open space will become important to future residents.	59904 (Fen Ditton PC)
No comments.	58375 (Linton PC)

S/NWC: North West Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/NWC: North West Cambridge](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

13 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the edge of Cambridge heading as the comments were specific to North West Cambridge. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

There were a mix of views on the proposed policy direction. For those that opposed concerns were expressed over whether the site could accommodate the additional housing, air pollution created by the development and its visual impact on local residents and the character of the area.

The potential infrastructure needs generated by additional development at Eddington were highlighted by a number of respondents. These included early years, day care and schools provision with requests for co-location and the provision of free plots of serviced land or purpose-built buildings. Green infrastructure and medical and pharmacy needs were also referenced. Confirmation was sought regarding whether the University would continue with the water efficiency measures that had been used on the site.

Cambridge University owns the site and support the allocation of additional housing on site although not the single site approach suggested in the policy direction. The position on affordable housing was supported, and they would be updating their needs assessments.

Table of representations: S/NWC – North West Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Supports additional housing, confirms there is sufficient capacity and will continue to develop this site.	58354 (University of Cambridge), 58343* (University of Cambridge)
Reflects Cambridge's specific strengths.	59903* (Fen Ditton PC)
Support the policy direction for a minimum 50% key worker housing provision. The University's housing needs assessment will be updated in order to support the evidence base for the new Local Plan	58354 (University of Cambridge)
Do not support the single policy approach with West Cambridge.	58354 (University of Cambridge)
There is little basis to conclude that the site can accommodate the amount of additional homes identified. It is surprising at this stage of Plan making that the capacity of the site has not yet been tested before consultation with the public.	58630 Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd
The loophole in the First Proposals document whereby if need is not evidenced the minimum 50% affordable housing stated in Policy S/NWC will reduce to the 40% required in Policy H/AH should be removed. All new developments over a certain size should provide a minimum of 50% affordable housing.	60741 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
Further major development in this area is unwise as:	59554 (Council for the Protection of Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will cause development to completely dominate this green space between Huntingdon Road and the M11. Important for the existing residents and to the character of the area. • The area will be polluted by the M11 and A14 and their major intersection. 	
<p>The intensification of the site will place additional demands on infrastructure, and on the associated contributions to deliver it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may be necessary for a 2-3 form entry primary school, with on-site early years provision. • It will also be necessary to allocate and market additional sites suitable for full day care provision to ensure sufficient provision, promote choice and for families who are not entitled to funded childcare. • Provision of strategic GI, including natural greenspace, as it is highly likely that the current on-site provision will represent a significant shortfall with the increased population. 	<p>56933 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57060 (The Wildlife Trust), 60741 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A medical centre and pharmacy (imperative also for the existing population). 	
<p>Where possible, the Council would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> encourage the co-location of education establishments to promote partnership working. actively encourage developers to provide free plots of serviced land or purpose-built buildings. 	56933 and 56934 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
<p>Would like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evidence on whether Eddington is succeeding in maintaining water usage to 100 litres/person/day. Information on how greywater will be managed and how much land use will be required to support an increase in 1000-1500 housing units. 	60741 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
<p>Policy 5 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan applies as most the site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel and the Southeast section is nearly all within a MSA for chalk and is within the settlement boundary.</p>	56933 and 56934 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
<p>No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but adjacent to two Conservation Areas, several grade II* listed</p>	59635 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>buildings/structures and grade I listed park and gardens. Any development has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording.</p> <p>Given the proposal to increase the number of dwellings, the HIA should also explore issues of capacity, height and density with careful consideration of landscape, townscape and heritage impacts.</p>	
<p>This development site contains an ancient tree. Appropriate measures should be taken to retain and protect the tree and its root system; i.e. by putting in place appropriate buffering around the tree.</p>	58999 (Woodland Trust)
<p>Clarification required on the status and proposed use of the area generally described as an ecologically sensitive area (known as 19 acre field).</p> <p>If this area is to be opened for public access, safeguards are required to prevent any resultant threats to the wildlife or environment e.g. a decline in the condition of the habitat.</p>	60741 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)
<p>The relocation of Madingley Road Park and Ride needs to be seriously considered.</p>	57658 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Eddington - development for Colleges and keyworkers. Total of 4,500 homes on the M11 side.	59864 (Dry Drayton PC)
No comment	57328 (Huntingdonshire DC), 58377 (Linton PC)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital)

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus \(including Addenbrooke's Hospital\)](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

83 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the edge of Cambridge heading as the comments were specific to Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Several respondents supported the proposal, with Fen Ditton PC noting that it reflected Cambridge's specific strengths. However, some respondents added caveats to their support, for example, the University of Cambridge argued that the proposed growth requirements were too restrictive. Other respondents argued that the site's design needs refinement, and the Wildlife Trust stressed the continuing importance of protecting the city's green edge. One respondent argued that currently on the site there is an imbalance in the availability of facilities for research organisations compared to the general hospital, but they noted that planning gain from the proposal could be used to address this.

Some respondents submitted neutral comments, including citizens who asked for an assessment of whether the expansion was necessary after Covid-19. Other respondents requested for the masterplan to be redrafted to improve things such as cycle and pedestrian permeability. Several respondents used their feedback to focus upon technical elements of the proposal such as measurements and policy wording. Developers also submitted representations arguing that the proposal necessitated the delivery of additional housing.

Some respondents objected to the proposals. Reasons for opposition included environmental concerns, specifically relating to the perceived threat of flooding, carbon emissions potentially produced by the proposal and the adverse impact that the expansion could have upon red-listed farm birds which currently frequent the site. Other objections were justified on the basis that the proposal would negatively impact green belt land and harm the city's green edge. Some people felt that the proposal would be more suitable in other parts of Cambridge, or if it was in another area of the country.

In addition to these representations, question 5 of the questionnaire was also related to the extension of the Biomedical Campus. Many responses voiced similar concerns that appeared in the representations to the policy, particularly in relation to the proposal's potential impact upon the environment, green spaces, and flooding. Some comments asked for the proposal to improve the layout, traffic flow, and amenities of the Campus as well as the need to provide affordable housing for key workers. There were also different opinions about the types of jobs that should be delivered, specifically whether there should be an emphasis upon healthcare or research.

Table of representations: S/CBC – Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Support)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support	56807 (M Colville), 57659 (Histon & Impington PC), 58453 (University of Cambridge), 58790 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 59905 (Fen Ditton PC), 60047 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum), 60449 (Anglian Water Services Ltd), 60564 (Countryside Properties), 60611 (CALA Group Ltd), 60616 (Endurance Estates – Orwell Site) 60626 (NIAB Trust – Girton Site), 60634 (NIAB Trust)
Reflects Cambridge's specific strengths.	59903* (Fen Ditton PC)
Offers the opportunity to accommodate demand in a sustainable and inclusive way. Agree that additional development is possible without undermining the wider function of the Green Belt or impacting on landscape.	58753* (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Support the policy position that the first priority should be to reassess the existing campus land, however:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the First Proposals, set out an inappropriately restricted approach to growth requirements which have been demonstrated in the Vision 2050. The Local Plan needs to provide a more comprehensive response • the allocated land will be exhausted in the site early on in the Plan's lifespan. • Aware that the existing proposed land release may be insufficient to address all the pertinent matters, including employment, landscape and amenity issues. 	<p>58453 (University of Cambridge), 58790 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 58982 (Jesus College (working with Pigeon Investment Management and Lands Improvement Holdings), a private landowner and St John's College)</p>
<p>Support with caveats, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The importance of providing Green Belt enhancement in neighbouring areas is welcome. • Important to emphasise expansion will not go beyond Granham's Road • There should still be a 'green edge' to Cambridge • Issue of water is still a potential 'show-stopper' • Issue of Lime Kiln Road needs to be addressed 	<p>57058 (The Wildlife Trust) 57667 (J Conroy), 58382 (Linton PC) 59774 (B Hunt)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities need to be monitored to avoid inappropriate development • CBC should include members of the Queen Edith's Community Forum on their liaison group • Discussion should start with CBC and southern campuses to explore how life-sciences can be accommodated in south-east Cambridge. • Care will need to be taken over site design to limit the impact of buildings/homes on landscape and natural environment • CBC needs to explore the topic of collaboration with the incoming businesses, i.e. who will collaborate with how and how depended is it on being on same site? 	
<p>Considers the loss of Green Belt to be justified and the loss can be offset by public environmental and biodiversity gains.</p>	<p>60449 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)</p>
<p>Support the proposal not to build south of Granhams Road.</p>	<p>57667 (J Conroy)</p>
<p>At CBC, there is a growing imbalance between the facilities available to the research partners on the site and the public hospital. 'Vision 2050' fails to examine this imbalance and uncritically supports proposals that will place significant further</p>	<p>58250 (S Davies)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>demands on hospital facilities. The hospital should be vigorously pursuing the argument that some of the planning gain from further CBC development must be ringfenced for hospital renewal. This must be in addition to reliance on HIP, prospects for which appear increasingly uncertain. The Local Plan offers an exceptional opportunity for such an approach.</p>	

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Objections)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>No development due to concerns about Sustainability issues, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon emissions from construction • Loss of biodiversity • Effect on national food security • Flooding • Concerns about flooding • Water supply makes development untenable. • Area has high-quality agricultural land, developing here undermines Policy J/AL. • Concerns about pollution/ increase in congestion 	<p>56522 (H Donoghue), 56817 (M Guida), 56814 (R Sorkin), 56966 (C Archibald), 57126 (R Cushing), 57130 (M Majidi), 57153 (J Nilsson-Wright), 57313 (J Buckingham), 57584 (M Jump), 57589 (J Jump), 57629 (M Polichroniadis), 57699 (S Wilkie), 57826 (M Thorn), 57830 (S Marelli), 57885 (M Brod), 58030 (K Rennie), 58031 (D Blake), 58042 (F Waller), 58045 (J Carroll) 58077 (S Kennedy), 58078 (J Stapleton), 58089 (D Lister), 58095 (A Hobbs), 58120 (P Edwards), 58144 (D Brian), 58352 (R Edwards), 58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58450 (F Gawthrop), 58768 (J Lister), 58916 (A Sykes), 59046 (Great</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal for a country park is ‘greenwashing’ 	<p>Shelford PC), 59254 (C Goodwille), 59493 (J Hunter), 59555 (Campaign to Protect Rural England), 59739 (S Steele), 59816 (A Thompson) 60230 (Heather Warwick), 60238 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60400 (V F Bolt), 60559 (J Buckingham), 60742 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>
<p>No development, due to concerns including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on views • Impact on Green Belt + would weaken the urban/ rural divide • Area should be designated as a country park/ Land including Nine Wells LNR must be protected • Areas for accessing nature are being pushed further away beyond walking reach of Queen Edith’s • Commercial gain from releasing Green Belt land not strong enough justification for development • The Council’s planners’ Site Assessment Survey for the Land at Granham’s Road, deems the suitability of the site as ‘RED’ • Contradicts the aim of Policy 17 of the 2018 Local Plan 	<p>56522 (H Donoghue), 56734 (Croydon PC), 56796 (R Elgar), 56817 (M Guida), 56814 (R Sorkin), 56966 (C Archibald), 56970 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57126 (R Cushing), 57130 (M Majidi), 57584 (M Jump), 57589 (J Jump), 57629 (M Polichroniadis), 57699 (S Wilkie), 57826 (M Thom), 58077 (S Kennedy), 58089 (D Lister), 58095 (A Hobbs), 58120 (P Edwards), 58144 (D Brian), 58342 (F Goodwille) 58352 (R Edwards) 58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future) 58450 (F Gawthrop) 58768 (J Lister), 58916 (A Sykes) 59046 (Great Shelford PC) 59254 (C Goodwille) 59267 (M Berkson), 59493 (J Hunter), 59555 (Campaign to Protect Rural England), 59739 (S Steele) 59816 (A Thompson) 60238 (Federation of Cambridge Residents' Associations), 60400 (V F Bolt) 60559 (J Buckingham)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would contravene Policy 18f) of 2018 Plan • Ninewells houses were sold on idea they would be at the boundary of the city • Any large development should have been planned at the 2018 Local Plan. Ninewells, GB1 + GB2 have already been approved and development will now be piecemeal rather than integrated • Contradicts the Council’s own policies on Green Belt and entrance into the city policies • Would produce several commercial structures unsuitable for area • Would undermine Cambridge’s ‘special character’ • The soft edge of the city should be defended + it would give the city a hard, commercial edge 	
<p>Object due to reasons including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield sites in north Cambridge would be more suitable • Spreading services around surrounding areas would reduce travel burden for patients, airport area is suggested. 	<p>57153 (J Nilsson-Wright), 58042 (F Waller), 58144 (D Brian) 58768 (J Lister) 59739 (S Steele) 60400 (V F Bolt)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undermining of government’s policy of ‘levelling-up’ • Not developing the site will mean less need for houses on other sites • Not developing would mean that it could go to another part of the city 	
<p>Object due to reasons including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about developing poor quality housing • Traffic is already bad on-site. There is a lack of consideration given to how transport will operate on site, leading to an increase in traffic • Lack of consideration about civic facilities • Lack of consideration about amenities for campus users • Lack of consideration about school facilities 	<p>56817 (M Guida) 56814 (R Sorkin), 56970 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57126 (R Cushing), 57313 (J Buckingham), 57699 (S Wilkie), 57826 (M Thom), 57830 (S Marelli), 58030 (K Rennie), 58031 (D Blake), 58042 (F Waller), 58077 (S Kennedy), 58078 (J Stapleton), 58089 (D Lister), 58095 (A Hobbs), 58120 (P Edwards), 58144 (D Brian) 58342 (F Goodwille) 58352 (R Edwards) 58768 (J Lister) 59046 (Great Shelford PC) 59254 (C Goodwille) 59739 (S Steele) 59816 (A Thompson), 60400 (V F Bolt), 60559 (J Buckingham)</p>
<p>Object due to reasons including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will make wealthier residents flee which will lead to further development. • Plan will have negative effect on lives of residents/ not improve their lives 	<p>56814 (R Sorkin), 56970 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57584 (M Jump), 57589 (J Jump), 57699 (S Wilkie), 58089 (D Lister),</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Object due reasons including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing use in technology undermines need to expand • The evidence that justifies the need for development beyond the CBC's current boundary has not been demonstrated • There are limits to land which Campus can expand. Why not build a new campus in a different location now as part of this Plan? • Question the need for facilities to be next to each other • Why are nearby employment sites already identified sites not sufficient? • The Biomedical Campus should first be required to optimally utilise its existing space • Proposed growth exceeds that which is projected • Why expand when research buildings are empty? • Bottleneck for filling existing space is not lack of housing, but Brexit, so more development is not needed. • Indication companies will not move to UK after Brexit which lessens need for development. • It is unclear what kind of development would be allowed 	<p>56814 (R Sorkin), 56970 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57584 (M Jump) , 58030 (K Rennie), 58045 (J Carroll) 58077 (S Kennedy), 58089 (D Lister), 58095 (A Hobbs), 58144 (D Brian), 58164 (S Kennedy 2nd comment) 58342 (F Goodwille) 58352 (R Edwards) 58120 (P Edwards), 58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 58419 (S Marelli) 58450 (F Gawthrop) 58768 (J Lister), 58916 (A Sykes) 59046 (Great Shelford PC) 59254 (C Goodwille) 59267 (M Berkson), 59555 (Campaign to Protect Rural England) 59816 (A Thompson) 60230 (Heather Warwick)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land is smaller than CBC want to build in their '2050' vision. So where do we draw the line? • Significant amount of southern Green Belt land was taken out because of the 2006 and 2018 Local plans / The campus has enough land to run to the end of the Plan's current period • Importance of hospital buildings not recognised in 2050 vision document. • No indication in 2018 Plan of these changes 	
<p>Why should we trust an organisation – CBC - which has consistently failed to plan their campus.</p>	<p>58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille)</p>
<p>Above all, don't allow a speculative sprawl now. Don't give permission that depends on conditions being met, but make it part of a future Local Plan with all of the consultation and consideration that entails.</p>	<p>58164 (S Kennedy 2nd comment)</p>
<p>It puzzles me why the air ambulance doesn't go straight to a dedicated helipad on the roof of the hospital. This would free up land and undermine the need for building in the Green Belt.</p>	<p>58077 (S Kennedy)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There has been a lack of consideration for resident's views/ a democratic deficit in the process and evidence-base/ an appreciation on how the proposal will impact residents	57629 (M Polichroniadis), 58030 (K Rennie), 58042 (F Waller) 58095 (A Hobbs) 59816 (A Thompson), 60400 (V F Bolt), 60559 (J Buckingham)
Angered by proposal to change the junction of Granham's Road as this was recently modified, including a hedgerow which was cut down and still hasn't been restored.	58077 (S Kennedy)
I support the letter of objection sent to you by Friends of the Cam	58042 (F Waller)
Need to sort out other problems before developing and pursuing Ox-Cam Arc	60230 (Heather Warwick)
We have previously objected to the expansion of CBC that was included in the current Local Plan (S/CBC/Policy E/2), as far as we are aware, no plans have been put forward for the use of the growth area that was included in the current Local Plan.	56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)
Restrict housing to south of the present line of Granham's Road (which is apparently to be rerouted to the south anyway) and use S/CBC/A for recreational purposes. A boating lake would help with drainage both north and south of the field	57885 (M Brod) 58095 (A Hobbs)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Infrastructure improvements need to be delivered before further development permitted (within existing boundary) to reduce impact and improve wellbeing of surrounding communities.	58089 (D Lister)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Neutral)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No comment	57335 (Huntingdonshire DC)
There needs to be an assessment of whether the expansion is needed in the post-Covid context	58095 (A Hobbs) 58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille) 59739 (S Steele), 59774 (B Hunt) 59816 (A Thompson)
Accept the desirability of expanding the campus, but there are more pressing issues, such as the inadequate public transport and the need to 'green' the campus.	57596 (C Maynard)
You have already allocated extra land on Dame Mary Archer Way, and that has been accepted. If more land is required definitely required, that area could be extended round Ninewells, which would have to be carefully landscaped	60559 (J Buckingham)
If Campus expansion is deemed to be inevitable there would appear to less environmental impact from development of the land south of Addenbrooke's Road, between Hobson's brook	58144 (D Brian)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
and the railway line, or indeed land further to the West, between Addenbrooke's road and the M11.	
Who will judge whether the existing CBC site (including its current allocations) has been properly utilised before releasing development land at S/CBC/A?	58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Deliverability)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
GCSP should ask for a review of the 2020 Vision, the existing master plan, outline planning permission for the Biomedical Campus and the more detailed subsequent applications to pull together things proposed, or conditions imposed which have not yet been fulfilled	58916 (A Sykes) 59254 (C Goodwille)
The masterplan document is key, it should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate in time and space with all the local and regional transport, housing and industrial proposals. • The masterplan must cover the whole Campus and the effects on the surrounding region. 	59267 (M Berkson)
A revised 2050 document is needed, it needs to:	58916 (A Sykes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • begin with the hospitals and set out their renovation and expansion plans, and explaining expected timing and funding. This is likely to highlight that, among other things, s106 funding will be needed to make them achievable. • The hospitals should, in this suggested revised 2050 Vision, along with their partners on the biomedical campus, identify what the clinical areas which support further expansion are. • The revised 2050 Vision needs to review other employment sites identified in Appendix H of the Greater Cambridge Economic Development and Employment Land Evidence Study close to the Biomedical Campus and, if appropriate, explain why they cannot be used for its proposed expansion. • It should also be scaled back to address the more limited allocations already in SCDC's Local Plan and, if appropriate, the additional allocation in the First Proposals 	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hospitals should also lead the revision of this document. 	
<p>Attached in their representation, the commenter included a list of tasks which they assert will need to be completed with GCSP to deliver the site. This long list includes outputs such as an environmental strategy and placemaking strategy. It is not copied here but is attached with the representation. In their representation, the commenter also offers to formalise this approach with the Council</p>	<p>58790 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)</p>
<p>An effective series of Town Planning controls is essential to guide development, help realise Vision 2050 and deliver benefits for local communities. CBC seeks to work with the Planning Authority to agree a suite of planning framework controls to safeguard the 2050 Vision.</p>	<p>59129 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus Ltd.)</p>
<p>The establishment of a formal review forum to review and influence any proposed campus planning applications and Planning Gain discussions would ensure that all those with a material interest in the campus had a say. A similar forum could also engage in negotiations on Community Infrastructure Levy, Section 106 or other 'Planning Gain' mechanisms.</p>	<p>59129 (Cambridge Biomedical Campus Ltd.)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>If it has to be delivered, there is a case for phasing it well into the future beyond 2041 after the current site's area has been maximised and requiring a design code that restricts its visual impact, removing homes and instead prioritising functions that need to be on campus.</p>	<p>56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)</p>
<p>Argue that a more rigorous set of criteria should be agreed so that new enterprises and activities have to demonstrate why co-location within the Campus is absolutely essential for their operation.</p>	<p>58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)</p>
<p>The commentator points out mistakes in the site allocation including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “There are no apparent priority habitats within the site”. This is not so: please see John Meed's Response to Local Plan Policy S/CBC. • That the development would “not have a detrimental impact on the functioning of trunk roads and/or local roads”. This is highly improbable. • “Distance to City ... Centre: Less than or Equal to 2,000m”. This is incorrect. The distance from Ninewells to the City centre is more than 4,000m. 	<p>58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Distance to Rapid Public Transport: Less than or Equal to 1,800m”. This is incorrect. The distance from Ninewells to the Central Railway Station is 3,300m 	
<p>If the Campus must be extended, do it in-line with the present permission on Dame Mary Archer way to the south creating a park round Ninewells and maintaining and adding to existing greenery.</p>	57313 (J Buckingham)
<p>If the proposal is brought ahead, other features could include enhancing sustainable access routes towards the Gog Magog Hills</p>	57058 (The Wildlife Trust)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Climate Change)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Relocation of the WWTP to Honey Hill will have carbon impacts.</p>	56514 (C Martin)
<p>The area between the Ninewells estate and Granham’s Road is prone to significant flooding which presents challenges to development in this area.</p>	56814 (R Sorkin), 56966 (C Archibald)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Biodiversity and green spaces)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>We should be protecting the Campus which is already constructed including the new children’s hospital with a “natural based” solution / wetland area, which will hold back the water. These areas could be “Green Belt Enhancement”</p>	<p>59493 (J Hunter) 58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille) 59816 (A Thompson)</p>
<p>Ideally for biodiversity the proposed housing between Worts Causeway and Babraham Road should be an extension to the green belt.</p>	<p>59493 (J Hunter)</p>
<p>Land should be set aside to protect to Nine Wells Reserve/ The area should be designated a country park/ the Reserve should be restored</p>	<p>56797 (R Elgar), 57126 (R Cushing), 58352 (R Edwards) 58916 (A Sykes), 60742 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p>
<p>We welcome the significant Green Belt enhancement which will come with the proposal. In addition to this, policy drafting must ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i). Any development is contingent on green infrastructure and biodiversity improvements in the adjoining area. ii). The scale and type of improvements are spelt out clearly so that both the developer and community understand what is expected. 	<p>58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>The area has a remarkable population of red-listed farmland bird species, water voles and other species. Mitigation measures are needed on this area and adjacent land to mitigate and compensate for the loss of biodiversity. These changes would need to be built into the Local Plan, via some form of agreement, and be regularly monitored through surveys.</p>	<p>56962 (J Meed), 57058 (The Wildlife Trust), 58042 (F Waller) 58214 (J Meed 2nd comment) 58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future) 60230 (Heather Warwick)</p>
<p>It is unrealistic to expect that Policy S/CBC/A, will achieve a minimum 20% biodiversity net gain, leave the natural environment better than it was before or help halt the decline in species abundance. Proper Green Belt enhancement will require substantially more land.</p>	<p>56814 (R Sorkin), 56962 (J Meed), 57699 57699 (S Wilkie), 58042 (F Waller) 58214 (J Meed 2nd comment) 58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille), 60559 (J Buckingham)</p>
<p>Policy S/CBC does not specify how the area would be managed to achieve a net gain in biodiversity. Even with enlightened habitat management, there would still be difficult decisions to be taken about which species would be favoured and which management measures to implement.</p>	<p>56962 (J Meed), 58042 (F Waller) 58214 (J Meed 2nd comment) 58342 (F Goodwille) 59254 (C Goodwille)</p>
<p>A walk within a development is not the same as walking in a green field with open views.</p>	<p>58342 (F Goodwille)</p>
<p>Should instead create a green wildflower meadow between Cambridge centre to Magog Down.</p>	<p>58342 (F Goodwille)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Habitat creation is harder work than maintaining existing habitat. Retaining the existing fields would be a less risky option.	56962 (J Meed) 58042 (F Waller) 58214 (J Meed 2 nd comment)
Development would likely entail rerouting of helicopter which would lead to visual and noise pollution of green spaces around site.	58342 (F Goodwille)
There is already a very easily accessible large green public space close to the Campus near to and surrounding the Hobson's Park bird reserve, which is currently under-utilised and could be made more accessible by providing easier access by foot and cycle to cross the railway line	58144 (D Brian)
The area could better be enhanced by increasing the green infrastructure either side of the railway line and towards the Shelfords.	58144 (D Brian)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Great Places)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There are no designated heritage assets within the boundary of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus or extension. However, there are nearby listed monuments and long- range views from Wandlebury and the Gogs across the site and City. Any	59607 (Historic England), 59636 (Historic England 2 nd comment)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>development of this site has the potential to impact upon the heritage assets and their settings. Therefore we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.</p>	
<p>In relation to Policy S/CBC - A Possible future expansion adjoining Babraham Road- there are important views of the edge of the city from the higher land to the south and in particular from heritage assets including the scheduled monuments of Little Trees Hill (on Magog Down) and Wandlebury. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. Furthermore, careful consideration should be given to development because the city edge in this area is currently screened by mature trees, whereas the site itself is much more exposed in views from the south.</p>	<p>59637 (Historic England 3rd comment)</p>
<p>In relation to policy S/CBC/PolicyM15 Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Main Campus), development of this site should ensure the protection and enhancement of the wider setting of the city, with buildings of an appropriate height, scale and mass for this edge of city</p>	<p>59638 (Historic England 4th comment)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
location. These considerations should be included in the policy for this area.	
In relation to S/CBC/Policy E2 Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension existing committed expansion, it is noted that the site lies close to scheduled monuments and long-range views are also a potential issue. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. Development in this location will need to conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets including any contribution made to that significance by setting. Opportunities should be taken to enhance the setting of these assets through the wider strategic green infrastructure proposals in the area.	59639 (Historic England 5 th comment)
In relation to Policy 17 –Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke’s Hospital) Area of Major Change, Historic England welcomes the proposals for green infrastructure and biodiversity improvements. We suggest that this is widened to include historic environment enhancements given the scheduled monument and other archaeological finds in the area as well as	59640 (Historic England 6 th comment)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>the monument at Nine Wells. The opportunity should be taken to enhance the setting of these assets. This could be informed by the HIA for the area. As with other sites along this edge of the City long range views are also a potential issue, affecting the setting of the City.</p>	

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Jobs)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>There is a sufficient supply of employment land elsewhere, as detailed in the Employment Land and Economic Evidence Base (Appendix H).</p>	<p>56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)</p>
<p>Benefits that come from life science jobs will outweigh the cons</p>	<p>59774 (B Hunt)</p>
<p>The Preferred Option for future expansion does not support CBC Ltd and the landowners' projections on future demand for life sciences space in Greater Cambridge. We are concerned that the Council's preferred jobs forecast is based on an assumption that jobs growth for life sciences to 2041 will be lower than that achieved between 2001-2017. A common set of growth projections for the CBC needs to be agreed in order to inform the next stages of local plan preparation.</p>	<p>58453 (University of Cambridge)</p>

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Homes)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>It is considered important that substantial housing growth is provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in close proximity to the Biomedical Campus to support its growth and so it can be accessed by sustainable transport means. • to the south-west of Cambridge, with access to the railway • South-east of Cambridge • It is imperative that a proportion of new housing growth is located along sustainable transport corridors from the Biomedical Campus/ has sustainable transport links to the Campus 	<p>60626 (NIAB Trust – Girton site) 60611 (CALA Group LTD) 60616 (Endurance Estates – Orwell Site) 60564 (Countryside Properties), 60634 (NIAB Trust)</p>
<p>A proper plan for hospital infrastructure needs to support expected housing and economic growth and the ageing population in the region.</p>	<p>59267 (M Berkson)</p>
<p>Given land is constrained in this area, we question whether there should be any housing/ healthcare, research, and technology uses should be prioritised</p>	<p>58411 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future) 58916 (A Sykes) 60047 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)</p>

Cambridge Biomedical Campus – to improve and develop this site for the two hospitals and research is sensible. However, need accommodation at affordable prices for those working on the site.	57210* (D Lott)
A high proportion of Key Worker accommodation for the Addenbrookes site is needed	57659 (Histon & Impington PC) 58144 (D Brian), 58740 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 59774 (B Hunt)
Appropriate housing is needed, is there no aims to build a new settlement in this area similar to Northstowe or Cambourne?	56807 (M Colville)
The proposed use of this land is for employment space, won't this intensify the imbalance between jobs (too many) and housing (too little)?	56814 (R Sorkin)
Policy implies there will be no market housing. If affordable housing is limited to campus employees to support the expansion of the Campus, it would have limited impact on the existing shortfall in affordable housing.	56970 (Trumpington Residents Association)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – (Infrastructure)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The Policy states 'Development is dependent on the successful implementation of a Trip Budget approach, to ensure that the level of vehicle trips is limited to an appropriate level for the	56814 (R Sorkin)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>surrounding road network.’ If that is the case, then unless the level is ‘zero’, no development should be sanctioned because the road network is already overloaded.</p>	
<p>The previous expansion of the CBC and Addenbrookes has impacted negatively on the surrounding communities, specifically by an increase in illegal parking, smoking and traffic. CBC cannot manage the unintended consequences of their growth. How can they expand without robust prevention? Examples to improve this situation for the Red Cross residents could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signage direct footfall/vehicles away from RedCross Areas • Module filters slowing through traffic • Signage not allowing no motorbikes into CBC through cycle path • Add P&R with cycle route into CBC site • Move cycle path around Ninewells so it does not direct traffic through Greenlands which was a cul-de-sac only has 32 houses only 4 road side taking thousands passing by weekly 24/7 letters to patients/staff/contractors /visitors 	<p>60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no waiting or parking in RedCross Area • A multi-agency approach is necessary to address these issues • CCTV • CBC need to better communicate with their staff the issues and enforce policies • Funding for community rangers to resolve traffic issues 	
<p>A significant number of people who cannot use bicycles or even walk easily and they must be provided for.</p>	<p>59267 (M Berkson)</p>
<p>A redesigned masterplan should provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the facilities required on a campus of this size, before any further land allocation is considered. • Redesign must additionally address inadequate cycle and pedestrian permeability through the campus and to the new station and busway. • Safer walking routes including more street and key area lighting, pavement bollards. • Adequate smoking areas to stop smokers going into neighbouring areas. 	<p>59254 (C Goodwille) 59267 (M Berkson) 58144 (D Brian), 60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend Ninewells Cycle path around Ninewells (not through it) and connect to cycle path by Helicopter pad – linking Park & Ride/Trumpington and give a Safer Active Travel Route for the increasing numbers of staff going into the Biomedical Campus • Discourage cars to trail/ illegally park on campus by offering adequate parking on-site. • Better signage on the site • Must take account of historic mistakes in design of campus which has caused parking issues • It is essential that there is a comprehensive network of rapid, accessible and cheap public transport provisions both within the Campus and along the feeder routes. No development can be permitted before such a network is operational. 	
CBC needs a station	60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)
Consult with the neighbours who will be impacted by infrastructure changes	60377 (RedCross Areas Residents Association)
Should the expanded site for CBC be allowed, GSPC believes that an alternative busway along the route of the A1307 would	59046 (Great Shelford PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
better serve CBC whilst minimising the significant ecological damage that CSET would create.	
Schemes such as the light rail concept proposed by Cambridge Connect also demonstrate some attractive aspects that could benefit the whole of the GCSP area	59046 (Great Shelford PC)
One of the transport proposals made in the context of the more extensive Cambridge South proposals for Biomedical Campus expansion was to close Granham's Road to through traffic. This would be very damaging to Great Shelford and Stapleford and should not be taken forward.	58916 (A Sykes)
Better signposting is needed on the campus for cycling paths	58916 (A Sykes)
Expect to see some workable, affordable, transport solutions in place before any more major building takes place. Charging people for access to Cambridge would be good for the Council but not for anyone else, and we would all like to see a real commitment from the planners for a top class transport system.	60559 (J Buckingham)
The expansion will lead to increased trips from North Hertfordshire and potentially negatively impact Royston. North Hertfordshire will need data from GCPS to understand the pressures on Royston, so it can respond positively. North	58663 (North Hertfordshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Hertfordshire also asks that the central role of Royston is recognised and the policies in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan will allow for appropriate contributions to be made for sustainable travel projects which will support commuters in Royston.</p>	
<p>We would welcome further discussions about potential longer term cross boundary issues as both the Greater Cambridge and North Hertfordshire plans progress.</p>	58663 (North Hertfordshire DC)
<p>An efficient, high density development will be more effective than a sprawl. Use less space for car parks and keep cars off the Campus more effectively.</p>	58164 (S Kennedy)
<p>(Minerals and Waste) Most of Consultation Area (CA) for Addenbrooke's energy from waste Management Area (WMA) is within the Proposed Area of Major Change. S/CBC/E/2 is partly within the CA. All of the PAMC is within a MSA for chalk and parts are within a MSA for sand & gravel.</p>	56935 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

S/CBC: Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital) – Other)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>In relation to CBC, Land north west of Balsham Road, Linton (HELAA site 60562) would provide vital housing for the new campus and enable sustainable transport. Linton is one of the largest settlements in South Cambridgeshire that will be served by the CSET route and would therefore reduce travel trips. Linton is situated outside of the Green Belt and therefore it is considered that Linton should be the focus for growth ahead of settlements that lie within this designation such as Sawston.</p>	<p>60564 (Countryside Properties)</p>
<p>In relation to CBC, HEELA Site 40247 'Land off Water Lane, Melbourn, Cambridgeshire' would fulfil some of the key housing needs which will be created by the new Campus and be accessible by the Cambridge South Station once it is built. Growth in Melbourn would be consistent with one of the key objectives of the Local Plan, which seeks to minimise car travel by focusing growth on locations with good transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>60611 (CALA Group Ltd)</p>
<p>In relation to CBC, the site 'Land Rear of Fisher's Lane, Orwell' would fulfil some of the key housing needs which will be created by the new Campus and that can benefit from the Cambridge</p>	<p>60616 (Endurance Estates – Orwell Site)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>South Station. Growth in this area would be able to ensure sustainable travel to the CBC, especially due to its proximity to Cambridge South Station via Shepreth which is a short cycle from Orwell</p>	
<p>In relation to CBC, the site 'Land East of Redgate, Girton' would fulfil some of the key housing needs which will be created by the new Campus whilst linking with sustainable forms of transport. The site is within half an hour cycling distance of the Campus and bus links are also available. Growth in Girton would be consistent with one of the key objectives of the Local Plan, which seeks to minimise car travel by focusing growth on locations with good transport infrastructure.</p>	60626 (NIAB Trust – Girton Site)
<p>In relation to CBC, their site 'Land West of South Road' in Impington would fulfil some of the key housing needs which will be created by the new Campus whilst linking with sustainable forms of transport. The site is within half an hour cycling distance of the campus and bus links are also available.</p>	60634 (NIAB Trust)
<p>In relation to CBC, as with the release of Green Belt land at Babraham (Policy S/BRC) Anglian Water consider the role of the Green Belt should be re- assessed and modified where</p>	60449 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
necessary to enable crucial services and public functions to continue, expand and be delivered when location options are constrained.	

S/WC: West Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/WC: West Cambridge](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

13 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the edge of Cambridge heading as the comments were specific to West Cambridge. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

The University of Cambridge support the continued development of the site as an Innovation District. They do not consider the policy should include residential development. Cambridgeshire County Council and Huntingdonshire District Council identified that housing should be considered. There was some support for a single policy approach with North West Cambridge. Historic England highlight the need for continued consideration of the historic environment. The university state that they recognise the need for the site to provide good walking and cycling connections. North Newnham Residents Association expressed concern about whether linkages would be provided.

Table of representations: S/WC – West Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Supported	57668 (J Conroy)
Will continue to develop this site as an Innovation District as per the existing outline planning permission with a mix of complementary uses to support research activities including a Shared Facilities Hub with a high-quality urban environment.	58461 (University of Cambridge), 58343* (University of Cambridge)
The forthcoming outline planning permission for West Cambridge does not include the development of additional residential units, and that part of policy should be deleted. The University is focussing its delivery of housing at North West Cambridge.	58461 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Reflects Cambridge's specific strengths.	59903* (Fen Ditton PC)
The policy does not appear to acknowledge the East-West rail route and its consequences.	56716 (Croydon PC)
West Cambridge is considered a suitable site to capitalise on the employment uses associated with its aim as an innovation district.	57345 (Huntingdonshire DC)
It is essential that the balance of residential to employment use is carefully considered to ensure that the aim of the site as an innovation district is not compromised.	57345 (Huntingdonshire DC)
The addition of housing to West Cambridge is supported in principle as allowing affordable housing for key workers to reduce commuting, traffic congestion and carbon emissions. This would be especially beneficial to those who are most affected by lower wages who have to live further away.	57345 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Recommend a plan to incorporate likely dwelling numbers and density at an early date.	56936 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Affordable housing would be especially beneficial to key workers who are most affected by lower wages associated with the site.	57345 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Innovation District planned by University - Eddington would be the closest place to employ people from, so could even more growth or density be expected?</p>	<p>59814 (Dry Drayton PC)</p>
<p>Support the single policy approach with West Cambridge as this would help ensure social and community infrastructure assets, including early years and education provision, are included as necessary and shared across sites of a similar community character.</p>	<p>56936 (Cambridgeshire County Council)</p>
<p>The grade II* listed Schlumberger Gould Research Centre is located within the West Cambridge site. There are two adjacent Conservation Areas and their associated listed buildings. Any development has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. Recommend that a HIA is prepared and that this informs the policy wording. Any policy for the site should refer the need to conserve and enhance the significance of these assets including any contribution to that significance by settings.</p>	<p>59641 and 59608 (Historic England)</p>
<p>It is not adequately responding to off-site locations or neighbouring context. The development must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate 	<p>57131 (North Newnham Residents Association)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance neighbouring communities • Acknowledge the character of the West Cambridge Conservation area. • Improve pre consultation with communities. <p>The existing West Cambridge development is self- centred, ignoring residents and changing the road network without understanding the Conservation Area and capacity issues with several areas badly affected and causing visual harm to Madingley Road – an historic approach road.</p>	
<p>Development of West and North West Cambridge and proposed densification of West Cambridge means that is more important than ever that the intervening pattern of remaining green spaces with the views and vistas they afford on the way in and out of the historic centre and the Conservation Area are preserved from development</p>	57942 (E Davies)
<p>A small part of site is within a Minerals Safeguarding Area for chalk. Within settlement boundary.</p>	56936 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
<p>Recognise that the development should provide high quality walking and cycling connections and maximising the opportunity for public transport improvements, e.g., the proposed Greater</p>	58461 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Cambridge Partnership Cambourne to Cambridge scheme and the proposed Comberton Greenway.	
<p>Existing section 106 obligations have not been implemented, for example, providing a dedicated cycle route east from the site to Grange Road.</p> <p>Realistic commitments to new dedicated cycle infrastructure to deal with the massively increased traffic flow should be a priority in a new Section 106 agreement.</p>	57131 and 57877 (North Newnham Residents Association)
No comments	58384 (Linton PC)
Support the expansion of Cambourne as a sustainable location for an enhanced public transport hub. It is a sustainable location for an EW Rail station. If EW Rail does not happen, however, there is still a need for Cambourne to be a public transport hub to serve its residents and the residents living in the rural hinterland.	56577 (Gamlingay PC)

S/EOC: Other existing allocations on the edge of Cambridge

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/EOC: Other site allocations on the edge of Cambridge](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

30

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Comments from Parish Councils outline need to prevent urban sprawl and that any new developments must be sensitive to the landscape and natural environment. Site promoters' highlight that existing adopted allocations should be reviewed and not automatically carried forward, and that sustainable villages on the edge of Cambridge should be considered for more growth. Site promoters' comments also highlight the problems of focussing on large sites. Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters. Historic England set out need to consider any heritage assets.

Specific concerns raised for **Darwin Green (S/EOC/R43 & S/EOC/SS/2)** in relation to access, drainage and loss of green space. Specific concern raised for **land south of Wort's Causeway (S/EOC/GB2)** in relation to trees and hedgerows. Comment highlights need for new student accommodation at **Bell School (S/EOC/R42d)** to take account of local area and new standards. Specific concerns raised for **Fulbourn Road East and Fulbourn Road West 1 & 2 (S/EOC/E/3 and S/EOC/GB3 & GB4)** in relation to loss of highly productive farmland and traffic problems. Comment highlights need for continued support for residents at **Cambridge Southern Fringe (R42a: Clay Farm, R42b: Trumpington Meadows, and R42c: Glebe Farm 1 & 2)** to ensure they become part of an integrated community.

Table of representations: S/EOC – Other existing allocations on the edge of Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Danger of creating urban sprawl around Cambridge.	56733 (Croydon PC)
Strategy for edge of Cambridge is focussed on strategic allocations and ignores sustainable villages located in this area. Growth of more sustainable villages should be part of the development strategy.	57106 (J Francis), 57637 (Dudley Developments)
Allocations proposed to be carried forward from the adopted Local Plans should be reviewed. If they have not already been developed there may be some issues with viability, and therefore they should not be relied on to meet housing need.	57159 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57220 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
No comments.	57347 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for limited release of land on the edge of Cambridge – as most are already included in adopted plans. However, need to allocate some smaller greenfield sites that can be built out faster.	57507 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner), 60656 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner),
Policy needs clarifying – Policy S/CE is shown on the map but there is no detail on the proposed development. Important to include these developments to prevent encroachment into the Green Belt and to retain the character of Teversham.	57611 (J Pratt), 57783 (Save Honey Hill Group)
Support proposals which exclude any development in the area of Little Linton. The settlements of Linton and Little Linton have distinct identities and new development would harm this. Directing development to other more sustainable locations is appropriate.	57840 (S Nickalls), 57869 (A Nickalls), 57894 (S Foulds), 57920 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57944 (C Mackay)
The map in Figure 31 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.	58129 (M Asplin)
Developments must be sensitive to the landscape and impact on natural environment.	58385 (Linton PC)
Key parts of the strategy include the delivery of complex developments that require delivery of transport and community infrastructure, therefore reducing provision of affordable	58960 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>housing. Housing delivery rates on these sites are challenging. Sufficient residual value in greenfield sites on the edge of Cambridge to support planning obligations and policy requirements in full, including affordable housing. Exceptional circumstances exist to release land from the Green Belt – need for affordable housing and need for housing to support economic growth.</p>	
<p>Principle of development of these sites has already been established. For any sites carried forward that have heritage assets on site or nearby, these assets should be referred to in the policy and supporting text. HIA may be needed, depending on heritage sensitivity.</p>	59642 (Historic England)
<p>Broadly supportive but would object if any of these developments further encroach into the Green Belt or endanger the character of the surrounding villages of Fen Ditton, Horningsea or Teversham.</p>	59906 (Fen Ditton PC)
<p>Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strategy for edge of Cambridge should include the sustainable villages in this area 	57106 (J Francis), 57507 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner), 57637 (Dudley Developments), 58742 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company), 58960 (North Barton Road Landowners Group), 58980 (Scott Properties), 60656

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need to allocate some smaller greenfield sites that can be built out faster • aspirations for development accord with the goals of the Local Plan • site can be developed within the first five years of the plan period • sufficient residual value in greenfield sites on the edge of Cambridge to support policy requirements in full, including affordable housing • exceptional circumstances exist to release land from the Green Belt • insufficient sites to meet housing needs 	<p>(Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner), 57159 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57220 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)</p>

Continuing existing allocations – housing

S/EOC/R43 & S/EOC/SS/2: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge (Darwin Green and Darwin Green 2/3)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Plan for access into Darwin Green from Cambridge Road, Impington (not Histon Road, Cambridge as often stated) is	57660 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
inadequate and such a simple junction so close to the Kings Hedges junction will cause traffic disruption.	
Drainage from Darwin Green development must be designed so that the baseflow in existing drains is not diminished. Reduced baseflow would cause environmental harm.	57729 (J Pavey)
Concerned about retention of two allocations at Darwin Green as they are significant areas of green space which help with the integration of Cambridge with its rural surroundings.	59556 (Campaign to Protect Rural England – CPRE)
No heritage assets on this site.	59609 (Historic England)

S/EOC/GB2: Land south of Wort's Causeway, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should ensure that the green hedgerow and tree lined footpath along Worts Causeway is maintained through this development.	57846 (D Lister)

S/EOC/R42d: Bell School, Babraham Road, Cambridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
New student accommodation, if delivered, should be sensitive to the evolving local area and meet the standards of the new plan.	57846 (D Lister)

Continuing existing allocations – employment

S/EOC/E/3 and S/EOC/GB3 & GB4: Fulbourn Road East and Fulbourn Road West 1 & 2

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Concerned about further development at Fulbourn Road East on highly productive farmland.	59556 (Campaign to Protect Rural England – CPRE)
Concerned about amount of development proposed in this area and potential for traffic problems, especially when considered alongside Cambridge East development. Full assessment of impact of traffic is needed.	59775 (B Hunt)

Allocations not proposed to be carried forward – housing

R42a: Clay Farm, R42b: Trumpington Meadows, and R42c: Glebe Farm 1 & 2

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Text refers to developments in Trumpington being built out and so do not need a policy framework. Construction work is still underway and there is need for continued support for residents to ensure that these developments become part of an integrated community.	56971 (Trumpington Residents Association)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land at Ditton Lane at junction with High Ditch Road, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 48148) – should be allocated for residential development	57106 (J Francis)
Land at Chandos Farm, Shelford Bottom (HELAA site 40141) – should be allocated for employment uses	57507 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)
Land at Newbury Farm, Worts Causeway (HELAA site 40139) – should be allocated for residential development	60656 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)
Land north of Cherry Hinton Caravan Club, Limekiln Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40528) – should be allocated for residential development	57637 (Dudley Developments)
Cambridge Science Park North (HELAA site – should be allocated for employment uses	57863 (Histon & Impington PC)
Land north of M11 and west of Hauxton Road, Trumpington (HELAA site 40048) – should be allocated for residential development, primary school, other uses and open space	58742 (Trumpington Meadows Land Company)
Land north of Barton Road and Land at Grange Farm, Cambridge (HELAA site 52643) – should be allocated for residential development	58960 (North Barton Road Landowners Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land to the east of Ditton Lane, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 40217) – should be allocated for specialist accommodation for older people and open space	58980 (Scott Properties)

New settlements

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [New settlements](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

25 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on development at new settlements, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific sites or the overall amount of jobs and homes proposed. These comments have been moved to the relevant site specific policy: S/CE: Cambridge East, S/CB: Cambourne, and S/NS: Existing new settlements, or to the housing and jobs requirement policy: S/JH: New jobs and homes.

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Broad support for new settlements, while noting the need to ensure that they have their own identity and provide the necessary services, facilities, public transport and other infrastructure. Sport England highlight need to provide significant on-site facilities for sport and physical activities, with requirements identified through evidence. Parish Councils support the use of brownfield sites, and reduction of allocations on greenfield sites. Some site promoters' comments highlight the potential for further new settlements to be identified, including by creating new settlements around existing infrastructure and services. Other site promoters' highlight the need for a better balance of development across Greater Cambridge and the problems of focussing on large sites. Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

Table of representations: New settlements

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Broadly supportive as Northstowe, Waterbeach, Cambourne and Bourn are major opportunities to meet growth aspirations with good or potential sustainable travel opportunities.	59907 (Fen Ditton PC)
New settlements are the best way of achieving an increased housing stock.	56808 (M Colville)
Support Councils aspirations of ensuring new settlements mature into great places to live and work, that make the most of existing and planned transport infrastructure, that are real	58684 (Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
communities with their own distinctive identity, and with the critical mass to support businesses, services and facilities.	
Potential for further new settlements to be allocated with the Local Plan. Identification of a further new/expanded new settlement would provide greater certainty over housing supply.	58634 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)
New settlements should not be viewed in isolation from existing infrastructure and communities – need to consider opportunities for creating new settlements around existing infrastructure and services.	58634 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)
Local Plans sustainability and climate change objectives mean that spatial strategy must optimise sustainable locations adjacent to Cambridge, rather than dispersing growth and travel.	58409 (Marshal Group Properties)
New settlements should include public transport hubs to serve their surrounding rural areas.	56578 (Gamlingay PC)
Support for new settlements of a substantial size to cater for more than local needs.	60116 (C Blakeley)
Crucial that Northstowe, Waterbeach, Cambourne and Bourn Airfield provide significant on-site facilities for sport and physical activities. Requirements should be identified in the emerging Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy.	56853 (Sport England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should provide a variety of homes and at different densities, including homes with sizeable gardens, to create an environment and homes that are different from the urban developments in Cambridge and on its fringes.	57827 (W Wicksteed)
Develop mechanisms to ensure social facilities and amenities (e.g. schools, shops, green spaces) are provided early in the delivery of the new settlement. If necessary, encouraged by initial lower rent / rent-free premises – could s106 contributions be secured for this?	57827 (W Wicksteed)
Must be sustainable with sufficient transport, water, electricity and other infrastructure.	58388 (Linton PC)
Vital that new settlements are served by low carbon transport options and existing major road networks so that the Local Plan can meet its aims for climate change and biodiversity.	58997 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts area)
Health services and facilities – any new allocations must undertake an assessment of existing health infrastructure capacity and fully mitigate the impact on the proposed development through appropriate planning obligations. Early engagement needed with the NHS to agree the form of infrastructure required.	59151 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Site specific allocations should set out the principles for delivering improvements to general health and wellbeing, and promote healthy and green lifestyle choices through well-designed places.	59151 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
New settlements are well places to meet the economic needs of the wider area, and so these areas should not be reused for other uses even if take up is slow.	57827 (W Wicksteed)
Sufficient employment land for mix of businesses, including for smaller manufacturing businesses that are being pushed out of Cambridge.	57827 (W Wicksteed)
Attractive and easily accessible public transport provision needed to workplaces and leisure uses.	57827 (W Wicksteed), 58388 (Linton PC)
Reducing allocation of greenfield sites is supported.	56578 (Gamlingay PC)
Strongly support new settlements, especially those on brownfield sites.	58388 (Linton PC)
No objection to the three existing new settlements that will continue to be developed during the plan period and beyond.	57160 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57222 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Potential to integrate new allocations with planned new infrastructure to the west of Cambridge, such as A428 dualling.	58634 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities.	57160 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57222 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Evidence base highlights benefits of meeting needs in sustainable locations adjacent to Cambridge. Opportunities for development on the edge of Cambridge should be optimised and preferred, to reduce need for new settlements that do not offer the same sustainability benefits, proximity to existing employment, or public transport infrastructure.	58796 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
Past track record of delivery on the new settlements places considerable doubt on whether the proposed trajectory can be achieved. Should be more smaller sites that can be delivered in the early years of the plan.	58737 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
Dry Drayton is in the middle of three new settlements (Northstowe, Bourn and Cambourne) – would we see increased traffic through the village?	59817 (Dry Drayton PC)
No comment.	57349 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:	57160 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57222 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire), 58302 (Hallam Land management Limited), 58634 (Vistry Group and RH

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • should be a better balance of new development, with more housing in the rural area to support the vitality and long-term future of rural communities • consistent with the proposed development strategy • potential for further new settlements to be allocated with the Local Plan • expansion of Cambourne presents opportunities to achieve sustainable growth • more smaller sites needed that can be delivered in the early years of the plan • opportunities for development on the edge of Cambridge should be optimised and preferred, to reduce need for new settlements 	<p>Topham & Sons Ltd), 58684 (Church Commissioners for England), 58707 (Grange Farm Partnership), 58737 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 58796 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)</p>

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Scotland Farm (East & West), Scotland Road, Dry Drayton (HELAA site 56252) – should be allocated as a new settlement</p>	<p>58302 (Hallam Land Management Limited)</p>
<p>Land at Grange Farm, east of A11 & north of A1307 (HELAA site 59401) – should be allocated as a new settlement</p>	<p>58707 (Grange Farm Partnership)</p>

S/CB: Cambourne

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/CB: Cambourne](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

48 (albeit see note below)

Note

Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the edge of Cambridge or new settlements headings as the comments were specific to Cambourne. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

There were mixed views expressed for an expansion to Cambourne within the representations from across the range of respondents.

There was considerable support for making the most of improved transport connections, the opportunity it presents to make the existing town more sustainable and expanding the employment provision and services and facilities available, and agreement that it should be landscape-led and provide a good amount of green space. In addition, some respondents made suggestions for what the new development should provide, including facilities such as a swimming pool, more sports facilities and retail, plenty of green space for nature and people including parks and nature trails, and improved sustainable transport connections including for active modes both within Cambourne and to surrounding villages.

There were mixed views around transport provision and in particular the relationship with East West Rail (EWR) and the current uncertainty around its delivery. Some respondents were opposed to further development in the absence of or before delivery of EWR and others opposed the EWR proposal itself. It was suggested that with the slow delivery of the GCP Cambourne to Cambridge scheme other forms of transport require consideration. Other respondents seek to maximise the opportunity EWR presents to create a transport hub and maximise opportunities for sustainable travel and achieve integration with the town.

Concerns were expressed by Parish Councils and developers as to whether expansion of Cambourne was necessary and whether development would be better spread across the area. Several site promoters submitted sites in the vicinity of Cambourne and nearby villages for consideration. Concerns raised against further expansion include the potential loss of Cambourne's character from over-development, the potential impact on neighbouring villages and the need to maintain their separate identity, and the need to explore how Cambourne will function with nearby villages. Other concerns related to potential impacts on landscape, open space, biodiversity, and the historic environment. It was questioned whether additional employment would be achievable.

In addition to these representations, question 6 of the questionnaire was also related to the housing, jobs, facilities and open spaces in and around Cambourne. Responses to this question broadly reflected the comments attributed to policy S/CB summarised above.

Table of representations: S/CB – Cambourne (Support)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Support Cambourne development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree should be landscape led to minimise impact on wider landscape • Making full use of EWR essential • Goes in right direction; making sustainable, high dwelling location with good green space and active travel provision. • Further development to provide much needed housing is logical • Proposed significant new public infrastructure investment in Cambourne to Cambridge corridor • Growing employment centre will provide opportunities for residents and nearby communities • Making effective connections to surrounding villages 	<p>Individuals 56494 (D Clay), 57669 (J Conroy), 57735 (J Pavey), 60116* (C Blakeley)</p> <p>Public Bodies 56868 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 57351 (Huntingdonshire DC), 59472* (Shepreth PC)</p> <p>Third Sector Organisations 56854 (Sport England), 57882 (North Newnham Residents Association), 58536 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 60743 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)</p> <p>Other Organisations 59868 (East West Rail), 60450 (Anglian Water Services Ltd),</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to make the most of transport connections and make overall Cambourne area a more sustainable place • Connectivity provided by EWR • Reduce flood risk to surrounding areas through innovative water re-use solutions. Can enable higher water efficiency and reduce quantity of wastewater. • Cambourne has grown rapidly but with a deficit in infrastructure 	<p>Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners 58603 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)</p>
<p>Agree that Cambourne presents opportunities to achieve sustainable growth.</p>	<p>58684* (Church Commissioners for England)</p>
<p>Suggestions for what the development should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better quality infrastructure and priority for cyclists and pedestrians within Cambourne and links to surrounding villages & Cambridge • Include and extend the existing nature trails and many parks • Provide a swimming pool • Provide additional retail opportunities (e.g. DIY shop) • Ensure school capacity is provided before development 	<p>Individuals 56494 (D Clay), 57669 (J Conroy), 57735 (J Pavey)</p> <p>Public Bodies 57351 (Huntingdonshire DC)</p> <p>Third Sector Organisations</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment opportunities – a centre for innovation and design for green technology • Develop infrastructure for sport and physical activity • Ensure the full strategic natural greenspace needs of an expanded population are met, and do not rely on country park. • Focus on place making • Delivery of wider vision for green infrastructure • Making full use of EWR essential. • Biodiversity enhancement should include scrub, new woodland, and meadows. • Needs attractive, segregated, reliable and frequent public transport between Cambourne and Cambridge to be truly successful • Safeguard employment and services and facilities and prevent gradual loss of sites to residential. • Set a modal shift from private cars to public transport, walking and cycling. • Design concept of walkable neighbourhoods. 	<p>57070 (The Wildlife Trust), 57882 (North Newnham Residents Association), 58536 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59001 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)</p> <p>Other Organisations</p> <p>56854 (Sport England)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be well integrated with the new EWR station location so the station is integral to the town • Adequate on site green infrastructure to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace 	
Support expansion to north-in relation to proposed EW Rail Station. Develop as a public transport hub whether or not a rail station materialises or not.	56579 (Gamlingay PC)
Agrees with the proposals and that Cambourne should not expand any further and should keep within its existing curtilage.	58348 (Caxton PC)
Noted the allocation responds to EWR which includes new station. Supports the principle of improved access to green transport and is neither for nor against EWR.	59286 (National Trust)
Cambourne should provide jobs near new homes, include more employment space potentially including a commercial hub based on any new railway station. Outside this commercial and retail hub, Cambourne should be focused on the large-scale offering of homes for families of those working across Cambridge area.	60048 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Neutral)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No comments	58390 (Linton PC)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Objections)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Concern that EWR is driving the development of Cambourne.	56682 (S Houlihane)
Concern over development sprawl into neighbouring villages. Cambourne and Papworth Everard should remain distinct developments and not merge.	56682 (S Houlihane)
<p>Concerns over more development at Cambourne, including for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already a large development and should not lose its character by over-development. • Natural greenspace and GI from original development could be lost. • Cambourne West already provides less greenspace than Cambourne. • No certainty over Oxford-Cambridge route and station at Cambourne and slow progress with GCP C2C busway. 	<p>Individuals</p> <p>Public Bodies 56710 (Croydon PC), 57662 (Histon & Impington PC), 59643 (Historic England), 59818 (Dry Drayton PC)</p> <p>Third Sector Organisations 57070 (The Wildlife Trust), 59286 (National Trust)</p> <p>Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other forms of transport require consideration • Could place additional recreation pressures on Wimpole Estate and potential impacts on nature conservation assets, infrastructure and visitor management. • Careful consideration will need to be given to potential impacts on historic environment, including designated assets and their setting • Suggest a Heritage Impact Assessment be undertaken to inform site location and mitigation • Explore how this will function with nearby existing villages • Concern about landscape and habitat harm • Risk of loss of identity of surrounding villages • Erosion of the Green Belt 	57334 (HD Planning Ltd)
Concern over whether there is a genuine need for the expansion of Cambourne, particularly as there are serious adverse landscape impacts that have been identified.	57160* (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57222 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Cambourne is already very large – does it really need expanding?	58044* (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Oppose further housing at Cambourne. Consider redistribution of housing to provide a better balance across plan area.	57161 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57224 (European Property Ventures - Cambridgeshire)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Concern about significant development north of A428, which might put recreational pressure on SSSIs like Overhall Grove and Elsworth Wood. New development needs adequate green infrastructure provided on site to provide Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs).	59001 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)
Objects to policy as so much uncertainty on delivery of a station. Any allocation should be tied to delivery of East West Rail station at Cambourne.	59170 (Cambourne TC), 59178 (Cambourne TC)
Object to any allocation until a final decision has been made on East West Rail and funding committed to the project.	59178 (Cambourne TC)
Object to all potential locations to the south, west and south-east of Cambourne. Major adverse impact on roads, high quality landscape and country park. Only support option (contingent on delivery of EWR station) north of A428.	59178 (Cambourne TC)
Object strongly to further expansion of Cambourne West. Urban sprawl without natural barriers to stop it. Loss of productive farmland. Lead to never ending cycle of demand for development and sprawl joining Cambridge to Bedford. Essential to address issues with existing developments first.	59558 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
New town by stealth. 'Strategic scale growth' and 'broad locations' is vague. Who is setting the agenda to create a 'town for 21 st century'? – not local people. No reference to mitigating impact on landscape or character of older communities. Protect Bourn Valley. Justifying based on carbon benefits - should develop in the Green Belt to maximise walking and cycling.	60249 (Bourn PC)
Businesses have already shown they are not interested in moving to this area, and so those living in the Cambourne area cause a large part of the congestion into the city. No point developing this area further.	57210* (D Lott)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Delivery)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Careful consideration will have to be given to timing of delivery with new railway station (EWR) and GCP scheme. No identified fall back position if infrastructure schemes are not brought forward.	57351 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Identified broad location for growth (no identified site to assess) but dependent on EWR programme which could easily slip. Limited prospect of achieving 1,950 completions in plan period.	58431 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms – Hardington - LLP), 58750 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms – Hardington – LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Whilst we do not disagree with Cambourne as location for growth, not enough certainty to justify inclusion of 1,950 dwellings in plan period. Dependent on EWR station, location and timescales unknown. Additional sites should be identified to meet needs.	59027 (Scott Properties)
No clarity from Government on funding full EWR route, or commentary on consultation with EWR Company around timetable for delivery. Plan should look elsewhere for growth without dependency on upfront major infrastructure delivery.	59097 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
Concern regarding delivery rate. Cambourne c. 4,250 homes was built over 22 years, gives annual rate of c.200 dwellings per annum. Adding Bourn Airfield and West Cambourne would require c.300 dpa. Additional 1,950 would require c.400 dpa. Unrealistic as there is a limit to what the market will absorb.	59178 (Cambourne TC)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Great Places)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Green Belt, City Conservation areas and Historic Approach roads like Madingley Road and Barton road must be protected	57132 (North Newnham Res. Ass)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>from Transport strategies, using principles of visually enhance and protect the character of the approach roads.</p> <p>Engineering must not damage historic streetscape with inappropriate bus lanes, street clutter, gantries and new roundabouts where the car dominates.</p>	

S/CB: Cambourne – (Infrastructure)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Council working to expand secondary school capacity. Additional capacity will be needed but not sufficient for a new school. Consider how will function with Bourn and nearby villages and relationship with Cambridge to enhance its sustainability.</p>	56937 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
<p>Cambourne needs better public transport - GCP scheme. EWR has no published business case, will cause unnecessary environmental damage and planning blight. If EWR is built it needs to follow CBRR route, within a trench.</p>	57037 (W Harrold)
<p>Policy makes reference to East West Rail, but not Cambourne– Cambridge busway.</p>	58519 (Smarter Cambridge Transport)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
New homes at Cambourne will create serious transport implications. Cannot make assumptions based on transport plans not yet developed.	57661* (Histon & Impington PC)
Cambourne's wastewater is planned to be served from Uttons Drove Water Recycling Centre.	60450 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

S/CB: Cambourne – (other)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
First Proposals document states 1,950 additional homes within the plan period. We assume these are West Cambourne planning permission and therefore should be considered an existing commitment. Document requires amending and no plan was included.	57334 (HD Planning Ltd)
Should be a requirement that future planning applications for development of land at Business Park be required to provide enhanced access through Business Park to Cambourne West.	59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)
Seek to maximise opportunities for intensifying development within existing boundary of Cambourne West, consistent with NW Cambridge.	59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Policy should allow for the development of residential uses on land identified for employment on Cambourne West Masterplan. Evidence demonstrating the market for employment floorspace in this location is limited.	59840 (MCA Developments Ltd)
Requests a requirement is included within policy wording to ensure that any additional development at Cambourne does not prejudice the preferred EWR route alignment (once announced) nor the delivery of EWR.	59868 (East West Rail)

S/CB: Cambourne – (Promoters’ Sites)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Promoting site for development - Land north of Cambourne, Knapwell (HELAA site 40114) Potential to add to range of uses in a highly sustainable way, including new leisure, employment and homes, enabling more residents to both live and work there, increasing self-containment and reducing the need to travel	57890 (Martin Grant Homes)
Promoting site for development - Scotland Farm (East & West), Scotland Road, Dry Drayton (HELAA site 56252)	58304 (Hallam Land Management Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Broad location should not be limited to expansion of Cambourne, but include other locations accessible to EWR Station and C2C public transport hub at Scotland Farm	
Promoting site for development - Land at Crow's Nest Farm, Papworth Everard (HELAA site 48096) Papworth is one of lowest impact locations for development (on green infrastructure) in the A428 corridor	58576 (MacTaggart & Mickel)
Promoting site for development - Land at Crow Green, north-east of Caxton Gibbet (HELAA site 56461) Additional employment land should be allocated to meet the needs for high and mid-technology manufacturing and logistics floorspace on strategic road network, and make Cambourne more sustainable by increasing the mix of uses.	58592 (Endurance Estates - Caxton Gibbet Site)
Promoting site for development - Land to the east of Caxton Gibbet Services, Caxton (HELAA site 47945) Settlement boundary shall include Caxton Gibbet services site given its immediate proximity to the approved Cambourne West development.	58664 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)
Promoting site for development - Land north and south of Cambridge Rd, Eltisley (HELAA site 51668)	58692 (The Church Commissioners for England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Strongly recommend Councils' review and re-assess the Site in light of the information prepared to support this representation.	
Promoting site for development - Land north west of A10 Royston Road, Foxton (HELAA site 40084) Object to housing trajectory lead in time and build out rates for allocating site.	59065 (Axis Land Partnerships)
Promoting site for development – Westley Green No clarity from Government on funding full EWR route, or commentary on consultation with EWR Company around timetable for delivery. Plan should look elsewhere for growth without dependency on upfront major infrastructure delivery.	59097 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
Promoting site for development - Land North of Cambourne (Site 40114) Highly sustainable option for accommodating both new housing and new jobs. Significant opportunity for development of a scale that can promote self-containment and consolidate the functions of existing settlement. Will support internalised movements using active travel and sustainable modes, minimising carbon impacts.	60666 (Martin Grant Homes)

S/NS: Existing new settlements

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/NS: Existing new settlements](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

31 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the edge of Cambridge or new settlements headings as the comments were specific to the three existing new settlements. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Broad support for new settlements, while noting the need to ensure that they provide the necessary services, facilities, public transport and other infrastructure. Some site promoters' have highlighted the limited contribution from new settlements within the

first five years of the plan period, and the need for more small and medium sized sites to be allocated to deliver within this period. Cambridge Past, Present & Future suggest that all new settlements need to deliver the same role as identified for Cambourne – well connected, town for the twenty-first century, employment areas, and a place that meets day-to-day needs. Campaign to Protect Rural England highlight need for various issues with existing new settlements to be resolved before further permissions are approved.

SS/5: Northstowe – comments highlight the need to ensure that faster delivery does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas, market absorption, and tenure diversity, and also question whether infrastructure can be delivered at the faster pace. Some site promoters' question the evidence for increased delivery rates and how these increased rates will be achieved. Historic England highlight need to consider heritage assets, Environment Agency highlight continued investigation of flood risk management options to reduce risk of flooding in Oakington, and Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties highlight concerns about the impact of the development on the local water tables.

SS/6: Land north of Waterbeach – comments highlight the need to ensure that faster delivery does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas, market absorption, and tenure diversity, and also question whether infrastructure can be delivered at the faster pace. Some site promoters' question the evidence for increased delivery rates and how these increased rates will be achieved. Historic England highlight need to consider heritage assets, Waterbeach PC highlight need to consider the Neighbourhood Plan and infrastructure issues that still need to be resolved, and other comments highlight transport implications from this development.

SS/7: Bourn Airfield – landowner of the employment area highlights that development needs to be compatible with existing industrial uses, and site promoter highlights that there is potential for higher annual delivery rates. Other site promoters' comments

highlight transport and infrastructure requirements for this development as being threats to delivery. Cambourne TC comment that transport links for this development should be considered in line with Cambourne and West Cambourne. Historic England highlight need to consider heritage assets.

Table of representations: S/NS – Existing new settlements

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support / Broadly support / Agree / Sensible approach / No objection	56580 (Gamlingay PC), 56714 (Croydon PC), 56869 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 57162 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57226 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 57737 (J Pavey), 59527 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield), 59644 (Historic England)
New settlements are better than dispersed development.	56714 (Croydon PC)
Need to have good public transport, schools, doctors etc.	56714 (Croydon PC)
Support provision of better public transport at existing new settlements – they need to act as a local transport hub.	56580 (Gamlingay PC)
Even with higher delivery rates, new settlements will not be contributing to the housing supply in the first five years of the plan period – see ‘Start to Finish’ by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners. Although agree the Local Plan should be planning for new settlements, need a greater reliance on small and medium	58437 (Deal Land LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>sized sites that can deliver homes earlier in the plan period. Especially important in Greater Cambridge given high house prices and trend for in-commuting.</p>	
<p>Contingency sites should be included to ensure the Local Plan is deliverable throughout the plan period, as required by the NPPF.</p>	<p>59235 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59236 (Wates Developments Ltd)</p>
<p>Need to improve the carbon footprint of houses already in the pipeline at Northstowe and other existing planned developments.</p>	<p>56874 (J Prince)</p>
<p>All new settlements need to deliver the same role as identified for Cambourne – well connected through high quality public transport, cycling and walking facilities; town for the 21st century; employment centre to provide opportunities for residents and nearby communities; and place that meets the day to day needs of residents. Therefore, need to safeguard employment areas, services and facilities within the settlement, support a shift from cars to public transport, walking and cycling, and include design concept of walkable and cyclable neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>58550 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)</p>
<p>New Local Plan will set out significant requirements for Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity Net Gain and environmental design. These requirements need to be reflected in policies for existing</p>	<p>59007 (RSPB Cambs/Beds/Herts Area)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
allocations that have not yet received planning permission e.g. Northstowe to potentially support Green Infrastructure in the Great Ouse Fenland Arc.	
Understand that existing new settlements will be carried forwards as allocations, but concerned by poor building control, lack of democratic control on detailed planning decisions, damage to underground water bodies, increasing flood risk, lack of engagement with communities, and lack of engagement with local experts and statutory bodies e.g. Internal Drainage Boards. These issues need to be resolved before any further permissions are approved.	59559 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
Increased densities in areas with access to transport hubs could creep into Dry Drayton.	59819 (Dry Drayton PC)
No comments.	58393 (Linton PC)
<p>Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • need a greater reliance on small and medium sized sites that can deliver homes earlier in the plan period 	58437 (Deal Land LLP), 57162 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57226 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 58306 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58441 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58649 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58977 (Endurance Estates), 59104 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	Residential Limited), 59235 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59236 (Wates Developments Ltd)

Continuing existing allocations

SS/5: Northstowe

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support.	59472* (Shepreth PC)
Concur that off-site modular construction can assist in accelerating delivery on sites.	57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Must ensure that faster delivery rates does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas e.g. access to doctors and transport networks, and recreational pressure on green infrastructure.	57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Can the necessary infrastructure for this site also be delivered at the faster pace?	58977 (Endurance Estates), 59104 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
If faster delivery rates, essential that supporting infrastructure and services are also delivered at an accelerated rate.	58121 (P Bearpark)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Careful consideration should be given to impact that faster delivery could have on market absorption rates and tenure diversity to justify that this is achievable.	57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Query whether evidence to justify increased delivery rates is robust, as absence of evidence for higher completion rates and unclear what evidence is being relied on.	58306 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58649 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)
Consultation document states that there is evidence for higher annual delivery rates, however, Strategy Topic Paper states in the section on Policy S/NS that the Councils “have not completed evidence focused on this topic”. Therefore no clear justification for increased delivery by 2041. Unclear whether assumptions on delivery provided in Strategy Topic Paper are from promoter or Councils.	58437 (Deal Land LLP)
Object to assumption that higher delivery rates can be achieved. There are triggers in place for highways, transport and infrastructure works, which are threats to delivery. Realistic review of timeframes for development and impacts on the trajectory is required.	58441 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No evidence has been put forward to detail how delivery will be sped up – what mechanisms will be used to ensure that the assumed faster delivery happens?	58977 (Endurance Estates)
Unclear what technical work has been undertaken to demonstrate that an additional 750 dwellings within the plan period is achievable.	59235 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59236 (Wates Developments Ltd)
There is no credible evidence that faster delivery can be achieved at Northstowe. No reference to site specific circumstances that would result in above average annual completions being deliverable on these sites.	60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)
Northstowe Area Action Plan is now 14 years old – is the Local Plan an opportunity to replace any out of date policies?	58550 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Important that the policy identifies onsite and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation measures required to address impacts.	59644 (Historic England)
Investigating flood risk management options to reduce the risk of flooding in Oakington, including attenuation upstream within Northstowe, potential channel modifications, and natural flood management. Policy should include this as an opportunity for	59721 (Environment Agency)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
delivering flood risk management measures or securing financial contributions.	
Being served by the Uttons Drove WRC.	60451 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)
Share concerns about impact of building on local water tables. A Hydroecological Assessment concluded that land use change as a result of the development of Northstowe is the most significant impact on local groundwater. Unclear whether local ground water features will ever recover. No further building until issue is resolved. Need tighter enforcement of environmental standards on new developments.	60744 (Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Green Parties)

SS/6: Land north of Waterbeach

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Offers excellent opportunities for linked trips to the existing settlement.	57162 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57226 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Further growth should be located here to ensure the long-term vitality of the settlement.	57162 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57226 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Must ensure that faster delivery rates does not impact on infrastructure provision and services in surrounding areas e.g.	57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
access to doctors and transport networks, and recreational pressure on green infrastructure.	
If faster delivery rates, essential that supporting infrastructure and services are also delivered at an accelerated rate.	58121 (P Bearpark), 59843 (Waterbeach PC)
Can the necessary infrastructure for this site also be delivered at the faster pace? Trip budget caps on both Waterbeach West (first 1,600 dwellings) and Waterbeach East (first 800 dwellings). No certainty over build programme for dualling of the A10. Similar concerns regarding waste water infrastructure and relocation of Waste Water Treatment Works.	58977 (Endurance Estates), 59104 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)
Unclear what technical work has been undertaken to demonstrate that an additional 750 dwellings within the plan period is achievable.	59235 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59236 (Wates Developments Ltd)
Careful consideration should be given to impact that faster delivery could have on market absorption rates and tenure diversity to justify that this is achievable.	57353 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Query whether evidence to justify increased delivery rates is robust, as absence of evidence for higher completion rates and unclear what evidence is being relied on.	58306 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 58649 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Consultation document states that there is evidence for higher annual delivery rates, however, Strategy Topic Paper states in the section on Policy S/NS that the Councils “have not completed evidence focused on this topic”. Therefore no clear justification for increased delivery by 2041. Unclear whether assumptions on delivery provided in Strategy Topic Paper are from promoter or Councils.</p>	<p>58437 (Deal Land LLP)</p>
<p>Object to assumption that higher delivery rates can be achieved. There are triggers in place for highways, transport and infrastructure works, which are threats to delivery. Realistic review of timeframes for development and impacts on the trajectory is required.</p>	<p>58441 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP)</p>
<p>No evidence has been put forward to detail how delivery will be sped up – what mechanisms will be used to ensure that the assumed faster delivery happens?</p>	<p>58977 (Endurance Estates)</p>
<p>There is no credible evidence that faster delivery can be achieved at Northstowe or Waterbeach. No reference to site specific circumstances that would result in above average annual completions being deliverable on these sites.</p>	<p>60698* (The White Family and Pembroke College)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Issues relating to public transport and active travel options must be given proper consideration, and trip budgets will need to be revised.	58121 (P Bearpark)
New homes at Waterbeach will create serious transport implications. Cannot make assumptions based on transport plans not yet developed.	57661* (Histon & Impington PC)
Any changes to the policy for Waterbeach New Town must properly consider the Neighbourhood Plan.	58121 (P Bearpark), 59843 (Waterbeach PC)
Important that the policy identifies onsite and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation measures required to address impacts.	59644 (Historic England)
Would like to know whether Policy SS/6 will be carried forward into the new Local Plan.	59843 (Waterbeach PC)
<p>There are identified infrastructure issues that need to be overcome in a timely and funded manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • water – until there is a sustainable water supply, the proposed growth may be unsustainable • sewage – build out must be limited until a new Waterbeach pumping station is commissioned and operational 	59843 (Waterbeach PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • electricity – barrier to current growth, will reinforcements be in place to enable accelerated delivery? • transport – proposals for sustainable transport infrastructure are piecemeal, and responsibility for delivery, cost and funding is unknown 	
<p>Will be served through a connection to Cambridge main and then to the existing Milton Wastewater Recycling Centre and new Cambridge wastewater facility.</p>	<p>60451 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)</p>

SS/7: Bourn Airfield

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Support the development of Bourn Airfield.</p>	<p>59471* (Shepreth PC)</p>
<p>No objection to the allocation being carried forwards, but development needs to be compatible with the existing industrial uses at Wellington Way and not hamper future expansion plans. The existing uses on the site generate noise and are serviced by heavy goods vehicles. Exploring expansion opportunities that could increase noise and number of heavy goods vehicle movements a day. Design of Bourn Airfield New Village will</p>	<p>58267 (DB Group (Holdings) Ltd)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
need to ensure sufficient separation from noise sources and may require acoustic barriers.	
Recent pre-application advice sought in relation to extension of hours of operation resulted in a response that an application was unlikely to be supported as a result of a “detrimental impact on the living conditions of existing neighbouring properties and future occupiers in the New Village development”. The proposed development of Bourn Airfield New Village is constraining expansion plans and highlighting compatibility issues between neighbouring uses.	58267 (DB Group (Holdings) Ltd)
This is the only existing new settlement not to have amended annual delivery rates. Consider there is potential for higher delivery rates of up to 190 dwellings a year due to mix of tenures, enabling a range of housing products to be delivered without competing with each other.	59527 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)
Proposed policy maps should include the strategic site boundary and major development site boundary.	59527 (Countryside Properties – Bourn Airfield)
There are triggers in place for highways, transport and infrastructure works, which are threats to delivery. Realistic	58441 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
review of timeframes for development and impacts on the trajectory is required.	
The transport links / hub for Bourn Airfield should be considered in line with Cambourne and West Cambourne.	59180 (Cambourne TC)
Important that the policy identifies onsite and nearby heritage assets and any mitigation measures required to address impacts.	59644 (Historic England)
Within the Bourn waste water catchment, although given the constrained capacity it is planned to be served by a connection to Cambourne main and then to Uttons Drove WRC.	60451 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

The rural southern cluster

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [The rural southern cluster](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

25 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on development within the rural southern cluster, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific sites. These comments have been moved to the relevant site specific policy: S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton and S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus.

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Support for clustering of new development in this area due to its good public transport links, co-location of housing and employment, and opportunities to expand existing business clusters. Parish Councils and individuals highlight the need to ensure that villages are not subject to a disproportionate amount of development, concern for loss of farmland and countryside, fear of urbanisation of the rural area, traffic congestion, lack of water resources, and poor infrastructure. Ickleton PC particularly highlights need to consider landscape impacts and impacts on river/chalk streams taking account of committed and planned developments. Some site promoters suggest that further allocations should be identified in this area, while other site promoters question separating the southern cluster from the rest of the rural area, especially as there are similar opportunities in other rural areas like the area surrounding Melbourn. TWI object to Granta Park and Welding Institute not being referred to given their importance. Support for the rejection of specific sites and requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

Table of representations: The rural southern cluster

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Support the clustering of new development in this area, as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • public transport links are good • it improves sustainability by co-locating housing and employment • provides more business space to support existing clusters 	<p>56581 (Gamlingay PC), 56870 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 58440 (Deal Land LLP), 57355 (Huntingdonshire DC)</p>
<p>Whilst wishing to support growth at the Biomedical Campus, care should be taken to protect the villages from disproportionate development.</p>	<p>59473 (Shepreth PC)</p>
<p>Babraham village is at risk from too much development as already two allocations in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and the Greater Cambridge Partnership park & ride and automated bus route. Further development would be above the housing need for the village and will have a significant adverse impact on the village character, the surrounding environment and landscape, local wildlife habitats, and historic assets. Risk creating ribbon development and amalgamation of villages. Will increase water abstraction from River Granta and put excessive pressure on existing amenities.</p>	<p>59262 (P Axon, H Axon, A Axon, G Axon, J Axon, H Thomas, D Stanwell-Smith, L Clayton-Payne, C Clayton-Payne, A Ogilvy-Stuart, D Savage, C Savage, S Punshon, M Punshon, M Punshon, J McCafferty, P McCafferty, P Elliott, P Elliott, S King, C Anastasi, Y Christova, J Thomas, R Thomalainen, S Thomalainen, R Smith, M Lucas, A Lucas, J Lucas, J Lovell)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Scale of the proposals and ambition is inadequate. Mismatch between economic potential of the existing sites and the scale of the new homes and employment sites being planned locally to support them.	58198 (SmithsonHill)
Welcomed that exceptional circumstances have been identified for Green Belt release, however consider that have not gone far enough. Additional land in the rural area should be identified for moderate levels of Green Belt release to ensure that viability of rural areas are protected and enhanced.	57164 (Southern & Regional Developments), 57229 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
The Local Plan states that the need to support the life sciences cluster is so great and the benefits are so significant to justify the release of land from the Green Belt, however the failure to make adequate provision for new housing in this area will have serious implications for travel patterns, carbon emissions, affordability and access to skilled labour. Additional land should be allocated for housing development.	58917 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
Agree there is a case for exceptional circumstances to release some limited areas from the Green Belt in this location if it results in the generation of less carbon emissions from care use.	57355 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the release of Green Belt land in this area, to enable housing growth next to established sustainable villages, and so that new residents are close to employment areas, services and facilities.	58440 (Deal Land LLP)
Opportunities for development on brownfield sites, for rural diversification and small business related developments should not be excluded.	60049 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)
Small residential developments should be included, taking account of Neighbourhood Plans.	60049 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)
Range of housing, jobs and facilities are needed as part of new allocations to allow villages to thrive and remain vibrant.	60565 (Countryside Properties)
Sites in villages on rail routes, at public transport nodes, and within public transport corridors should be prioritised.	60049 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)
Significant growth in appropriate locations that maximises public transport should be considered as additions to the sites proposed.	60049 (Cambridgeshire Development Forum)
Question the approach that separates the southern cluster from the rest of the rural area – there are other public transport and employment clusters, such as the area surrounding Melbourn. South western area should be explored in the same way as an	57333 (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
area with strong existing public transport connections and employment opportunities.	
Regret any loss of good farmland and countryside.	58394 (Linton PC)
Fear urbanisation from Stapleford to Saffron Walden. Major planning applications have been considered individually, with no consideration of cumulative effects and impacts on landscape and existing settlements.	57907 (Ickleton PC)
Moratorium is required on large developments in the upper Cam valley, until water usage, landscape impacts, and impacts on river/chalk streams have been assessed taking account of existing permitted developments and those already planned for. Cross-border liaison under Duty to Co-Operate is required.	57907 (Ickleton PC)
Planning has already been granted to develop some of these areas, but roads and other infrastructure still need to be upgraded. Infrastructure should be a priority and delivered ahead of other buildings.	58046 (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Concerns over traffic congestion, poor infrastructure, lack of water resources, and significant building on floodplains.	58394 (Linton PC)
Important that there is both sufficient and suitable business space to meet the needs of those who wish to locate in the area.	58198 (SmithsonHill)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the recognition that the life sciences cluster needs to be maintained and developed. The success of the cluster is closely linked to the continued success of Cambridge Biomedical Campus.	58803 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust)
Object to Granta Park and the Welding Institute (TWI) not being referred to, as this is not reflective of the importance of Granta Park.	58726 (TWI)
Major transport consideration needed before any proposed expansion. Rural areas should not be segregated from Cambridge, particularly where there are jobs and services nearby.	57700 (Histon & Impington PC)
Concerns regarding effects of expansion of Haverhill – need workplaces for those living in these homes, and also genuinely affordable housing for lower paid workers.	58394 (Linton PC)
Health services and facilities – any new allocations must undertake an assessment of existing health infrastructure capacity and fully mitigate the impact on the proposed development through appropriate planning obligations. Early engagement needed with the NHS to agree the form of infrastructure required.	59155 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Site specific allocations should set out the principles for delivering improvements to general health and wellbeing, and promote healthy and green lifestyle choices through well-designed places.</p>	<p>59155 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)</p>
<p>Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • additional land in the rural area should be identified for moderate levels of Green Belt release to ensure that viability of rural areas are protected and enhanced • south-western area should be explored in the same way as an area with strong existing public transport connections and employment opportunities • to expand Avtech commercial business cluster • mismatch between economic potential of the existing sites and the scale of the new homes and employment sites being planned locally to support them • to support the clustering of new development in this area • responds directly to the priorities of the Local Plan • to ensure a range of housing, jobs and facilities are provided within villages to allow them to thrive and remain vibrant 	<p>57164 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57229 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 57333 (HD Planning Ltd), 58006 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College), 58198 (SmithsonHill), 58440 (Deal Land LLP), 58715 (Grange Farm Partnership), 58803 (CBC Limited, Cambridgeshire County Council and a private family trust), 58917 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 59118 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited), 60565 (Countryside Properties)</p>

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Avtech1, Avtech 2 and the expansions of Duxford village (HELAA Site 40095) – should be allocated for employment uses, housing and community facilities	58006 (Imperial War Museum / Gonville and Caius College)
Land to the east of the A1301, south of the A505 near Hinxton and west of the A1301, north of the A505 near Whittlesford (HELAA site 40441) – should be allocated for employment uses	58198 (SmithsonHill)
Land at Grange Farm, east of A11 & north of A1307 (HELAA site 59401) – should be allocated as a new settlement	58715 (Grange Farm Partnership)
Six Mile Bottom (HELAA site 40078) – should be allocated as a new settlement	59118 (L&Q Estates Limited and Hill Residential Limited)

Support for sites rejected

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Land adjacent to Babraham (HELAA site 40297)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection as will have a significant adverse impact on Babraham village character, its surrounding environment, local wildlife habitat and historic interest. 	59262 (P Axon, H Axon, A Axon, G Axon, J Axon, H Thomas, D Stanwell-Smith, L Clayton-Payne, C Clayton-Payne, A Ogilvy-Stuart, D Savage, C Savage, S Punshon, M Punshon, M Punshon, J McCafferty, P McCafferty, P Elliott, P Elliott, S King,

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	C Anastasi, Y Christova, J Thomas, R Thomalainen, S Thomalainen, R Smith, M Lucas, A Lucas, J Lucas, J Lovell)
<p>Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c, Sawston (HELAA site 40509)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection as will have a significant adverse impact on Babraham village character, its surrounding environment, local wildlife habitat and historic interest. 	59262 (P Axon, H Axon, A Axon, G Axon, J Axon, H Thomas, D Stanwell-Smith, L Clayton-Payne, C Clayton-Payne, A Ogilvy-Stuart, D Savage, C Savage, S Punshon, M Punshon, M Punshon, J McCafferty, P McCafferty, P Elliott, P Elliott, S King, C Anastasi, Y Christova, J Thomas, R Thomalainen, S Thomalainen, R Smith, M Lucas, A Lucas, J Lucas, J Lovell)

S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

10 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the rural southern cluster heading as the comments were specific to the Genome Campus. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Ickleton PC identified issues regarding implementation of the planned development, including addressing governance issues. Histon & Impington and Linton PCs highlighted the need for suitably priced housing to support a range of job types. Campaign for Protection of Rural England object to the development in principle. Historic England consider that the policy should mention the importance of considering historic environment impacts. North Herts DC highlight the need to consider traffic implications. One individual highlights that jobs should be where homes are planned, such as Cambourne.

Table of representations: S/GC – Genome Campus, Hinxton

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Strongly object to Policy S/GC: Genome Campus, Hinxton as: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Too large compared to existing campus.• Majority of it is on productive farm land.	59563 (Campaign for Protection of Rural England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is room for expansion on the existing campus. • It is not required and is sprawl into the countryside, hidden within the badge of a Wellcome expansion. • Hinxton is a rural community with a long history in a countryside location and this should be respected. • It is similar to a previous proposal near Hinxton which the Council rejected and which was upheld by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal. 	
<p>Removing further land from the Green Belt is inconsistent with the re-iteration of the purpose of the Green Belt in the statement on Great Places in the Plan.</p>	<p>60402 (Campaign for Protection of Rural England)</p>
<p>Within the Green Belt and therefore needs protection from excessive development.</p>	<p>56724 (Croydon PC), 56723* (Croydon PC)</p>
<p>Support research work at the Genome Campus. But concerns over the availability of suitably priced housing. For example, affordable housing for those in lower paid roles that support the research such as cleaners, childcare, should be supported.</p>	<p>57701 (Histon & Impington PC), 58395 (Linton PC)</p>
<p>It is of utmost importance that the “tie” conditions for the development restricting homes to Campus workers are</p>	<p>57918 (Ickleton PC)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>rigorously applied. Failure to limit growth will lead to unacceptable impacts on neighbouring communities.</p>	
<p>Consideration should be given at an early date to civic governance issues including whether a separate parish council is required. There is the potential that the voices of Hinxtton residents will be lost, with residents dependent on the Campus for homes and jobs in the majority.</p>	57918 (Ickleton PC)
<p>Policy 5 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan applies as the site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for chalk and part of it lies within a MSA for sand and gravel.</p>	56938 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
<p>No designated heritage assets within the site boundary, but to the west it is close to a Conservation Area which includes several grade II* and numerous grade II listed buildings and to the south lies an important cluster of scheduled monuments. The policy should mention the importance of considering historic environment impacts as part of any future proposals and it would be helpful if it mentioned key heritage assets and potential mitigation needed.</p>	59646 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Agree with the proposed policy for additional industry and warehousing uses associated specifically with the use requirements of the Genome Campus.	57356 (Huntingdonshire DC)
The Wellcome Genome Campus is currently only accessible by car from North Hertfordshire. The proposed development will have an impact on the district, positively in terms of increased employment opportunities or negatively in terms of additional traffic using the A505. The recommendations from the current A505 corridor studies could have a bearing on this.	58666 (North Hertfordshire DC)
Locate the Genome Campus where you are planning new homes e.g. Cambourne. The location of employment growth south of the city and new homes north of the city contradicts the desire for sustainable growth.	56496* (D Clay)

S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

21 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the rural southern cluster heading as the comments were specific to the Babraham Research Campus. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Babraham PC oppose the removal of the campus from the green belt and expansion outside of their land. Cambridge Past, Present & Future highlight green belt policy requirements for compensatory improvements to the remaining green belt. They also highlight landscape sensitivities that would need to be addressed. Campaign for Protection of Rural England consider the policy proposals too vague to provide assurance they will not lead to sprawl. Concerns were expressed by a number of people about the continued expansion of the campus, and its impact on the green belt, the environment and the character of Babraham village. Some representors, including Linton PC and Histon & Impington PC, were concerned about the availability of affordable housing to support the employment. Babraham Research Campus support the allocation of development and release from the green belt, due to the importance of the site to the life sciences cluster. They also support opportunities to include co-located housing, in particular to redevelop from 40 homes to 60 homes and 100 student apartments. They seek amendments to the site boundary, including to

exclude the church. They include evidence to support the proposals. Historic England highlight the need for consideration of impact on historic assets when exploring development proposals.

Table of representations: S/BRC – Babraham Research Campus

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Within the Green Belt and therefore needs protection from excessive development.	56725 (Croydon PC), 56723* (Croydon PC)
The Research Campus has already doubled in size in last five years. The removal of the site from the Green Belt will add further pressure on the need for housing in Babraham and will destroy the open, rural landscape character of Babraham Hall's open parkland setting.	59216 (P Axon, H Axon, A Axon, G Axon, J Axon, H Thomas, D Stanwell-Smith, L Clayton-Payne, C Clayton-Payne, A Ogilvy-Stuart, D Savage, C Savage, S Punshon, M Punshon, M Punshon, J McCafferty, P McCafferty, P Elliott, P Elliott, S King, C Anastasi, Y Christova, J Thomas, R Thomalainen, S Thomalainen, R Smith, M Lucas, A Lucas, J Lucas, J Lovell), 59262* (P Axon, H Axon, A Axon, G Axon, J Axon, H Thomas, D Stanwell-Smith, L Clayton-Payne, C Clayton-Payne, A Ogilvy-Stuart, D Savage, C Savage, S Punshon, M Punshon, M Punshon, J McCafferty, P McCafferty, P Elliott, P Elliott, S King, C Anastasi, Y Christova, J Thomas, R Thomalainen, S Thomalainen, R Smith, M Lucas, A Lucas, J Lucas, J Lovell)
Successive developments over the last 5 years have resulted in extensive use of parish green belt for housing so reducing green	59216 (P Axon, H Axon, A Axon, G Axon, J Axon, H Thomas, D Stanwell-Smith, L Clayton-Payne, C Clayton-Payne, A Ogilvy-

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>space between Sawston and Babraham; adoption of CSET automated bus route and P&R; and doubling in size of the BRC in 5 years. The process of steady drip fed development is unacceptable to Babraham villagers.</p>	<p>Stuart, D Savage, C Savage, S Punshon, M Punshon, M Punshon, J McCafferty, P McCafferty, P Elliott, P Elliott, S King, C Anastasi, Y Christova, J Thomas, R Thomalainen, S Thomalainen, R Smith, M Lucas, A Lucas, J Lucas, J Lovell)</p>
<p>The BRC submission needs to be placed in context of other sites brought forward in the area. All sites together surround Babraham village.</p> <p>The process does not adequately explain the risk to Babraham village as demonstrated by earlier accepted developments in our Parish including the GCP Babraham P&R and automated bus route; the soon to be completed Hawthorns; and S/RSC/H1 (c).</p>	<p>59216 (P Axon, H Axon, A Axon, G Axon, J Axon, H Thomas, D Stanwell-Smith, L Clayton-Payne, C Clayton-Payne, A Ogilvy-Stuart, D Savage, C Savage, S Punshon, M Punshon, M Punshon, J McCafferty, P McCafferty, P Elliott, P Elliott, S King, C Anastasi, Y Christova, J Thomas, R Thomalainen, S Thomalainen, R Smith, M Lucas, A Lucas, J Lucas, J Lovell)</p>
<p>These individual sites taken both individually and together will have a significant adverse impact on Babraham village character, its surrounding environment, local wildlife habitat and historic interest. Specifically, these submissions, if accepted, will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amalgamate the villages of Sawston and Babraham to create a ribbon of housing stretching from Trumpington village, through the Shelfords and Stapleford. 	<p>59216 (P Axon, H Axon, A Axon, G Axon, J Axon, H Thomas, D Stanwell-Smith, L Clayton-Payne, C Clayton-Payne, A Ogilvy-Stuart, D Savage, C Savage, S Punshon, M Punshon, M Punshon, J McCafferty, P McCafferty, P Elliott, P Elliott, S King, C Anastasi, Y Christova, J Thomas, R Thomalainen, S Thomalainen, R Smith, M Lucas, A Lucas, J Lucas, J Lovell), 58232 (A Ogilvy-Stuart)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the current housing stock of a village regarded by Greater Cambridge Partnership as suitable for “infill only” by 2650% from 130 houses to 3710 houses. • Far exceed the advice from the most recent Housing Needs Assessment (November 2021) which advises that Babraham village should accommodate 10 additional houses over the next 10 years. • Take no account of the historic importance of Babraham village, its link to farming through the Bennet and Adeane family who built Babraham Hall and also introduced numerous agricultural innovations leading to a rich farming heritage. Their insight and commitment to the village created the unspoilt parkland setting surrounding Babraham Hall and the unobstructed open farming landscape in which they sit. • Build on land once farmed by Jonas Webb, who first created the Babraham enclosures and then became a world renowned farmer who pioneered early animal husbandry. 	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build on the few open landscape windows within the linear settlement, not least an ancient water meadow running alongside the River Granta to the South East. • Destroy important wildlife habitats in the form of river systems, riverine habitat corridors, floodplain grasslands and ancient water meadows. • Build around and adversely affect the setting of the 13 Grade 1, 2* and 2 listed buildings within the village and wider Parish. • Surround Babraham Hall's historic open parkland setting on all sides with new housing and laboratories, destroying the open, rural landscape character entirely. • Take no account of the numerous and important archaeological findings including Anglo Saxon settlements and graves only recently identified during exploratory digs in preparation for the Greater Cambridge Partnership guided bus route between Babraham and Sawston. 	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Place a considerable number of houses and research facilities on and close to floodplains stretching along the River Granta. • Put overwhelming pressure on the already overburdened river Granta in the form of additional water abstraction requirements, and damage the ecological balance of Cambridges chalk streams and associated habitats. • Place unsustainable and excessive pressure on limited village amenities, dominate a small historic village and infrastructure designed for only 130 houses. • Add to what has already been a large programme of building over the last 5 years within Babraham Parish including the Hawthorns development; the doubling of the Babraham Research Institute and South of Sawston Road. 	
<p>Removing this site from the Greenbelt will remove very important constraints on planning and should not be allowed. The Close is adjacent to the village - a conservation area - and must remain under the strictest planning constraints to make sure that development is extremely sensitively handled.</p>	58156 (H Thomas)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There has been enormous development in the Babraham Research Campus already, despite its greenbelt location, so removing this could be extremely detrimental to the village character, housing density and infrastructure. Removing the Campus from the greenbelt will undoubtedly invite over-development.	58156 (H Thomas)
Agree with the proposed policy if the release of green belt does not impact on important landscape features, biodiversity and heritage.	57358 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Co-locate the research campus where the majority of new homes are e.g. in Cambourne. It makes no sense to develop the majority of the new housing north of the city and then create new employment clusters south of the city.	56495 (D Clay)
Support Babraham research work, but concerns over availability of suitably priced housing.	58396 (Linton PC)
Agree that development should be restricted to R&D and appropriate supporting ancillary uses and infrastructure.	57358 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Supporting research important but that also includes affordable homes for those supporting the research generally, e.g., lower-level staff who's services are still required.	57702 (Histon and Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The listed buildings here are an important part of the heritage.	57702 (Histon and Impington PC)
Include publicly accessible footpaths through the campus open to members of the public like Hinxton.	57837 (D Lister)
Policy 5 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan applies as the site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area for chalk and nearly all within a MSA for sand and gravel.	56939 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Do not agree with the withdrawal of Babraham Institute from the Green Belt. We would strongly oppose any expansion of Babraham Institute outside of their land and into the surrounding Green Belt.	59507 (Babraham PC)
<p>The following provisos should be incorporated into the Local Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following principle should be applied: “National Planning policy requires that the impact of removing land from the Green Belt to be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land”. 	58569 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59507 (Babraham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Preferred Options documents do not seem to recognise that this site is located within the Cambridge Nature Network and that it is adjacent to two strategic green infrastructure areas making it an important site (Green Infrastructure Strategic Initiatives: Gog Magog Hills (3) and River Cam Corridor (2c)). We would expect the proposals in the policy area to reflect this with a very strong emphasis on biodiversity enhancement within or adjacent to the grounds of the campus combined with better public access/benefits. We note that google earth seems to show an area of exposed chalk in the south-west corner which could provide an opportunity for ecological restoration of priority calcareous grassland habitat. • There is a potential conflict between the development of this site and policies designed to protect landscape character. To be acceptable in planning terms, any new buildings would need to be below tree height as viewed from the Gog Magog Hills (including any chimneys or 	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>rooftop plant), they should also be designed to blend into the landscape when viewed at distance as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the area identified for development would be on much higher ground than those buildings that have already been built on the campus (which are sunk into the hillside). ○ This location is sensitive in landscape character terms, being visible from the higher ground of the Gog Magog Hills, including from the Roman Road Schedule Ancient Monument. ● One of the newer buildings on the campus has already had a very negative impact on landscape which is contrary to planning policy and should not have been granted permission (photos provided). We request that before any future development of the site takes place there is a requirement for retrospective action to screen this building and/or better blend it into the landscape when viewed at distance. 	
<p>Object most strongly to Policy S/BRC: Babraham Research Campus. The proposed policy area would approximately double</p>	<p>59565 and 60401 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>the size of the existing site. It is unacceptable to withdraw this area from the Green Belt. Withdrawal is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. The Babraham site is located within the Cambridge Nature Network and adjacent to two strategic green infrastructure areas (Green Infrastructure Strategic Initiatives: Gog Magog Hills (3) and River Cam Corridor (2c)).</p>	
<p>Vague terms such as these used by the Shared Planning Service:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Protect and enhance the landscaped setting of the site • Preserve the appearance of the conservation areas, and the setting of the Grade II Listed Babraham Hall and the Grade I Listed St Peters Church. • Protect and enhance the corridor of the River Granta (recognised as a county wildlife site) • Take steps to include sustainable travel opportunities, including the opportunities provided by the planned Cambridge South East Transport Scheme. • Retain the area of The Close as key worker and affordable housing to support the needs of the Campus. 	<p>59565 and 60401 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Any future renovation or replacement should retain the low density character, which responds to the sensitive village edge location.”</p> <p>These provide no comfort that this Policy will not lead to further sprawl into the countryside.</p>	
<p>The proposed Policy Area extension is on higher ground than the existing campus buildings and the location is sensitive in landscape character, being visible from the higher ground of the Gog Magog Hills, including from the Roman Road Scheduled Ancient Monument. The landscape has already been damaged by one of the recently constructed buildings on the campus. CPRE is very concerned by the further development of this site towards Cambridge and we will request the Secretary of State to consider very carefully any further attrition of the Green Belt at this location.</p>	59565 and 60401 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
<p>The identification of Land at Babraham Research Campus to be allocated as a proposed Policy Area for employment development, comprising the existing built area of the Campus and further areas adjoining the existing built area of the</p>	58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Campus, and the release of land within the Policy Area from the Green Belt is supported as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The life science cluster in Greater Cambridge continues to grow and there is a need for additional flexible R&D/laboratory workspace. • Life science companies tend to prefer to cluster together and close to research institutes and, in some cases clinical medicine, in order to benefit from the exchange of ideas, information, resources. • The Employment Land and Economic Development Evidence Study identifies that at the Babraham Institute site “intensification opportunities are limited given greenbelt sensitivities” and that “the site should be considered for employment designation”. • The Campus has seen rapid growth over the last 5 years with considerable interest in additional space for expansion or relocation. • The Campus has been highly successful in attracting new companies and is driving investment in the Cambridge Southern Research Cluster. 	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Campus's key point of difference when compared to other science and R&D centres in the country is the support infrastructure offered to start-ups, which gives the Campus its unique role within the life science research and development ecosystem. • Demand for space is now outstripping supply. The rapid success of the Campus has now stalled and this has become a significant barrier to growth. Additional space is required across all stages of the business lifecycle. • The development of new space is consistent with the objectives of both national and local planning policy to support economic growth and particularly clusters of knowledge-driven, creative and high technology industries. 	
<p>There is a need for additional dedicated housing at the Campus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide initial accommodation to retain Cambridge University doctoral graduate students from outside the UK – a first step on the housing ladder. • For key underpinning support staff that operate the facilities at the Campus. 	58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Greater Cambridge Local Plan will facilitate higher rates of housing delivery, but it will be sometime before this has a meaningful effect on house prices and availability. The BRC needs the accommodation now otherwise the rapid growth of the Campus seen in recent years is likely to stall. • Co-locating housing with the employment will reduce the need for staff and visitors to travel to/from off-site will reduce the expansion's impacts on transport infrastructure and services in the wider area. 	
<p>In order to achieve the identified development aspirations it is appropriate to release the developed area of the Campus and adjoining land from the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Cambridge Green Belt Study (2021) concludes that the parcel has 'low harm' if released from the Green Belt. The parcel scored Limited/No Contribution to the first Purpose of the Cambridge Green Belt and Relatively Limited to the remaining two.</p>	<p>58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>A Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) and Green Belt Study has been prepared by Bidwells LLP in support of these representations. The Bidwells Green Belt Study concludes that the proposed Campus expansion would result in a low level of harm. The analysis of visual and landscape aspects of the effects on the Green Belt found that the overall qualities and openness of the Cambridge Green Belt would be preserved, and the proposal will not cause harm. Where adverse effects are identified, they are limited to a very local scale and a restricted group of receptors.</p> <p>All other reasonable options for meeting the identified development needs have been explored and exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the release of land from the Green Belt.</p>	
<p>The boundary of the proposed Policy Area is broadly supported but it needs to exclude the Church and Church Lane as that falls outside of the Campus estate.</p>	58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)
<p>It is not clear how the councils have calculated 17.1 hectares and BRC Ltd would welcome a discussion to clarify this. At this</p>	58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>stage, the additional employment land (research and development) proposed to be delivered as part of the Campus expansion, through both redevelopment of the existing built area of the Campus and on land adjoining the Campus equates to 9.4 hectares (and circa 28,870 sqm of floorspace).</p>	
<p>Support the proposal to identify the whole site release from the Green Belt as a Policy Area, requiring any proposals to restrict development to research and development (use class (E(g)(ii) Research and development of products or processes) and appropriate supporting ancillary uses and infrastructure.</p>	<p>58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)</p>
<p>The following design principles are recommended to be applied to future detailing of the Campus expansion in order to protect and enhance the landscaped setting of the site;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dense planting around built development to the west and north-west in order to mitigate visual effects experienced by receptors on the bridleway 12/12, road users on Babraham Road and residents at the edge of Sawston; • Larger tree specimens to the north of the proposal to filter possible glimpses of the proposed built form and flues in views from the Roman Road recreational footpath; 	<p>58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Retention of open, grassland landscape to the west of the Site to preserve the river landscape character and retain the capacity to improve and support the River Granta GI corridor;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal green gaps between the existing and proposed built form to retain some local sense of openness. • It is noted that the mitigation of visual effects would be reliant on the successful establishment of proposed planting. Therefore, appropriate landscape maintenance plans can also be prepared to ensure the planting will thrive and grow successfully. 	
<p>An initial Built Heritage Appraisal, including a site sensitivity plan, has been prepared in support of these representations. It includes an assessment of the initial impacts in terms of built heritage in the context of the emerging illustrative masterplan. The Appraisal concludes that, at this early stage, if masterplanning is further developed to ensure impacts on built heritage assets are mitigated or removed altogether these impacts are likely to be at the level of “less than substantial” harm in terms of the policies of the NPPF – although it is not</p>	<p>58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>possible to define any more precisely the levels of impact at this stage until more detail is available.</p>	
<p>BRC Ltd are committed to protecting and enhancing the corridor of the River Granta. A priority for BRC's approach to nature is, in the first instance, retaining the existing ecological value such as the flood plain which provides flood alleviation and locks up carbon. Overall, Campus expansion will enhance ecological value by delivering at least a 20% biodiversity net gain (BNG) in line with Natural Cambridgeshire's Vision of doubling the nature conservation value of the area by 2050. This will consist of wider enhancements to the campus, including improvements to the river systems. Detail on biodiversity enhancements are provided in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal.</p>	<p>58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)</p>
<p>A Transport Strategic Overview and Access and Movement Strategy has been prepared which sets out the access and movement ambition and commitments for BRC and has been used to inform the emerging Illustrative Masterplan for the campus expansion. The strategy is based on a sustainable expansion that integrates with existing and committed walking, cycling and public transport networks, such as the CSET</p>	<p>58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>scheme, so that the expansion has excellent connectivity with surrounding areas by these modes, as well as continued permeability through the Campus site. The key elements of the strategy are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing the Need to Travel by Car and Build in Healthy Lifestyles through the provision of on-site housing, a network of cycle and footpaths and thoughtfully planned internal layout. • Maximising Opportunities for New Types of Mobility through a flexible and resilient transport strategy and planning for the campus expansion. • Prioritising Walking and Cycling for Local Trips through the provisions of high quality connections and the preparation of a Travel Plan. • Maximising the Use of Public Transport through developing a public transport strategy that makes full use of the committed Cambridge South East Transport Scheme (CSET) public transport strategy and infrastructure, develop a public transport strategy that makes full use of the committed Cambridge South East 	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Transport Scheme (CSET) public transport strategy and infrastructure and footways and cycleways connecting to current and future public transport services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private Car Strategy through prioritising cyclists and pedestrians over motorised vehicles, car parking provision that is balanced at a level which recognises likely demand, but also seeks to deter habitual car use for journeys that could be made by non-car modes and car club spaces. <p>The transport improvements planned through the Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) scheme provide a significant opportunity to align and support the Campus plans for expansion.</p> <p>The Strategy concludes that there are no transport nor highways reasons why the Babraham Research Campus Expansion should not be allocated for development in the Greater Cambridge Local Plan.</p>	
<p>BRC Ltd supports the area of The Close being retained as affordable housing for key workers to support the needs of the Campus. The proposed redevelopment from 40 homes to 60</p>	<p>58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
homes and 100 student apartments will retain a low density character and respond appropriately to its village edge location.	
A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been completed. It concludes that the overall value of the site to wildlife is considered to be Lower at the County scape. The report states that it is likely to be possible to deliver effective mitigation for any impacts arising from development of the proposed Campus masterplan to benefit biodiversity	58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)
<p>A Sustainability Statement has been prepared. The Statement sets out the ambition and commitments for BRC and has been used to inform the emerging Illustrative Masterplan for the campus expansion. These address the following areas:</p> <p>Physical – Achieving net zero carbon: Passive design and energy efficiency; All electric servicing strategy; Renewable generation; Pathway to net zero carbon buildings; Connectivity; Electric Vehicle Charging; Digitally enhanced lives.</p> <p>Social – Creating vibrant communities: Accelerating knowledge and creativity; Inclusive Placemaking; Empowered local voice.</p> <p>Economic – Pursuing inclusive prosperity: Circular Economy; Construction; Stewardship; Life Science.</p>	58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Human – Enabling personal empowerment: Healthy Buildings; Fitness and Wellbeing</p> <p>Natural – Achieving an environmental net gain: Natural Capital</p>	
<p>Babraham Research Campus is largely located in Flood Zone 1 which is a low chance of flooding. The River Granta runs within the site and the land immediately bordering the river encroaches into Flood Zone 2. A number of mitigation measures would be put in place including the creation of additional flood plains and flood scrapes. Other opportunities include restoring the minor watercourses to a more meandering profile; reinstating shallow foot-drains; restoring lost ponds; re-wetting the grazing marsh. Additionally, by introducing new systems such as SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems), street trees, a green roof and green walls the water management capacity of the site could be further enhanced.</p>	<p>58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)</p>
<p>An Archaeological Assessment has found that all the archaeological remains reported at the Campus are 'undesigned heritage assets' in the meaning of the NPPF. Based on the extensive archaeological investigations carried out</p>	<p>58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>on the site, there are unlikely to be further assets of substantially higher significance than those already found and excavated.</p> <p>The main potential impact of development within the BRC lies primarily within the footprint of proposed new buildings along with any buried services. Based on the present assessment of archaeological potential and the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Team's past approaches to the archaeology within the BRC, there is no expectation that any future finds would have a significance which would warrant their preservation in situ or constrain potential future allocation and development of the Campus.</p>	
<p>The identification of Babraham Research Campus as a Policy Area in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, including for its expansion, would provide significant economic, social and environmental benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to its release from the Green Belt, the site has no insurmountable technical constraints that would preclude the development of further employment land and supporting Campus-linked housing as part of a planned expansion of the Campus; 	58615, 58626, 58633 and 58878 (Babraham Research Campus)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering the objectives of the Government's objectives to grow the UK's Life Science capabilities by focussing economic growth within the core of the Cambridge Southern Research cluster; • Provision of circa 28,870 sqm of net additional research and development floorspace within an exemplary working science community which in turn would support approximately 1,400 jobs and £50.7m in GVA to the national economy. Lending critical mass to the Campus would also create more opportunities for interactions and collaboration to support innovation; • Further employment opportunities through the provision of expanded on-site facilities and amenities to meet the needs of the Campus and through the construction process and increase in business rates; • Provision of 120 net additional Campus linked houses; • Provision of new and enhanced nursesey and retail provision, including for a new community meeting point and a new local play area; 	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of circa 3.5 hectares of amenity land, for the use of the Campus and the local community; A new community orchard and ‘Common’ area within the south of the Campus, adjacent to the community planting area (Forest Garden), local school and cricket pitch; • The site’s location within the A1307 Strategic Transport Corridor between Cambridge and Haverhill enables the site to support potential transport improvements in the corridor, such as the Cambridge South East Transport scheme (CSET); • New and enhanced opportunities for informal recreation to promote health and wellbeing; • An embedded Net Zero Carbon strategy from the outset to ensure a positive, local response to climate change; • A development capable of securing at least 20% Biodiversity Net Gain as a result of the extensive network of retained and proposed green spaces providing opportunities for an increase in natural habitat and ecological features; 	

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enriching landscape and providing an array of new publicly accessible green open spaces; • Mitigating and enhancing flood risk through the creation of additional flood plains and flood scrapes; and • A development capable of providing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land and to define new robust Green Belt boundaries. 	
<p>The Babraham Institute is currently only accessible by car from North Hertfordshire. The proposed development will have an impact on the district, positively in terms of increased employment opportunities or negatively in terms of additional traffic using the A505. The recommendations from the current A505 corridor studies could have a bearing on this.</p>	58669 (North Hertfordshire DC)
<p>The site includes the grade I listed Church of St Peters and grade II listed Babraham Hall as well as part of Babraham Conservation Area. There are a number of other listed buildings nearby in the village of Babraham as well as a series of scheduled monuments on the higher land to the north and north west of the site. Any development of the site has the potential to</p>	59647 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
affect these heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.	
Welcome the reference to the church and Hall and Conservation Area in the bullet points on page 10. Reference should also be made to the wider offsite heritage assets.	59647 (Historic England)
The wording should be amended to read, “Development should conserve or where appropriate enhance the significance of heritage assets, including the grade I listed St Peters Church, grade II Babraham Hall and Babraham Conservation Area as well as nearby heritage assets (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset).”	59647 (Historic England)
Support the release of land from the Green Belt to support nationally important R and D and life science jobs located near to public transport routes and active transport.	60117 (C Blakeley)

S/RSC: Other site allocations in the rural southern cluster

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/RSC: Other site allocations in the Rural Southern Cluster](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

121

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Individuals have commented that use of Green Belt land is contrary to previous consultations, and that Green Belt should be protected from urban sprawl as provides recreational space. Objections to release of Green Belt in Great Shelford and Babraham, and to development at Linton. Comments highlight need to retain character of existing villages. Parish Councils support small scale developments where there is suitable infrastructure and public transport, and highlight that Neighbourhood Plans need to be considered when identifying sites. Requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters, on the basis that there is a need for affordable housing, there is suitable land for additional residential development, and growth is needed to support existing village services and facilities. A comment from an individual that more smaller developments are needed to deliver homes quickly.

S/RSC/HW: Land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford – Cambridge Past, Present & Future, local parish councils, district councillors, and a number of individuals have commented that the site: fails to meet the exceptional criteria for Green Belt release, will destroy high grade land, will contribute to the merging of Great Shelford and Stapleford into one settlement, has poor quality access and will create congestion, and does not materially contribute towards the overall housing need. Cambridge Past, Present & Future and district councillors suggest the policy should include requirements for public open space / Green Belt mitigation / Local Green Space for both the northern and eastern boundaries. Concerns that proximity to the station will result in the new homes being bought by London commuters rather than locals, and that the allocation is based on the promise of transport initiatives that have not yet been approved. Also comments from individuals that there is no reference to the retirement village allowed on appeal for a nearby site, that the assessment fails to consider the proposed busway, that Cambridge South Station will not benefit new residents as its more convenient to travel by car to Addenbrooke's, and that the existing infrastructure is already overstretched such that new development will put pressure on water supply, drainage, services and facilities, biodiversity, and food production. Historic England has highlighted consideration of heritage impacts as an issue for further consideration. Support for its allocation from the landowner, with a commitment to prepare additional assessments.

S/RSC/MF: Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford – IWM has highlighted that the site falls within Duxford's Air Safeguarding Zone and Historic England has highlighted consideration of heritage impacts as an issue for further consideration.

S/RSC/CC: Comfort Café, Fourwentways – Historic England has highlighted consideration of heritage impacts as an issue for further consideration.

S/RSC/H/1(c): land south of Babraham Road, Sawston (Part of the site is in Babraham Parish) – individuals do not support this allocation as: the neighbouring site north of Babraham Road has used inappropriate building materials that are not in accordance with the Design Guide SPD, the housing density is inappropriate, the green space to be provided is negligible, transport improvements are needed, character of the village needs to be conserved, loss of woodland and farmland, and impacts on landscape and water courses need to be considered. A comment that once full planning permission is approved the allocation will no longer be necessary. Historic England has highlighted consideration of heritage impacts as an issue for further consideration.

Table of representations: S/RSC – Village allocations in the rural southern cluster

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Object to any Green Belt changes, including the release of Green Belt land in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Shelford • Babraham 	56485 (N Hilliard), 58436 (J Thomas)
The use of Green Belt land is contrary to previous consultations.	56485 (N Hilliard), 56684 (P Dootson)
Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • suitable for additional residential development (including, affordable housing, market housing, key worker housing, older persons housing, residential care home, custom or self-build housing, specialist ‘other forms’ of housing) 	57087 (Shelford Investments), 57128 (The Grange Field Consortium), 57509 (Cambridgeshire County Council (as landowner)), 58439 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58442 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58522 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 58540 (Deal Land LLP), 58906 (St John’s College Cambridge), 58927 (Wedd

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • within a village that provides sustainable modes of transport, employment opportunities (including knowledge based employment) • there is an identified need for affordable housing which would not be met by other means • suitable for open space and/or recreational/leisure uses • need to support the existing services and facilities in the village 	Joinery), 58940 (Carter Jonas), 59021 (Deal Land LLP), 59033 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland), 60566 (Countryside Properties), 60689 (Gladman Developments), 60691 (Gladman Developments), 60695 (Trustees of Great Wilbraham Estate), 60713 (D Wright), 60714 (Pembroke College), 60715 (C Sawyer Nutt), 60732 (F.C Butler Trust), 60753 (S Gardner), 60754 (S Gardner), 60771 (Mr and Mrs Bishop), 60773 (Abington Farms Ltd)
Green belt should be protected from urban sprawl and provides much needed recreational space.	56679 (R Rigge)
Comments on sites in Ickleton, Duxford and near Hinxton that have been rejected to date.	56533 (P Fletcher)
In general support small scale development in the rural area where there is suitable infrastructure and reliable alternative public transport other than car (train/bus/cycle).	56582 (Gamlingay PC), 56726 (Croydon PC), 57919 (Ickleton PC)
The reason for wanting to develop in these villages are understandable given the relatively high number of jobs in close proximity and the relative lack of new houses being planned for the south side of Cambridge. However, development within	56809 (M Colville)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
these villages should remain limited to avoid ruining the character of the village for existing residents.	
Should ensure that Neighbourhood Plans are fully taken into account when considering housing allocations.	57299 (Foxton PC)
Unclear as to whether these allocations are existing commitments or proposed allocations. There seems to be discrepancy within the wording and mapping along with inclusion within the main development strategy and the table included at page 32.	57332 (HD Planning Ltd)
No comment.	57359 (Huntingdon DC)
Strongly disapprove of any further expansion around Linton.	58397 (Linton PC)
Use good multidisciplinary design to offer alternatives to exploitative imposition on the land as in previous planning history.	58436 (J Thomas)
<p>Instead of land in Great Shelford, development could be delivered in other locations such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn • Over • Girton • Whittlesford 	58667 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Concerned about the definition and implications of the “Rural Southern Cluster” and this requires much more detailed elucidation, explanation and justification.</p>	<p>59855 (Barrington PC)</p>
<p>Policy has different name on map page.</p>	<p>60118 (C Blakeley)</p>
<p>The First Proposals plan is heavily reliant on the delivery of a handful of strategic developments, particularly large and complex sites which on average would take 5 to 8 years for the first home to be delivered. To ensure that housing delivery does not stall and the affordability crisis worsened as a result a pipeline of smaller developments which can deliver homes quickly will be needed in the short to medium term.</p>	<p>60712 (C King)</p>
<p>S/SCP/WHD Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge:</p> <p>This proposed policy area includes the scheduled monument and grade II* listed Chapel of the Hospital of St John and the grade II listed Red Lion. Any development in this area has the potential to affect the significance of these heritage assets.</p> <p>Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. Height is an issue in this very sensitive location.</p>	<p>59652 (Historic England)</p>

New allocations – housing

S/RSC/HW: Land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>The site fails to meet exceptional criteria for Green Belt release and will destroy high-grade land. There is no new relevant information to justify reassessment of this site since its rejection in the 2018 Local Plan. What are the ‘exceptional circumstances’ that the council has to remove the land from the Green belt?</p>	<p>Individuals</p> <p>56485 (N Hilliard), 56681 (N Campbell), 56684 (P Dootson), 56686 (A Kennedy), 56694 (D Kennedy), 56828 (S Dootson), 56829 (E Turnbull-Jones), 56831 (S Kwan), 56832 (V Nash), 56833 (M Dewey), 56835 (L Plumb), 56836 (L Carrothers), 56839 (A Collier), 56840 (M Farrington), 56842 (L Sikkema), 56844 (N Punshon), 56845 (B Ragbourn), 56849 (J White), 57317 (A Czernuszewicz), 57631 (P Antill), 57764 (J Sennitt), 57843 (A Gannon), 57982 (K Lockhart), 57985 (A Lockhart), 58083 (C Bendelack), 58101 (S Ingram), 58104 (K Ackerman), 58124 (C Hilliard), 58143 (N Hamid), 58150 (M Vigouroux), 59256 (P Sparks), 59283 (M Berkson), 59761 (Anonymous First Proposals Consultation), 60544 (P Mirrlees), 60254 (Cllr B Shelton), 60496 (Cllr N Sample)</p> <p>Public Bodies</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	<p>56972 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57561 (Stapleford PC), 59084 (Great Shelford PC)</p> <p>Third Sector Organisations 58575 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)</p> <p>Developers, Housebuilders and Landowners 58667 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)</p>
<p>Support for development at allocated land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford due to exceptional circumstances including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • near to good range of services and facilities, employment, sustainable modes of transport • need for additional housing including affordable housing 	<p>57303 (A J Johnson)</p>
<p>A number of technical reports will need to be prepared including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • landscape assessment • heritage assessment • ecological appraisal • transport assessment 	<p>57303 (A J Johnson)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There is no mention of the proposed retirement village in the Local Plan report.	56694 (D Kennedy)
The Cambridge South Station will not benefit the residents of the 100 new homes as it is more convenient to commute to Addenbrooke's from Shelford by car.	56485 (N Hilliard), 57985 (A Lockhart)
The assessment has failed to consider the proposed Bus Way, which is expected to run directly North of the site. The route does not provide reasonable access from Great Shelford. The construction of the Bus Way makes maintaining the intervening Green Belt land of greater importance, which this development would erode.	56485 (N Hilliard), 56694 (D Kennedy), 59283 (M Berkson)
The site sits exactly on the boundary between Great Shelford and Stapleford, so contributes to the merging of these communities into one continuous suburban settlement, damaging the character of the villages and impacting on social wellbeing and mental health.	56485 (N Hilliard), 56681 (N Campbell), 56694 (D Kennedy), 56832 (V Nash), 56833 (M Dewey), 56839 (A Collier), 56840 (M Farrington), 56842 (L Sikkema), 56844 (N Punshon), 57631 (P Antill), 57764 (J Sennitt), 57843 (A Gannon), 57982 (K Lockhart), 58083 (C Bendelack). 58101 (S Ingram), 58104 (K Ackerman), 58118 (S Lancaster), 58124 (C Hilliard), 58143 (N Hamid), 58150 (M Vigouroux), 59761 (Anonymous First Proposals Consultation)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>How have you assessed the poor quality access to this site?</p> <p>The site will exit onto a narrow 20 mph road. The increased traffic congestion and pollution along this road and through the conservation area of Stapleford will detriment the village environment. There is already a major issue with traffic queuing on Hinton Way at the railway crossing, which this development and 200 additional cars will exacerbate. Changes to public transport and the inadequate train/bus services would mean more residents would use their cars. Creating danger for cyclists on this route.</p>	<p>Individuals</p> <p>56485 (N Hilliard), 56684 (P Dootson), 56686 (A Kennedy), 56707 (M Zmija), 56679 (R Rigge), 56790 (R Rigge), 56828 (S Dootson), 56829 (E Turnbull-Jones), 56830 (H Sikkema Lucena), 56831 (S Kwan), 56832 (V Nash), 56835 (L Plumb), 56836 (L Carrothers), 56839 (A Collier), 56840 (M Farrington), 56842 (L Sikkema), 56844 (N Punshon), 56845 (B Ragbourn), 56849 (J White), 57317 (A Czernuszewicz), 57631 (P Antill), 57764 (J Sennitt), 57843 (A Gannon), 57861 (P Milne), 57900 (Schofield), 57982 (K Lockhart), 57985 (A Lockhart), 58083 (C Bendelack), 58118 (S Lancaster), 58124 (C Hilliard), 58143 (N Hamid), 58150 (M Vigouroux), 59256 (P Sparks), 59283 (M Berkson), 59761 (Anonymous First Proposals Consultation), 60496 (Cllr N Sample), 60544 (P Mirrlees)</p> <p>Public Bodies</p> <p>59084 (Great Shelford PC), 57561 (Stapleford PC)</p> <p>Third Sector Organisations</p> <p>58575 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>S/RSC/HW provides less than 1.5% of the new total housing allocations and does not materially contribute to new housing stock and is insignificant to the full Local Plan. Homes would not be truly affordable, and this site should not be built on. Why is such a large area (10 hectares) proposed for development?</p>	<p>Individuals</p> <p>56681 (N Campbell), 56684 (P Dootson), 56694 (D Kennedy), 56828 (S Dootson), 56829 (E Turnbull-Jones), 56831 (S Kwan), 56832 (V Nash), 56833 (M Dewey), 56839 (A Collier), 56840 (M Farrington), 57317 (A Czernuszewicz), 57631 (P Antill), 57764 (J Sennitt), 57900 (Schofield), 58101 (S Ingram), 58124 (C Hilliard), 58143 (N Hamid), 59283 (M Berkson), 59761 (Anonymous First Proposals Consultation), 60496 (Cllr N Sample)</p> <p>Public Bodies</p> <p>59084 (Great Shelford PC)</p>
<p>It seems that the longer-term intention of the Planning Department is for further green belt release in this location, this is evidenced by: “open space to be provided to the east of the built development to help provide compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt.” There is also green belt to the north (indeed that is the longer boundary and the one viewed from higher ground) and therefore if the intention was to contain the development there</p>	<p>58575 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
would be a requirement for public space/green belt mitigation for both the northern and eastern boundaries.	
The Planning Authority is basing the allocation on the promise of transport initiatives which have not yet been approved, or in some cases, even entered a planning application stage such as CSET.	59084 (Great Shelford PC)
The justification for this site seems to be that it is close to Great Shelford station. However, this means that the new dwellings will appeal to London commuters and therefore there is a high risk that the new housing does not support the new jobs creation set out in the Plan, but instead further exacerbates local housing shortage.	58575 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future), 59084 (Great Shelford PC)
There are other sites that are not protected by the Green Belt policy that should be prioritised. Housing on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus would be more appropriate and have less impact.	56836 (L Carrothers)
<p>Local infrastructure already over-stretched and development will put further demand and pressure on these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • water supply and drainage • schools 	<p>Individuals</p> <p>56485 (N Hilliard), 56681 (N Campbell), 56684 (P Dootson), 56686 (A Kennedy), 56694 (D Kennedy), 56707 (M Zmija), 56828 (S Dootson), 56829 (E Turnbull-Jones), 56830 (H</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GP practices • other local services and amenities • biodiversity, flora and fauna • Congestion and pollution from cars • local character including the Magog Hills and Wandlebury • long views from Mingle Lane to the rolling chalk hills to the north • food production needs and loss of arable land <p>What is the assessment of impact on local services?</p>	<p>Sikkema Lucena), 56831 (S Kwan), 56832 (V Nash), 56833 (M Dewey), 56835 (L Plumb), 56836 (L Carrothers), 56839 (A Collier), 56840 (M Farrington), 56842 (L Sikkema), 56844 (N Punshon), 56845 (B Ragbourn), 56849 (J White), 57317 (A Czernuszewicz), 57631 (P Antill), 57764 (J Sennitt), 57843 (A Gannon), 57900 (Schofield), 57982 (K Lockhart), 57985 (A Lockhart), 58083 (C Bendelack), 58101 (S Ingram), 58104 (K Ackerman), 58124 (C Hilliard), 58143 (N Hamid), 58150 (M Vigouroux), 59761 (Anonymous First Proposals Consultation), 60496 (Cllr N Sample), 60544 (P Mirrlees)</p> <p>Public Bodies</p> <p>56972 (Trumpington Residents Association), 57561 (Stapleford PC)</p>
<p>Uncertainty and changeability on the part of the council are contributors to significant stress for the local residents.</p>	<p>56684 (P Dootson), 56828 (S Dootson), 56829 (E Turnbull-Jones), 56831 (S Kwan), 56832 (V Nash), 56839 (A Collier), 56842 (L Sikkema), 57631 (P Antill), 58101 (S Ingram), 58143 (N Hamid)</p>
<p>Where is the environmental impact study for the two new areas that make up this proposed site? The two areas sit on different</p>	<p>56686 (A Kennedy), 56694 (D Kennedy), 57561 (Stapleford PC), 59761 (Anonymous First Proposals Consultation)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>land quality – part on meadow, and part on agricultural land. The meadow has flora and fauna with UK conservation status of ‘red’ and highest nature ratings in the European Monitoring of Biodiversity in Agricultural Landscapes (EMBAL) Survey Manual 2017. To use the meadow but only a small fraction of heavily used agricultural land with ‘between very low and rather low nature’ value suggests that the plan goes against supporting biodiversity at its core.</p>	
<p>Waverley Park an existing built-up area opposite will become available soon.</p>	56790 (R Rigge)
<p>We call on the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service to either (1) reduce the area of land proposed for development is OR (2) designate a Local Green Space the area of the 10-hectare plot beyond that which is necessary for 100 houses, thereby protecting it from development and offering the potential of park land with play facilities to the east of Great Shelford and Stapleford. This would represent a significant benefit to families living in the area.</p>	60496 (Cllr N Sample), 60397 (Cllr P Fane)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
All within MSAs for chalk and sand & gravel. MWLP Policy 5 applies. Site is adjacent to residential properties; amenity buffer likely to sterilise most of the mineral.	56940 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
In Fig. 33, the land between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Great Shelford (Policy S/RSC site HW) is marked in orange as an existing site when it should be purple as a proposed new site allocation.	59283 (M Berkson)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the Stapleford Conservation Area lies adjacent to the site, and includes a number of listed buildings, most notably the grade II* listed St Andrew's Church. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect these heritage assets through a change in their settings. Therefore, recommend the preparation of an HIA to determine/confirm whether this site is suitable, and to inform the policy wording.	59648 (Historic England)

S/RSC/MF: Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
All within a MSA for chalk. MWLP Policy 5 applies. Site is adjacent to residential properties and too small to contain a workable quantity of mineral.	56940 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
The 60 dwelling site at Maarnford Farm is within Duxford's Air Safeguarding Zone. Consultation is necessary to ensure that any development in this location does not affect airfield operations and residents of the new development are aware of the established impact of the location's proximity to the airfield.	58007 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)
There are no designated heritage assets on this site and whilst the Duxford Conservation Area lies to the south east of the site it is separated from the site by development and a playing field. Recommend the preparation of an HIA to determine/confirm whether this site is suitable, and to inform the policy wording.	59649 (Historic England)

New allocations – employment

S/RSC/CC: Comfort Café, Fourwentways

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>All within MSAs for chalk and sand & gravel. MWLP Policy 5 applies. Site is too small to contain a workable quantity of mineral.</p>	<p>56940 (Cambridgeshire County Council)</p>
<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets on site, there is a grade II listed building, the Temple café and restaurant, to the south of the site. Development of the site has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset through development within its setting. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. However, given the intervening vegetation and distance we consider the impact of development of the site on the asset is likely to be minimal.</p>	<p>59650 (Historic England)</p>

Continuing existing allocations – housing

S/RSC/H/1(c): land south of Babraham Road, Sawston (Part of the site is in Babraham Parish)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Do not support development. The site currently under construction (Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston (H1/b)) used inappropriate building materials for construction that do not align with the design guidelines of Sawston.	58159 (H Thomas)
Housing density is inappropriate and allocated green spaces is negligible.	58159 (H Thomas)
S/RSC/H/1 should only be allowed to go ahead if development aligns with Sawston design guidelines, and is at a density MUCH lower than H1/b.	58159 (H Thomas)
Transport infrastructure must be brought in to avoid the additional pressure that has been placed on Babraham village by H1/b.	58159 (H Thomas)
Should preserve Babraham and the unique rural wooded farmland character. Allow full conservation of historic character.	58436 (J Thomas)
Protect fertile soils, woodland, farmland and parkland character as a primary resource against climate change	58436 (J Thomas)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Should survey chalk, landscape, hydrology and protect watercourses.	58436 (J Thomas)
A full application for this site is currently pending consideration so it will no longer be appropriate to allocate it.	58540 (Deal Land LLP)
There are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary. However, Sawston Hall a grade II Registered Park and Garden lies to the south west of the site. Development of the site has the potential to impact the significance of this heritage asset through development within its setting. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.	59651 (Historic England)

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c, Sawston (HELAA site 40509) – should be allocated for residential development	57019 (KWA Architects), 57032 (KWA Architects)
Land adjacent to Babraham (HELAA site 40297) – should be allocated for residential development, employment uses,	57566, 57568, 57569, 57571, 57572 and 58482 (Cheveley Park Farms Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
community facilities, schools, public open space and areas for biodiversity enhancement.	
Land to the rear of 24 Brookhampton Street, Ickleton (HELAA: 40536) should be allocated for residential development.	60712 (C King)
Land off Cabbage Moor, Great Shelford (HELAA: 40529) – should be allocated for residential development	57087 (Shelford Investments)
Grange Field, Church Street, Great Shelford (HELAA: 40128) – should be allocated for residential development.	57128 (The Grange Field Consortium)
Robinson Farm, Sawston (HELAA: 40146) – should be allocated for residential development.	57509 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)
Mill Lane Site, Sawston (HELAA: 40341) – should be allocated for residential development.	58439 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd), 58442 (NW Bio and its UK Subsidiary Aracaris Capital Ltd)
Land west of Linton (HELAA: 51047) – should be allocated for residential development, a doctors surgery, an early years facility and open space.	58522 (Bloor Homes Eastern)
Land east of Cambridge Road, Sawston (HELAA site 40547) – should be allocated for a residential-led mixed use development.	58540 (Deal Land LLP)
Land west of Hinton Way, Great Shelford (HELAA: 40485) should be allocated for residential development.	58906 (St John’s College Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Wedd Joinery, Granta Terrace, Stapleford (HELAA: 40477) – should be allocated for residential development.	58927 (Wedd Joinery)
Land off Hinton Way Stapleford (HELAA: 40369) – should be allocated for residential development.	58940 (Carter Jonas)
Land east of Haverhill Road, Stapleford (HELAA: 40546) – should be allocated for mixed use development.	59021 (Deal Land LLP)
Land to the west of Duxford Road, Whittlesford (HELAA site 59397) – should be allocated for residential development.	59033 (Grosvenor Britain & Ireland)
Land to the north-west of Balsham Road, Linton (HELAA: 40411) - should be allocated for residential development.	60566 (Countryside Properties)
Land at Balsham Road, Linton (HELAA Site 40336) – should be allocated for residential development.	60689 (Gladman Developments)
Land at Back Road, Linton (HELAA Site 40343) – should be allocated for residential development.	60691 (Gladman Developments)
Land to the East of the A11, Mill Road, Great Wilbraham (HELAA site 40130) – should be allocated for employment uses.	60695 (Trustees of Great Wilbraham Estate)
Land to the South of Shelford Road and Cambridge Road, Fulbourn, (HELAA: 48064) – should be allocated for residential development.	60713 (D Wright)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land South of Horseheath Road Linton (HELAA: 40554) – should be allocated for residential development.	60714 (Pembroke College)
Land North of Pampisford Road, Great Abington (HELAA: 40539) – should be allocated for residential development.	60715 (C Sawyer Nutt)
West of 40 Station Rd West, Whittlesford (new site: 59391) – should be allocated for residential development.	60732 (F.C Butler Trust)
Land south of West End 27 West End Whittlesford (new site: 59382) – should be allocated for residential development.	60753 (S Gardner)
Land adj to Whittlesford Highways Depot 57 Station Road East Whittlesford (new site 59383) – should be allocated for residential development.	60754 (S Gardner)
Land adj to M11 (nr. 24 Newton Rd) Whittlesford (new site 59384) – should be allocated for residential development.	60754 (S Gardner)
Land north of Hinxton Court Hinxton (HELAA: 40080) – should be allocated for either employment uses or residential development.	60771 (Mr and Mrs Bishop)
Land between Great Abington and north of Great Chesterford (HELAA: 40352 and 45645) – should be allocated for residential development.	60773 (Abington Farms Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land east of M11, west of Duxford, AND Land at Duxford (HELAA: 40095) – should be allocated for residential development and community facilities.	58013 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)
Land north of Cambridge Road, Linton (HELAA site 51721) – should be allocated for residential development.	60513 (Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd)

Support for sites rejected

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land at Coploe Road, Grange Road, Ickleton (HELAA site 40502): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection as unsuitable for development. 	56533 (P Fletcher), 56669 (The Ickleton Society), 56670 (L O’Sullivan), 56671 (I Lester), 57919 (Ickleton PC)
Land south of Ickleton Road, Great Chesterford (HELAA site 47934): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection as unsuitable for development. 	56533 (P Fletcher), 56669 (The Ickleton Society), 56670 (L O’Sullivan), 56671 (I Lester), 57256 (A Gale), 57919 (Ickleton PC)
Land to the east of the A1301, south of the A505 near Hinxton west of the A1301, north of the A505 near Whittlesford, CB10 1RG (HELAA sites 52057, 52058, & 52059), Options 1, 2 & 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection as unsuitable for development. 	56533 (P Fletcher), 56669 (The Ickleton Society), 56670 (L O’Sullivan), 56671 (I Lester), 57919 (Ickleton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Land east of M11, west of Duxford, AND Land at Duxford (HELAA site 40095):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection as unsuitable for development. 	<p>56533 (P Fletcher), 56669 (The Ickleton Society), 56670 (L O'Sullivan), 56671 (I Lester), 57256 (A Gale), 57919 (Ickleton PC)</p>
<p>Land to the rear of 24 Brookhampton Street, CB10 1SP (HELAA site 40536):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection as unsuitable for development due to out of character with the village, access is restricted, next to a flood plain, is within a conservation area, and unnecessary in light of much more significant housing developments going ahead nearby. 	<p>56532 (P Fletcher), 56560 (S Lober), 56563 (J Williams), 56565 (G Nel), 56669 (The Ickleton Society), 56670 (L O'Sullivan), 56671 (I Lester), 56794 (C Waters), 56795 (M Waters), 57256 (A Gale), 57541 (J Varley), 57579 (A Izzarf), 57581 (M Mortaz), 57919 (Ickleton PC), 58024 (M Smith), 58779 (D Keating),</p>

S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/SCP: Policy areas in the rural southern cluster](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

21

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

General support for the approach towards the Policy areas in the rural southern cluster (S/SCP) with some particular points raised. Those who supported included Gamlingay PC who supported the need for improved cycling networks. Croydon PC indicated Papworth needed development after the loss of its hospital, as does Fen Drayton. They noted the current congestion in Duxford and questioned the need for additional development. Histon & Impington PC emphasised the need for the correct transport policy because some areas have very limited public transport.

One member of the public supported the existing site allocations to be carried forward along with the expansion of Babraham research campus using Green Belt land. Another member of the public suggested the inclusion of Granta Park to provide a locally agreed framework for future development. Peterhouse requested that Greenhedge Farm, Stapleford should be released from the Green Belt given its limited contribution to the Cambridge Green Belt.

The approach proposed for **Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge (S/SCP/WHD)** was supported by Imperial War Museum (IWM)/Gonville and Caius College who are keen to work with Greater Cambridge Partnership to explore delivery of Whittlesford Parkway Masterplan. IWM asks that they are considered a key stakeholder in sustainable transport plans.

Cambridgeshire County Council, as landowner also supports the promotion of an enhanced rural travel hub at Whittlesford Station and continue to promote their site at Whittlesford Depot for mixed use development. Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority, noted that the site is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for sand and gravel, and

part is within a MSA for chalk. The railway, A505 and existing residential and other sensitive properties would be a constraint to working the site for minerals.

BCM LLP on behalf of Land North of Station Road East, Whittlesford request, given the site's proximity to the site, that the land submitted should be considered in the wider context of this site. The site was outlined for mixed use and residential development in initial consultation documents. SmithsonHill noted its site at Hinxton is strategically placed in the centre of this area - outside of green belt, immediately north of the Genome Campus policy area, and adjacent to Whittlesford Parkway Station. H.J. Molton Settlement, while supporting this policy they indicated the policy is limited to "redevelopment" of the existing built-up area and suggest the policy area should be expanded eastwards to include the land to the east of Whittlesford Highways Depot.

The approach proposed to the area **South of A1307, Linton (S/SCP/H/6)** was broadly supported by both Linton PC and several members of the public. Many re-iterated the same point about the settlements of Linton and Little Linton having historically distinct identities. New development in the area would disrupt the historic open landscape, destroying the separation and damaging the individual character of each settlement. Furthermore, land in this area is a valuable environmental resource, which should be protected. They supported the retention of the land between Little Linton and Linton within the designated countryside. Historic England also support this policy approach, noting this policy area includes part of Linton Conservation area and many listed buildings; development in this area has the potential to impact upon these heritage assets and their settings; and the proposed policy restricts residential development in this area to improvements to existing properties.

Table of representations: S/SCP - Policy areas in the rural southern cluster

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the requirement for improved cycling networks to enable access from rural areas surrounding the sites.	56583 (Gamlingay PC)
Papworth needs development after the loss of its hospital, as is Fen Drayton. Duxford is already very congested, so not sure why additional development is required here.	56727 (Croydon PC)
Need to get transport policy right – some areas have very limited public transport.	57703 (Histon & Impington PC)
No comment.	57360 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Support existing site allocations to be carried forward including the expansion of Babraham research campus using Green Belt land.	60119 (C Blakeley)
The First Proposals consultation includes policy areas for the Babraham Research Campus and for the Genome Campus. Given further likely developments at Granta Park, having a Policy Area covering it would provide a locally agreed framework for future development.	60253 (T Orgee)
Greenhedge Farm, Stapleford: Overall, the Local Plan evidence clearly demonstrates that the site makes at best a relatively limited or limited contribution to the Cambridge Green Belt and	59435 (Peterhouse)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>in terms of purposes two and three it makes no contribution at all. In addition, its release would have negligible harm on the adjacent Green Belt and a low harm overall. The Council's own evidence, alongside that prepared by Peterhouse, clearly points in favour of releasing the site from the Green Belt.</p>	

S/SCP/WHD: Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Minerals and Waste - All within a Mineral Safeguarding Area (MSA) for sand & gravel; part within a MSA for chalk. Most of the site is within the settlement boundary. Railway, A505 and existing residential and other sensitive properties would be a constraint to working the minerals.</p>	<p>56941 (Cambridgeshire County Council)</p>
<p>HELAA site: 40165: Cambridgeshire County Council as landowner supports the promotion of an enhanced rural travel hub at Whittlesford Station and would like to continue to promote their site at Whittlesford Depot (reference 40165) for mixed use development.</p>	<p>57510 (Cambridgeshire County Council – as landowner)</p>
<p>IWM and Caius are supportive of S/SCP/WHD. IWM is keen to work with Greater Cambridge Partnership to explore delivery of</p>	<p>58008 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Whittlesford Parkway Masterplan. Also, keen to work together to shift to sustainable transport routes for visitors, staff and volunteers. Given the scale of IWM's economic impact in the region (£43m GVA), and ambitions for growth and the volume of potential road journeys this equates to, IWM asks that IWM is considered a key stakeholder in sustainable transport plans. IWM is encouraged by GCP Making Connections consultation emphasis on accelerating the development of greenways and regular bus routes to connect Royston to Whittlesford and Cambridge via Duxford.</p>	
<p>HELAA Site: 40097: As agent, on behalf of the landowner, land was submitted as part of the HELAA 'Call for Sites' (JDI - 40097 Site Name - Land North of Station Road East, Whittlesford) adjacent to the proposed mixed use site at Whittlesford Station (S/SCP/WHD Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge). We would request that given the close proximity to the site, together with part of the clients land specifically the access track included, that the land submitted should be considered in the wider context of this site. The site was outlined for mixed use and residential development in initial consultation documents.</p>	58178 (BCM LLP)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Land at Hinxton: By reference to Figure 40 of the first proposals plan, SmithsonHill notes that its site at Hinxton is strategically placed in the centre of this area - outside of green belt, immediately north of the Genome Campus policy area, and adjacent to Whittlesford Parkway Station. It is considered that there is substantial potential for future proposals on the SmithsonHill land to contribute positively to the rural southern cluster. SmithsonHill will be further exploring this potential, with the option to adapt and amend its AgriTech proposal to involve a broader mix of employment uses.</p>	<p>58204 (SmithsonHill)</p>
<p>Land East of Whittlesford Highway Depot (HELAA site 59406) and Station Rd West Whittlesford (HELAA site 59385): Support the new policy area S/SCP/WHD Whittlesford Parkway Station Area, Whittlesford Bridge however due to the sustainable location we believe this policy area should be expanded eastwards to include the land to the east of Whittlesford Highways Depot. This site immediately adjoins the policy area S/SCP/WHD and inclusion of this site would act as a very logical extension.</p> <p>Furthermore, the policy is limited to "redevelopment" of the</p>	<p>60368 (H.J. Molton Settlement)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>existing built up area and the inclusion of the adjoining, well contained site to the east would facilitate much needed further growth. The greenfield site would support the strategy and follow the redevelopment of the brownfield and as it is an unconstrained site can be delivered in a timely manner.</p>	

S/SCP/H/6 South of A1307, Linton

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Support for the proposals which exclude development in Little Linton.</p>	<p>57838 (S Nickalls), 57839 (S Nickalls), 57870 (A Nickalls), 57904 (S Foulds), 57921 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57949 (C Mackay), 58393 (Linton PC)</p>
<p>The settlements of Linton and Little Linton have historically had distinct identities. New development in the area would disrupt the historic open landscape, destroying the separation and damaging the individual character of each settlement. The direction of future development to other more sustainable locations is appropriate and will ensure that Little Linton and Linton retain their identity.</p>	<p>57838 (S Nickalls), 57839 (S Nickalls), 57870 (A Nickalls), 57904 (S Foulds), 57921 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57949 (C Mackay), 58393 (Linton PC)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land in this area is a valuable environmental resource, which should be protected.	57838 (S Nickalls), 57839 (S Nickalls), 57870 (A Nickalls), 57904 (S Foulds), 57921 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57949 (C Mackay)
Support for the retention of the land between Little Linton and Linton within the designated countryside.	57838 (S Nickalls), 57839 (S Nickalls), 57870 (A Nickalls), 57904 (S Foulds), 57921 (H Lawrence-Foulds), 57949 (C Mackay),
This policy area includes part of Linton Conservation area and just over a dozen grade II listed buildings. Development in this area has the potential to impact upon these heritage assets and their settings. We note that the policy restricts residential development in this area to improvements to existing properties. We broadly support this policy approach.	59653 (Historic England)

Rest of the rural area

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Rest of the rural area](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

38 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Whilst the webpage linked above effectively included only general comments on development within the rest of the rural area, some comments attached to this webpage relate to specific sites. These comments have been moved to the relevant site specific policy: S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area.

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

Parish Councils support the strategy for the rest of the rural area, whereas site promoters object to the small amount of growth proposed for the rest of the rural area. Site promoters highlight that the proposed strategy: ignores the long term viability of rural settlements; is counter to the national planning policy objective of supporting and promoting mixed and balanced communities; ignores the need for local affordable housing, and needs more small and medium sized sites that can be delivered more quickly. Site promoters suggest that there are opportunities for a cluster of development around Melbourn due to its public transport links and services and facilities, whereas the Melbourn PC state that the village has no further capacity for development based on its existing infrastructure. Site promoters also suggest that investment should be put into improving public transport in rural areas, so that rural areas are not penalised, and that additional growth in villages would support existing public transport services. Parish Councils highlight that: Neighbourhood Plans should have greater influence on the proposed strategy; preservation of rural character and identity of villages is important; development should be limited to that required based on local needs; and should prevent loss of good farmland and countryside. Comment that garden centres should be recognised within the strategy for the rural

area as they provide employment, retail and leisure opportunities, but they are not referred to in the First Proposals plan. Support for the rejection of specific sites and requests for specific sites to be allocated from site promoters.

Table of representations: Rest of the rural area

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Acceptable / support the strategy	56728 (Croydon PC), 59474 (Shepreth PC)
<p>Object to small amount of growth identified in rural area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • insufficient consideration being given to the long term viability of rural settlements • limiting allocations in rural area is counter to national planning policy objective of supporting and promoting mixed and balanced communities • to deliver a robust development strategy that meets needs, an adequate amount of development needs to be provided in the rural area, especially for settlements that are highly sustainable locations • expansion of villages will boost the local economy, create a critical mass for improved services and facilities, rejuvenate villages / create a sense of place, and will promote sustainable lifestyles by reducing the need to travel • needed to meet local needs and provide affordable housing 	<p>57165 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57234 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 58445 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58572 (Croudace Homes), 58623 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58745 (LVA), 58817 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58983 (Endurance Estates). 60257 (Jesus College), 60549 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60613 (CALA Group Ltd)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • national policy advocates a more nuanced approach than that proposed in the Local Plan • needed to ensure a balanced and resilient strategy – small / medium sized sites can be delivered more quickly 	
<p>Amount of development allocated in this area seems disproportionate and extremely low given the sustainable transport nodes in some of the villages. Railway corridor between Melbourn and Cambridge needs additional consideration as its own cluster. Development in this area can be achieved without the same landscape impacts as the proposed Green Belt releases in rural southern cluster.</p>	57331 (HD Planning Ltd)
<p>Growth should be focussed in villages such as Melbourn which benefit from a range of services and are located outside of the Green Belt. Local Plan should take account of new public transport links.</p>	60613 (CALA Group Ltd)
<p>Understand the rejection of large scale sites in the Green Belt, but this should be mitigated by providing sites for affordable housing to sustain villages as viable communities. This should include Rural Exception Sites delivered by local Community Land Trusts.</p>	59799 (Histon & Impington Community Land Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Do not consider it appropriate to differentiate between 'rest of rural area' and 'rural southern cluster' as insufficient rationale provided for this.	58670 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited)
Evidence base should clearly acknowledge the different roles that parts of the district can play in delivering growth. Rural area across Greater Cambridge varies significantly in terms of its role and ability to deliver growth.	58653 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)
Should only accommodate new development that is local needs derived and that has the support of the local community / Parish Council.	56585 (Gamlingay PC)
Local residents must be listened to.	57228 (D Lott)
Melbourn does not have any more capacity – already at capacity for doctors and health care workers, and children are being taken to other schools due to lack of spaces.	60490 (Melbourn PC)
Neighbourhood Plans are only mentioned 6 times – should the Local Plan take greater account of Neighbourhood Plans?	60364 (Gamlingay PC)
Development should be minimised in this location as over development of villages ruins their character and should therefore be avoided.	56810 (M Colville), 58846 (R Mervart)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Preservation of rural character and identity of villages is important.	59474 (Shepreth PC)
Larger villages should not be expanded any further – villages should remain as they are so as not to lose their identity. E.g. Melbourn is now more akin to a small town, but the infrastructure has not been upgraded to match.	58047 (Great and Little Chishill PC)
Support proposals to limit housing development west of M11 as this supports implementation of Duxford’s Air Safeguarding Zone – which allows Imperial War Museum to operate.	58010 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)
Should only allow individual new homes, but these developments should not destroy the beauty of the rural area.	57228 (D Lott)
Support prioritisation of development in Cambridge and at new settlements, rather than in the rural area.	56871 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
Village development has the highest carbon footprint and should be avoided.	59474 (Shepreth PC)
Any new development should have access to a sustainable alternative to the private car – hourly public transport to nearby market town or local transport hub or train station.	56585 (Gamlingay PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Investment should be put into improving public transport links in the rural area rather than penalising those areas where there are not sufficient existing links.	57165 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57234 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire)
Transport is an important factor for sustainability but is not the sole consideration. Additional growth in villages would support existing bus services.	58572 (Croudace Homes)
Major transport consideration needed before any proposed expansion. Rural areas should not be segregated from Cambridge, particularly where there are jobs and services nearby.	57802 (Histon & Impington PC)
Support not locating development where car travel is easiest or only method of transport.	57586 (R Pargeter)
Detailed location of new development should be considered in relation to likely traffic flow e.g. locate new development on the edge of the village that is located closest to Cambridge to avoid increased traffic flow through the village.	57586 (R Pargeter)
Need more consideration for horse riders and inclusion of bridleways. Active travel should refer to more than just cycling.	59253 (Teversham PC)
Population projections used for schools planning should be reviewed for the rural area – especially where a second choice	57802 (Histon & Impington PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
school would be more than a walk away therefore increasing car use.	
Health services and facilities – any new allocations must undertake an assessment of existing health infrastructure capacity and fully mitigate the impact on the proposed development through appropriate planning obligations. Early engagement needed with the NHS to agree the form of infrastructure required.	59162 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Site specific allocations should set out the principles for delivering improvements to general health and wellbeing, and promote healthy and green lifestyle choices through well-designed places.	59162 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group)
Support expansion of businesses in the rural area if the proposals are in keeping with character of the area and of benefit to local residents.	56585 (Gamlingay PC)
Garden Centres should be recognised within Local Plan policy – although they are widespread and provide employment, retail and leisure opportunities there is no mention of them in the Local Plan.	59052 (Avison Young)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Villages are in danger of becoming isolated due to major infrastructure projects dissecting South Cambridgeshire.	56728 (Croydon PC)
Regret any loss of good farmland and countryside.	58399 (Linton PC)
Cambridge and new settlements have at least as good and generally better transport links, so its misguided to allow development in villages that have good transport links.	56810 (M Colville), 58846 (R Mervart)
The map in Figure 42 should include a reference to the proposed relocation site for the Waste Water Treatment Works.	58130 (M Asplin)
No comment.	57361 (Huntingdonshire DC)
<p>Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • performs equally well or better than allocated sites • necessary to enable long term viability of rural settlements and to deliver a robust development strategy that meets needs • expansion of villages will boost the local economy, create a critical mass for improved services and facilities, rejuvenate villages / create a sense of place, and will promote sustainable lifestyles by reducing the need to travel 	57039 (KWA Architects), 57165 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd), 57234 (European Property Ventures – Cambridgeshire), 57331 (HD Planning Ltd), 58445 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms (Hardington) LLP), 58572 (Croudace Homes), 58623 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58653 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58745 (LVA), 58817 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58983 (Endurance Estates), 60257 (Jesus College), 60549 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 58670 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 59073 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> limiting the amount of development in the rural area is too restrictive without allocating more sites there will be a reduction in services and facilities in rural areas, reducing rural sustainability 	

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c (HELAA site 40509) – should be allocated for residential development	57039 (KWA Architects)
Station Fields, Foxton (HELAA site 40084) – should be allocated for residential, employment and community uses	59073 (Axis Land Partnerships)

Support for sites rejected

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Sites in Fen Ditton parish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> supportive of exclusion of all sites other than Marleigh and Cambridge Airport 	59908 (Fen Ditton PC)

S/RRA: Allocations in the rest of the rural area

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/RRA: Site allocations in rest of the rural area](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section

223 (albeit see note below)

Note

- Some representations included in these summaries of representations tables have been moved from the rest of the rural area heading as the comments were specific to the proposed site allocations. Representations which have been moved in this way are denoted with an asterisk in the following format Representation number* (Name of respondent).

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council PM = Parish Meeting

Executive Summary

Many developers argue that growth in the more sustainable villages must be part of the development strategy. Although there is support from some for the overall approach there is also criticism that this is not followed through with sufficient allocations (for both housing and employment). Paragraph 79 of the NPPF is highlighted with its support for sustainable development in rural areas.

Paragraph 69 of the NPPF was also flagged due to its focus on delivering more small and medium size sites and the benefits this can have in helping to maintain a five year housing land supply and making the Local Plan more resilient. There are calls for villages to be assessed on their own merits rather than through a settlement hierarchy and many specific villages are promoted as being suitable for more development. There are also many sites, which have not been proposed for allocation, supported with promoters putting forward a broad range of economic, social and environmental benefits to support their specific sites. The corollary is that many parish councils and individuals have flagged their opposition to many sites that have not been proposed for allocation.

All of the proposed allocations received some feedback.

S/RRA/ML: The Moor, Moor Lane, Melbourn – the promotor states that the site remains available, deliverable and viable and fits with local policies, including being located within a Minor Rural Centre. However, there are concerns raised about traffic, ecology and heritage.

S/RRA/H: Land at Highfields (phase 2), Caldecote – the promotor suggests some amendments to the policy to clarify capacity in the light of extant permissions and completions. East West Rail (EWR) also request the policy is updated to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route alignment nor the delivery of EWR. Objections focus on the cumulative impacts when considered alongside Bourn, historical reasons for adjoining permissions (lack of a five year housing land supply) no longer being relevant, lack of public transport, landscape impacts and flooding.

S/RRA/MF: Land at Mansel Farm, Station Road, Oakington – the promotor is seeking to increase the capacity of the site. However, Historic England want a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the policy wording and capacity. The parish council and

several individuals object to the proposed allocation on multiple grounds including the cumulative impacts of Northstowe, coalescence, flooding, biodiversity and landscape impacts.

S/RRA/CR: Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn – the promoters and supporters of the site highlight the benefits of the site to both Melbourn and the wider economic area. The parish council consider that the residential element is unsustainable whilst Campaign to Protect Rural England is concerned that the employment area will further industrialise the village. Individuals argue that the infrastructure cannot cope with further growth.

S/RRA/SAS: Land to the south of the A14 Services – the promoters stress their willingness to be flexible in refining details, introducing appropriate mitigation measures and even providing more land. However, nearby parish councils oppose the proposed allocation citing flooding, transport and landscape impacts alongside the cumulative impacts when considered alongside other nearby proposals. Cambridge Past, Present & Future question the appropriateness of the site for 'last mile delivery' into Cambridge.

S/RRA/BBP: Land at Buckinghamway Business Park, Swavesey – the promotor stresses the range of B use classes that could be suitable on the site whilst the parish council opposes the proposed allocation on numerous grounds including scale, traffic and landscape impacts and would want significant mitigation measures if allocated. Campaign to Protect Rural England raise similar objections.

S/RRA/SNR: Land to the north of St Neots Road, Dry Drayton – the promotor wants the site allocation expanded. However, East West Rail (EWR) request the policy allocation drafting is updated to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the

preferred EWR route alignment nor the delivery of EWR whilst Historic England want a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the policy wording and capacity. The parish council requests a landscape strategy as mitigation.

S/RRA/OHD Old Highways Depot, Twenty Pence Lane, Cottenham – there is support for this allocation from the parish council subject to consideration of the impact on the neighbouring Grade 1 listed church. This stance is supported by Historic England, who also require a Heritage Impact Assessment, and Cambridge Past, Present & Future. Campaign to Protect Rural England suggest B8 uses should be excluded to avoid increasing HGV traffic through the village.

S/RRA/H/1(d): Land north of Impington Lane, Histon & Impington – there are few comments and no objections to this proposed allocation.

S/RRA/E/5(1): Norman Way, Over – the only comment on this proposed allocation was from Historic England who requested a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the policy wording.

S/RRA/H/2: Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton – the only comments received on this proposed allocation focused on the boundary. Historic England did also request a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the policy wording.

S/RRA/H/3: Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals – The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust question the logic of retaining the allocation whereas a site promotor wants the site area expanded to include Capital Park. Historic England request a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform the policy wording.

Table of representations: S/RRA – Allocations in the rest of the rural area

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Growth of more sustainable villages must be part of development strategy, particularly those villages that contain a good range of services and facilities, accessible by a range of modes of transport, and where there is an identified need for affordable housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for proposed general approach but this not followed through with sufficient allocations • The Rest of Rural Area should accommodate more housing/ allocations for housing • Paragraph 79 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable development in rural areas and acknowledges that housing can enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and support local services • Paragraph 104 of the NPPF expects transport issues to be considered at the earliest stages of plan-making. Those issues include opportunities created by existing or proposed transport infrastructure in terms of the scale, location and density of development, and opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use 	<p>57005 (Hastingwood Developments), 57054 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd), 57065 (C Meadows), 57075 (Elbourn Family), 57099 (RO Group Ltd), 57116 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 56720 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 57123 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 57223 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57354 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57512 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57520 (R2 Developments Ltd), 57655 (Endurance Estates), 57692 (Endurance Estates), 58098 (Jesus College), 58149 (J Manning), 58154 (Hill Residential), 40514 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group), 58194 (Countryside Properties - UK Ltd), 58236 (Countryside Properties - UK Ltd), 58242 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58264 (Bletsoes), 58268 (Bletsoes), 58276 (Bletsoes), 58340 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 58477 (D Moore), 58524 (Hill Residential Limited), 58538 (Phase 2 Planning), 58546 (Phase 2 Planning), 58552 (Croudace Homes), 58554 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 58598 (Hill Residential Limited), 58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58662 (Artisan (UK) Projects Ltd), 58674 (Abbey</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 62 of the NPPF expects the size, type and tenure of housing needs of the community to be assessed and reflected in planning policies, including for example those with an affordable housing need, students, renters and self-builders 	<p>Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58689 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58713 (R Grain), 58792 (LVA), 58834 (Hopkins Homes), 58841 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58869 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58925 (St John's College Cambridge), 58976 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59038 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59083 (Scott Properties), 59123 (A P Burlton Turkey's Ltd), 59167 (Silverley Properties Ltd), 59176 (Scott Properties), 59226 (Scott Properties), 60265 (Gonville & Caius College), 60299 (Miller Homes), 60306 (Miller Homes), 60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd), 60542 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60581 (Martin Grant Homes), 60615 (CALA Group Ltd), 60619 (Endurance Estates), 60627 (NIAB Trust), 60628 (NIAB Trust), 60630 (NIAB Trust), 60635 (NIAB Trust), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships), (60649) (K.B. Tebbit Ltd), 60650 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60651 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60652 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60653 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60654 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60655 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60664 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60669 (Mill Stream</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	Developments), 60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd), 60699 (NIAB Trust), 60701 (NIAB Trust), 60706 (Countryside Properties), 60707 (Steeplefield), 60708 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60710 (Endurance Estates), 60711 (S&J Graves), 60716 (W Garfit), 60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60729 (P, J & M Crow), 60733 (The Critchley Family), 60736 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited)
More small and medium sized sites should be allocated in accordance with paragraph 69 of the NPPF. These sites can make a significant contribution towards the short term housing land supply and the five year housing land supply position in Greater Cambridgeshire	56483 (V Chapman), 56492 (D&B Searle), 56501 (W Grain), 56519 (R&J Millard), 57054 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd), 57065 (C Meadows), 57075 (Elbourn Family), 57099 (RO Group Ltd), 57116 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57123 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 57223 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57330 (HD Planning Ltd), 57354 (Bloor Homes Eastern), 57512 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57655 (Endurance Estates), 57692 (Endurance Estates), 58098 (Jesus College), 58149 (J Manning), 58154 (Hill Residential), 40514 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group), 58264 (Bletsoes), 58268 (Bletsoes), 58340 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58524 (Hill Residential Limited), 58598 (Hill Residential Limited), 58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd),

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	<p>58689 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58713 (R Grain), 58792 (LVA), 58834 (Hopkins Homes), 58841 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58925 (St John's College Cambridge), 59038 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59083 (Scott Properties), 59176 (Scott Properties), 59457 (M Carroll), 60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd), 60542 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60581 (Martin Grant Homes), 60615 (CALA Group Ltd), 60619 (Endurance Estates), 60627 (NIAB Trust), 60628 (NIAB Trust), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60650 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60651 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60652 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60653 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60654 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60655 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60669 (Mill Stream Developments), 60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd), 60701 (NIAB Trust), 60707 (Steeplefield), 60711 (S&J Graves), 60716 (W Garfit), 60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60729 (P, J & M Crow), 60733 (The Critchley Family), 60736 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>More employment land should be allocated to support spatial strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projections of need for storage and distribution space are an under-estimate • Need for large scale facilities • Employment allocations in larger villages support sustainability 	<p>58242 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58340 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 59092 (Lolworth Developments Limited), 59317 (Avison Young), 60265 (Gonville & Caius College), 60630 (NIAB Trust), 60635 (NIAB Trust), 60699 (NIAB Trust), 60717 (Cheffins), 60756 (Bidwells)</p>
<p>Given that many living within the surrounding villages turn to the City for work, retail, leisure and entertainment it is clear that a planning framework that acknowledges this relationship needs to be developed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar logic applies to smaller towns such as Cambourne 	<p>58545 (Bruntwood SciTech), 58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58792 (LVA), 60708 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)</p>
<p>In order to provide greater certainty for the plan period it will be necessary to increase the amount of housing and employment space in Group Villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide greater flexibility and resilience in the Councils' housing/development strategy • Need more allocations as should not rely on windfall sites as village frameworks are tight 	<p>57520 (R2 Developments Ltd), 58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 58524 (Hill Residential Limited), 58582 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58662 (Artisan - UK - Projects Ltd), 58792 (LVA), 58834 (Hopkins Homes), 58841 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59038 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd), 60581 (Martin Grant Homes), 60615 (CALA Group Ltd), 60619 (Endurance Estates), 60627 (NIAB</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	Trust), 60628 (NIAB Trust), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60669 (Mill Stream Developments), 60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd), 60701 (NIAB Trust), 60707 (Steeplefield), 60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd)
Do not object to any of the specific allocations proposed within the First Proposals	56811 (M Colville)
<p>More housing and employment could be delivered if villages are assessed on their individual merits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing that a rural settlement has strong sustainability credentials in terms of public transport links, employment opportunities, social infrastructure, shops and services it is abundantly possible to bring forward proportionate levels of new sustainable development • Many individual villages cited • A more tailored assessment of settlements can deliver carbon reductions • A more flexible approach to village frameworks 	56899 (RWS Ltd), 58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 58524 (Hill Residential Limited), 58538 (Phase 2 Planning), 58546 (Phase 2 Planning) 58554 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 58578 (Endurance Estates), 58582 (MacTaggart & Mickel), 58598 (Hill Residential Limited), 58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 58662 (Artisan – UK - Projects Ltd), 58792 (LVA), 58834 (Hopkins Homes), 58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59083 (Scott Properties), 59123 (A P Burlton Turkey’s Ltd), 59167 (Silverley Properties Ltd), 59083 (Scott Properties), 59176 (Scott Properties), 59226 (Scott Properties), 59310 (Countryside Properties), 59457 (M Carroll), 60265 (Gonville & Caius College), 60299 (Miller Homes), 60306 (Miller Homes), 60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd), 60542 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60581 (Martin Grant Homes), 60615

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	(CALA Group Ltd), 60619 (Endurance Estates), 60627 (NIAB Trust), 60628 (NIAB Trust), 60630 (NIAB Trust), 60635 (NIAB Trust), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60650 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60651 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60652 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60653 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60654 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60655 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60664 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60669 (Mill Stream Developments), 60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd), 60699 (NIAB Trust), 60701 (NIAB Trust), 60707 (Steeplefield), 60708 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60711 (S&J Graves), 60716 (W Garfit), 60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60725 (M Asplin), 60729 (P, J & M Crow), 60733 (The Critchley Family), 60736 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited), 60756 (Bidwells)
Smaller villages are becoming more sustainable as more people work from home	57099 (RO Group Ltd)
<p>More sites should be allocated in rural areas for custom and self build</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> relying on plots within larger developments does not work 	58477 (D Moore), 58713 (R Grain), 58863 (S Grain), 60725 (M Asplin)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are economic benefits to the local economy from these small schemes 	
Housing needs (for the affordable or elderly persons markets for example) can best be met in the places where those communities' needs already exist	58642 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 60710 (Endurance Estates)
The Plan should recognise the possibilities for increasing the C2C corridor to St Neots and maximising the modal shift options that the section of the de-trunked A428 can offer post 2025/26 between Croxton and Cambourne	58660 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)
Allocated sites must have reliable/frequent public transport system (hourly) to a local transport hub/nearby market town/or train station	56587 (Gamlingay PC)
Transport plans are needed for Caldecote, Cottenham and Fulbourn. The expectation of a new station cannot be used as a reason for not making other transport improvements	57803 (Histon & Impington PC)
More consideration of sustainable transport in the rest of the rural area	59879 (Cottenham PC)
Opposed to any allocations in the green belt.	56811 (M Colville), 58862 (R Mervart)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good public transport and carbon reductions through reduced transport use are not 'exceptional circumstances' to justify release 	
<p>Planning assumption of 40 dwellings per hectare is too high for villages and will change the character of local areas</p>	58139 (M Claridge)
<p>There is a risk that developers will seek speculative permission in the open countryside greenfield sites contrary to the development strategy using the windfalls allocation</p>	60120 (C Blakeley)
<p>Want some form of development protection given to the former private, outdoor, laboratory of the late Dr Norman Moore at Boxworth End, Swavesey. The site itself has some local value as habitat and a landscape amenity. However, its overwhelming significance is as a site of scientific study, in particular of ecology and wildlife conservation.</p>	59570 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
<p>At this stage in the plan making process, the Council does not wish to make any detailed comments about the proposed development strategy set out in the consultation document, given that the significant proposals are situated to the north of Cambridge and there will be a more limited impact for North Hertfordshire</p>	58711 (North Hertfordshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the Local Plan proposals insofar as they affect Whaddon	60558 (Whaddon PC)
<p>Promotion of specific sites not included in the First Proposals, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • economic benefits to rural communities through construction jobs and increased demand for local goods and services • enhance the setting of a village • enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities • logical extension to proposed allocation • logical development when recent/ pipeline schemes taken into account • accommodate tree planting thereby creating biodiversity net gain • site serves no green belt purpose • minimal impact on green belt • exceptional reasons for release from green belt • sites are in sustainable locations • will deliver infrastructure and community facilities • redevelopment of previously used land in the green belt • redevelopment of previously used land 	<p>56483 (V Chapman), 56492 (D&B Searle), 56501 (W Grain), 56519 (R&J Millard), 56561 (D Calder), 56720 (KB Tebbit Ltd), 56846 (Queens' College), 56899 RWS Ltd), 56957 (RO Property Management Ltd), 57005 (Hastingwood Developments), 57042 (KWA Architects), 57065 (C Meadows), 57075 (Elbourn Family), 57099 (RO Group Ltd), 57116 (Cambridge District Oddfellows), 57118 (Bartlow Estate), 57123 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family), 57193 (R Cowell), 57223 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd), 57307 (S Barker), 57512 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 57520 (R2 Developments Ltd), 57535 (H d'Abo), 57655 (Endurance Estates), 57692 (Endurance Estates), 58098 (Jesus College), 58149 (J Manning), 58154 (Hill Residential), 40514 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group), 58242 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58264 (Bletsoes), 58268 (Bletsoes), 58276 (Bletsoes), 58340 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF), 58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc), 58477 (D Moore), 58524 (Hill Residential Limited), 58530 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the relocation of the existing use from the site would provide benefits to the neighbouring residents and to the village in terms of removing noise, odour, and traffic movements • site has been incorrectly omitted/ assessed • identified issues can be mitigated • more suitable than other sites allocated • collection of sites should be assessed separately rather than collectively • new information is available to update the assessment • provision of open space and green infrastructure • would include housing and affordable housing to meet local needs of the village • there are realistic alternatives to the car for travel to and from the site • site will be more sustainable when planned bus and other transport improvements are implemented • utilises strategic highways/ minimal impact on local roads • to support a travel hub • could provide land for local Community Land Trust • could deliver custom and self build housing 	<p>Farms – Hardington – LLP), 58538 (Phase 2 Planning), 58546 (Phase 2 Planning), 58554 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd), 58578 (Endurance Estates), 58660 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd), 58662 (Artisan – UK - Projects Ltd), 58689 (Hawkswren Ltd), 58713 (R Grain), 58792 (LVA), 58834 (Hopkins Homes), 58841 (Redrow Homes Ltd), 58855 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), 58869 (Wates Developments Ltd), 58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 58925 (St John's College Cambridge), 58955 (Carter Jonas), 58976 (Wates Developments Ltd), 59038 (Varrier Jones Foundation), 59083 (Scott Properties), 59092 (Lolworth Developments Limited), 59167 (Silverley Properties Ltd), 59176 (Scott Properties), 59317 (Avison Young), 59457 (M Carroll), 60265 (Gonville & Caius College), 60299 (Miller Homes), 60306 (Miller Homes), 60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd), 60542 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd), 60581 (Martin Grant Homes), 60615 (CALA Group Ltd), 60619 (Endurance Estates), 60627 (NIAB Trust), 60630 (NIAB Trust), 60635 (NIAB Trust), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships), 40329 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides opportunity to improve local footpaths and lighting • innovative approach including shared open spaces • unique opportunity to create garden village • potential to deliver facilities (such as hotel and EV charging) has not been considered • meet need for more commercial and R&D space • need for more distribution and storage space • larger employment sites provide more flexibility in terms of unit sizes • could support economic cluster on A14 • could accommodate businesses re-located from North East Cambridge • single ownership means site can be delivered relatively quickly • landowner wanting to work with community 	<p>Limited), 60647 (Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited), (60649) (K.B. Tebbit Ltd), 60650 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60651 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60652 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60653 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60654 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60655 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60658 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60662 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60664 (Thakeham Homes Ltd), 60665 (Hallam Land Management Limited), 60669 (Mill Stream Developments), 60675 (Bidwells), 60676 (Savills), 60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd), 60690 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd), 60692 (Gladman Developments), 60693 (Gladman Developments), 60694 (Gladman Developments), 60696 (Gladman Developments), 60697 (Gladman Developments), 60699 (NIAB Trust), 60701 (NIAB Trust), 60706 (Countryside Properties), 60707 (Steeplefield), 60708 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes), 60710 (Endurance Estates), 60711 (S&J Graves), 60716 (W Garfit), 60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd), 60720 (Lancashire Industrial & Commercial Services), 60721 (Bidwells), 60722 (Bidwells), 60723 (S&D Raven), 60724 (BDW Homes</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
	Cambridgeshire & The Landowners - Currington, Todd, Douglas, Jarvis, Badcock & Hartwell), 60725 (M Asplin), 60729 (P, J & M Crow), 60733 (The Critchley Family), 60736 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited), 60756 (Bidwells), 60760 (U+I Group PLC)
New development on edge of Cambridge should be scaled back due to post-Covid reductions in commuting	58844 (R Donald)
The supporting maps that form part of the evidence base are incorrect. Figure 43 indicates that the Mingle Lane site in Great Shelford is an existing commitment to be carried forward in the GCLP.	58951 (Great Shelford - Ten Acres - Ltd)

New allocations – housing

S/RRA/ML: The Moor, Moor Lane, Melbourn

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The site remains available, deliverable and viable when considered against both existing and emerging policy requirements	56788 (T Elbourn)
The site fits with Melbourn’s position as a Minor Rural Centre	56788 (T Elbourn)

<p>The site should be fully integrated into the proposed Melbourn Greenway and A505 Walking and Cycling bridge, to facilitate an active travel link between these sites, Cambridge to the north and Royston to the south. The proposed bus network improvements suggested, to better facilitate cross border routes and trip, are also supported</p>	<p>59476 (Hertfordshire County Council)</p>
<p>The junction of the Moor and the High Street is very dangerous and already has more traffic than it should</p>	<p>60179 (J Stevens), 60492 (Melbourn PC)</p>
<p>The ecology of the site is unique. It is home to rare plants, animals and insects. It offers habitat to birds</p>	<p>60179 (J Stevens), 60492 (Melbourn PC)</p>
<p>This is the last of the many horse fields that would have been in and around Melbourn and as such is part of our heritage</p>	<p>60179 (J Stevens), 60492 (Melbourn PC)</p>
<p>An inappropriate site for development due to traffic issues on Moor Lane and a lack of infrastructure more generally in the village. Moor Lane has had considerable development over the last 20 years</p>	<p>56559 (W Bains), 58093 (R Ennals)</p>
<p>All within a MSA for chalk. The site is adjacent to residential properties and too small to contain a workable quantity of mineral</p>	<p>56942 (Cambridgeshire County Council)</p>

S/RRA/H: Land at Highfields (phase 2), Caldecote

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>This allocation is necessary in order to enable villages such as Caldecote, which have very good existing and/or planned public transport connections, to grow and thrive</p> <p>Suggested drafting amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consistency between capacity and site area, i.e. does the policy include phases 1 and 2 or just phase 2 • landscaping criteria should be more flexible 	<p>58571 (Vistry Homes Ltd)</p>
<p>The location of this allocation is in close proximity to EWR route alignments 1 and 9. Therefore, EWR Co requests that a requirement is included within the proposed wording of the policy allocation to ensure that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route alignment nor the delivery of EWR</p>	<p>59869 (East West Rail)</p>
<p>Do not support. On its own as a village development this would have made sense. However, given the proximity of the nearby major development at Bourn Airfield, CPRE considers this will eventually lead to coalescence and a continuous urban sprawl alongside the A428 from Caldecote to Cambourne</p>	<p>59566 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)</p>
<p>Object due to:</p>	<p>58139 (M Claridge)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • outline permission granted due to lack of 5 year housing supply which is no longer relevant • lack of nearby public transport • outside of village framework • intrusion into countryside • flood risk 	
<p>The policy and boundary should be amended to take into account factual errors and existing permissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • boundary and site area should exclude current (phase 1) permission • additional flood and landscape mitigation should be built into policy wording 	58275 (P Claridge)

S/RRA/MF: Land at Mansel Farm, Station Road, Oakington

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
This is a sustainable location and the capacity could be increased to 35 dwellings	57544 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the Oakington Conservation Area lies adjacent to the	59654 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>site. Westwick Conservation Area lies to the east of the site. There are also a number of listed buildings nearby including the grade II* listed St Andrews Church and several grade II listed buildings. Westwick Hall to the east of the site very much overlooks this site, albeit separated by the guided busway. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings including views into and out of the Conservation areas. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording.</p>	
<p>Developing this site would have damaging environmental consequences and is inconsistent with the aims of the plan. Issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flooding • loss of biodiversity • loss of effective carbon sink • congestion • negative consequences for active travel • impacting the appearance and setting of Longstanton • erosion of gap between Northstowe and Oakington 	<p>56556 (P Garsed), 56673 (L Lawrence), 56885 (J Prince), 56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC), 58107 (E Brett), 58608 (A Malyon), 58688 (J Prince), 59821 (Dry Drayton PC), 59896 (D Pereira), 60672 (Anonymous First Proposals Consultation)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impacting green buffer and distinctiveness of Westwick 	
<p>Release of this site from the green belt is unjustifiable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> proximity to guided bus stop does not justify green belt release 	56556 (P Garsed), 56673 (L Lawrence), 56885 (J Prince), 56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC), 57789 (J Pavey), 58107 (E Brett), 58608 (A Malyon), 59896 (D Pereira)
The proposed additional housing, including affordable, could be better accommodated at Northstowe	56556 (P Garsed), 56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC), 57789 (J Pavey), 58107 (E Brett), 58608 (A Malyon)
Any assessment of site impacts need to take into account the cumulative impacts of neighbouring Northstowe	60504 (S Guy)
There is a limit on developments of 15 houses on villages like Oakington	56885 (J Prince)
The scheme could set a precedent for further development in Oakington & Westwick	56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC), 58608 (A Malyon)
<p>Significant archaeological work required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> would make 20 houses uneconomical 	56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC), 58608 (A Malyon), 58688 (J Prince)
The site falls outside the Northstowe Development Area	56892 (Oakington & Westwick PC)
All within a MSA for sand & gravel. WWLP Site is adjacent to residential properties and too small to contain a workable quantity of mineral	56942 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Given significant level of development at Northstowe, insensitive to propose further development in Oakington.	56818* (C Hough)
Will potentially destroy village atmosphere and will add pressure on already stretched infrastructure.	56818* (C Hough)
Area has repeatedly flooded, with significant amount of water sitting on the field in winter 2020.	56818* (C Hough)
Will increase traffic on Water Lane, which has already seen increased traffic due to developments in Cottenham.	56818* (C Hough)

New allocations – mixed use

S/RRA/CR: Land to the west of Cambridge Road, Melbourn

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
As a site that lies adjacent to Melbourn Science Park, there is a clear opportunity to enhance the village's existing employment sector through more jobs and investment and providing a logical extension to the Park whilst planning for the adjacent residential development in an appropriate manner	58545 (Bruntwood SciTech)
Makes an important contribution to the spatial strategy through providing an opportunity to deliver affordable and market	58194 (Countryside Properties - UK Ltd), 58236 (Countryside Properties - UK Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>housing, alongside employment opportunities in a sustainable location including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • delivery of affordable housing • co-locating employment and residential uses • improvements in walkability and active travel • recreational assets • support for local economy 	
<p>The allocation is supported on the basis that it reflects an acknowledgement of the role that Melbourn plays as a Minor Rural Centre in the Plan and the important links that the Park has to the local community</p>	<p>58485 (TTP Campus Limited)</p>
<p>The site should be fully integrated into the proposed Melbourn Greenway and A505 Walking and Cycling bridge, to facilitate an active travel link between these sites, Cambridge to the north and Royston to the south. The proposed bus network improvements suggested, to better facilitate cross border routes and trip, are also supported</p>	<p>59476 (Hertfordshire County Council)</p>
<p>140 houses is unsustainable in terms of primary education within the village and traffic movements via The Cross</p>	<p>60491 (Melbourn PC)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
At first sight, there is logic to this proposal but it could further industrialise the centre of this historic village which has already been badly visually affected by the existing Science Park	59567 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
Unfair that Melbourn is being targeted again, it is already over-developed with inadequate infrastructure	56506 (A Hartley)
Melbourn does not have the infrastructure or road capacity for further major developments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the train station is not accessible from the site 	58093 (R Ennals)
All within a MSA for chalk. Situated between Melbourn Science Park and residential properties and too small to contain a workable quantity of mineral	56942 (Cambridgeshire County Council)

New allocations – employment

S/RRA/SAS: Land to the south of the A14 Services

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No objection to the proposed allocation, and being owner of part of the site, will work positively with the Local Planning Authority and adjoining landowners/ promoters to refine the details of the	58490 (University of Cambridge)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
allocation and bring forward the site, if allocation is taken forward in the Plan	
There are no constraints which cannot be addressed by suitable mitigation or technical reports	60717 (Cheffins)
There is also the potential for further land to be made available if required	60717 (Cheffins)
<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, there are a number of listed buildings at Boxworth including the grade II* Church of St Peter as well as at Lolworth including the grade II * All Saints Church. Given the scale and mass of typical employment development, there is potential for impact upon the wider historic environment. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. We welcome reference to the need for landscape buffers around the site which should help to minimise impact. There is also considerable existing tree coverage between the heritage assets and the site which should offer some degree of mitigation. If the site is allocated the policy should reference nearby heritage assets and any mitigation required</p>	59655 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support Policy requirement to ensure that strong landscaping is provided to help the site fit into the surrounding rural countryside character	58579 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
A good location for a regional distribution centre but it cannot meet the aspiration that “last mile delivery” in Cambridge can be carried out by sustainable modes of transport	58579 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)
Any development should be restricted to the area south of Cambridge Services previously used as a compound for the A14 roadworks	56708 (Lolworth PM)
If additional land is required there is adjacent brownfield land which should be used instead of farm land	56708 (Lolworth PM)
Do not support. There is no natural barrier to prevent further expansion into the wide-open landscape at this location which has already been damaged by the necessary but unfortunate location of the services. Such development will lead to further, unsightly, road freight driven sprawl	59568 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
Opposed to loss of green belt land	56708 (Lolworth PM)
Mitigation measures should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • noise reduction • new tree belt 	56708 (Lolworth PM)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no use of Robins Lane by contractors 	
Object to this allocation	56838 (Boxworth PM)
Concern this will create increased foul and surface water flows into the Swavesey system. Must also be considered in context of other nearby proposals	59715 (Swavesey PC)
Proposals will create increased traffic, particularly of HGVs in this area and around the already busy Swavesey A14 junction. Must also be considered in context of other nearby proposals	59715 (Swavesey PC)
Further information would be welcomed specifically in relation to the potential transport and economic impact of these sites and their relationship with the Huntingdonshire economy and the nearby Lakes Business Park	57362 (Huntingdonshire DC)

S/RRA/BBP: Land at Buckinghamway Business Park, Swavesey

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
The site is well located and all identified constraints can be overcome	60657 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
The site is well suited to a variety of B-use classes	60657 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, there is a grade II listed barn for the north east of the site. Any	59656 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>development of this site therefore has the potential to affect the listed building and its setting. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. We would recommend that landscaping be provided along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site to minimise visual and heritage impact in this open landscape</p>	
<p>Do not support. There is no natural barrier to prevent further expansion into the wide-open landscape at this location which has already been damaged by the necessary but unfortunate location of the services. Such development will lead to further, unsightly, road freight driven sprawl. There will also be adverse additional traffic through the centres of Swavesey and Over</p>	59569 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
<p>The A14 construction compound and accommodation block was granted temporary permission on the grounds that it would revert back to agricultural use. It should therefore be treated as a green field site</p>	56838 (Boxworth PM)
<p>There is no rationale for extending the boundary of the site beyond the confines of the construction compound</p>	56838 (Boxworth PM)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Unacceptable traffic impacts at Cambridge services roundabout	56838 (Boxworth PM)
There will be negative impacts on the setting of Boxworth village	56838 (Boxworth PM)
<p>If the site is allocated the following mitigation measures should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use the ex-construction compound on the other side of Boxworth Rd to geographically constrain the commercial expansion closer to the junction and remove any creep up Boxworth Rd • reduce congestion by moving exit to the new lorry park so that it passes behind the hotel (as originally proposed) • visual and ecological mitigation to minimise the impact on the entrance to Boxworth • density of the development should reflect the density and pattern of non-residential development in the nearby village of Boxworth • a cycleway between the Boxworth and the new NMU bridge over the A14 	56838 (Boxworth PM)
Within CA for Uttons Drove Water Recycling Area (WRA). MWLP Policy 16 applies	56942 (Cambridgeshire County Council), 60452 (Anglian Water Services Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Further information would be welcomed specifically in relation to the potential transport and economic impact of these sites and their relationship with the Huntingdonshire economy and the nearby Lakes Business Park	57362 (Huntingdonshire DC)

S/RRA/SNR: Land to the north of St Neots Road, Dry Drayton

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for allocation but want boundary to be expanded to also include for additional land which can provide for development and other associated use and mitigation	60259 (Cambridge Innovation Parks Ltd)
Do not support. This small land parcel forms a green buffer between St Neots Road and the A428 and development would create further coalescence along the A428	59571 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the grade II* Registered Park and Garden, Childerley Hall lies to the north of the site. There are a number of listed buildings within the designed landscape. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect the Conservation Areas and their settings including views into and out of the Conservation areas. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The	59657 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording	
The allocation is located to the north-east of Bourn Airfield and EWR alignments 1 and 9, and as such, does not appear to conflict with existing EWR alignment proposals. However, due to the proximity of the allocation with EWR, and prior to the announcement of the preferred route option, EWR Co requests that a requirement is included within the proposed wording of the policy allocation, which recognises EWR and ensures that development of the site does not prejudice the preferred EWR route alignment nor the delivery of EWR	59871 (East West Rail)
Would office rents be set at affordable levels?	60663 (Dry Drayton PC)
Landscaping should emphasise the rural location of this site	60663 (Dry Drayton PC)

S/RRA/OHD: Old Highways Depot, Twenty Pence Lane, Cottenham

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support the allocation of the Old Highways Depot site for economic development, subject to protection of view of the church	59879 (Cottenham PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the Cottenham Conservation area is next to the south western corner of the site. The grade I listed Church of All Saints is very nearby as are two grade II listed buildings. Any development of this site therefore has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings including views into and out of the Conservation areas. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording</p>	<p>59658 (Historic England)</p>
<p>Support policy requirement to ensure enhanced landscaping on its open boundaries and avoidance of any impact on the settings of the Grade 1 listed church and conservation area</p>	<p>60644 (Cambridge Past, Present & Future)</p>
<p>Support the redevelopment providing it was limited to employment Class E(g)(i) and/or E(g)(ii). Oppose development of this site for Class B8, storage and distribution use. Cottenham already endures significant disturbance from HGV traffic arising from the industrial site further north along Twenty Pence Road</p>	<p>59572 (Campaign to Protect Rural England)</p>

Continuing existing allocations – housing

S/RRA/H/1(d): Land north of Impington Lane, Histon & Impington

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Do not object to development of site S/RRA/H/1, as long as it is a small development, to provide additional housing whilst maintaining the character of Impington and keeping it as a separate entity from Cambridge city and Milton	58844 (R Donald)
No comments – this site is committed, and part built out??	59659 (Historic England)

Continuing existing allocations – employment

S/RRA/E/5(1): Norman Way, Over

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Whilst there are no designated heritage assets on the site, the scheduled monument and grade II listed Over Mill lies to the south west of the site. Whilst the principle of development of this site has already been established and there is a buffer of planting between the site and the assets, any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA.	59660 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. However, we recommend that the policy refers to these heritage assets and the need for suitable landscaping mitigation between the asset and the site</p>	

S/RRR/H/2: Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>The principle of development of this site has already been established. Agree the boundary should be amended to show only the area for employment uses. Map on p349 still shows whole site. This part of the site lies very close to the cluster of grade II listed buildings at Hauxton Mill. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. The policy for this site should mention these listed buildings and state that 'Development should preserve the significance of the listed buildings (noting that significance may be harmed by development within the setting of an asset).' Any required mitigation should be included within the policy wording.</p>	<p>59661 (Historic England)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
It is not clear whether the policy will make reference to the Former Waste Water Treatment Works to West of A10, Hauxton as it did in the 2018 Local Plan	58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc)

Continuing existing allocations – mixed use

S/RRA/H/3: Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
There is no logic in retaining Policy H3 in the new Local Plan as it relates to Fulbourn and Ida Darwin given the policy was drafted over 7 years ago and planning permission has now been granted for residential development on the Ida Darwin site	58239 (Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust)
Site allocation should be expanded to include Capital Park (HELAA site 59394) for commercial uses	58340 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF)
This site lies within Fulbourn Hospital Conservation Area. Any development of this site has the potential to affect these heritage assets and their settings. Therefore, we recommend you prepare an HIA. The recommendations of the HIA should then be used to inform the policy wording. The policy for this site should mention the conservation area and state that	59662 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
'Development should preserve, or where opportunities arise, enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting'. Any required mitigation should be included within the policy wording	

Other sites proposed for allocation

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land adjacent A1198, Caxton (HELAA site 51606) – should be allocated for residential development	56483 (V Chapman)
Land at 20 Bourn Road, Caxton (HELAA Site 40453) – should be allocated for residential development	56492 (D&B Searle)
Land south of Bourn Road, Caxton (HELAA site 52991) – should be allocated for residential development	56492 (D&B Searle)
Land at St Peter's Street, Caxton (HELAA site 40462) – should be allocated for residential development	56501 (W Grain)
Land off Brockholt Road, Caxton (HELAA Site 40254) – should be allocated for residential development	56519 (R&J Millard)
Land at Thorpe, Huntingdon Road, Cambridge (HELAA site 40325) – should be allocated for residential development/ care home	56561 (D Calder)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land north east of Hurdleditch Road, Orwell (HELAA site 40383) – should be allocated for residential development	56720 (KB Tebbit Ltd)
Land to the south west of Hurdleditch Road, Orwell (HELAA site 40378) – should be allocated for residential development	60649 (KB Tebbit Ltd)
Noon Folly Farm, Land north of A14 Bar Hill. (HELAA site 40121) - should be allocated for employment development	56846 (Queens' College)
Land at Fulbourn Road, Teversham (HELAA site 40295) – should be allocated for residential development	56899 (RWS Ltd)
Madingley Mulch, land at Madingley Mulch off A428 (HELAA site 40158) – should be allocated for employment development	56957 (RO Property Management Ltd)
Land at Bury End Farm in Meldreth (HELAA site 40284) – should be allocated for residential development	57005 (Hastingwood Developments)
Land to the south of Babraham Road and east of site H1c (HELAA site 40509) – should be allocated for residential development	57042 (KWA Architects)
Land west of Malton Road in Orwell (HELAA Site 40324) – should be allocated for residential development	57054 (CEMEX UK Properties Ltd)
Land r/o 113 Cottenham Road Histon (HELAA Site 40526) – should be allocated for residential development	57065 (C Meadows)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land off Fenny Lane Meldreth (HELAA Site 40036) – should be allocated for residential development	57075 (Elbourn Family)
Land south of Hall Lane Great Chishill (HELAA Site 47879) – should be allocated for residential development	57099 (RO Group Ltd)
Land at Two Mill Field Cottenham (HELAA Site 40419) – should be allocated for residential development	57116 (Cambridge District Oddfellows)
Land north of Oakington Road Cottenham (HELAA Site 40417) – should be allocated for residential development	57116 (Cambridge District Oddfellows)
Land at 3 Hills Farm, Ashdon Road, Bartlow (HELAA Site 40375) – should be allocated for residential development	57118 (Bartlow Estate)
Land of Home End Fulbourn (HELAA Site 40523) – should be allocated for residential development	57123 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family)
Land at Court Meadow House off Balsham Road Fulbourn (HELAA Site 40522) – should be allocated for residential development	57123 (KG Moss Will Trust & Moss Family)
Land at Bannold Road Waterbeach (HELAA site 40466) – should be allocated for residential development	57166 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
Land off Kingfisher Way, Cottenham (HELAA site 40472) – should be allocated for residential development	60702 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land to the north of Cottenham (HELAA site 59386) – should be allocated for residential development	60703 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
Land at Boxworth End Swavesey (HELAA site 40506) – should be allocated for residential development	60704 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
Land at Priest Lane, Willingham (HELAA site 40468) – should be allocated for residential development	60705 (Southern & Regional Developments Ltd)
Land at Hazelwood Farm, Lolworth (HELAA site 52680) – should be allocated for employment development	57193 (R Cowell)
Grain Store Site, Lodge Road, Thriplow (HELAA site 47379) – should be allocated for residential development	57223 (MPM Properties (TH) Ltd and Thriplow Farms Ltd)
Land at Dry Drayton Road, Oakington (HELAA site 51617) – should be allocated for residential development	57236 (European Property Ventures -Cambridgeshire)
Land at Fen End Willingham (HELAA site 40469) – should be allocated for residential development	57236 (European Property Ventures -Cambridgeshire)
Land adjacent to Bridleway 2 between Highfields Road and Hardwick Wood, Highfields Caldecote (HELAA site 59378) – should be allocated for residential development	57307 (S Barker)
Land adjacent to No. 53 Station Road, Meldreth (HELAA Site 40461) – should be allocated for residential development	57330 (HD Planning Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land east of Ridgeway and Old Pinewood Way, Papworth Everard (HELAA Site 40439) – should be allocated for residential development	57354 (Bloor Homes Eastern)
Glebe Farm, Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham Glebe Fen Farm (HELAA site 40176) – should be allocated for residential development	57512 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Land west of Cottenham Road, Histon (Buxhall Farm) (HELAA site 40193) – should be allocated for residential development	60650 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Land adjacent to Histon School, Glebe Way, Histon (HELAA site 40192) – should be allocated for residential development	60651 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Land to the north of Cardyke Road, Waterbeach (HELAA site 40183) – should be allocated for residential development	60652 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Belsar Farm, Willingham (HELAA site 40179) – should be allocated for residential development	60653 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Tostock Farm, Cambridge Road, Melbourn (HELAA site 40199) – should be allocated for residential development	60654 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Herod's Farm, High Street, Foxton (HELAA site 40148) – should be allocated for residential development	60655 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Land to the north and east of Barrington Road Foxton (HELAA site 40412) – should be allocated for residential development	57520 (R2 Developments Ltd)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land to the south-east of Cambridge Road Foxton (HELAA site 40408) – should be allocated for mixed-use development	57520 (R2 Developments Ltd)
West Wrattling Estate (HELAA site 56213) – should be allocated for residential development	57535 (H d'Abo)
Hall Farm, West Wrattling Estate (new site 59388) – should be allocated for mixed-use development	57535 (H d'Abo)
Land off Old House Road Balsham (HELAA Site 40438) – should be allocated for residential development	57655 (Endurance Estates)
Land off Poplar Farm Close Bassingbourn (HELAA Site 40230) – should be allocated for residential development	57692 (Endurance Estates)
Land off The Causeway Bassingbourn (HELAA Site 40228) – should be allocated for residential development	57692 (Endurance Estates)
Land off Elbourn Way Bassingbourn (HELAA Site 40227) – should be allocated for residential development	57692 (Endurance Estates)
Land at Station Road Harston (HELAA site 40303) – should be allocated for residential development	58098 (Jesus College)
Land off Station Road Willingham (HELAA Site 40527) – should be allocated for residential development	58149 (J Manning)
Land east of Balsham Road in Fulbourn (HELAA Site 40271) – should be allocated for residential development	58154 (Hill Residential)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Meadow Drift, Elsworth (HELAA Site 40514) – should be allocated for residential development	40514 (Enterprise Residential Developments Ltd and Davison Group)
Land south of Capital Park, Fulbourn (HELAA site 40087) – should be allocated for employment development	58242 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF)
Land off High Street, Little Eversden (HELAA Site 40211) – should be allocated for residential development	58264 (Bletsoes)
Land off Chapel Road, Great Eversden (HELAA Site 40212) – should be allocated for residential development	58268 (Bletsoes)
Land West of Comberton (HELAA Site 40152) – should be allocated for residential development	58276 (Bletsoes)
Capital Park, Fulbourn (HELAA site 59394) – should be allocated for employment development	58340 (Janus Henderson UK Property PAIF)
Former Waste Water Treatment Facility, Cambridge Road, Hauxton (HELAA site 59400) – should be allocated for mixed use development	58415 (Bridgemere Land Plc)
South of the High Street, Graveley (HELAA site 40231) – should be allocated for residential development	58477 (D Moore)
Land at Manor Farm Site, Graveley, (HELAA site 40229) – should be allocated for residential development	58477 (D Moore)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land adjacent Ponds Farm Cottage, Graveley (HELAA site 40234) – should be allocated for residential development	58477 (D Moore)
Land north of Impington Lane, Impington (HELAA site 40061) – should be allocated for residential development	58524 (Hill Residential Limited)
Land east of Cambridge Road, Hardwick' (HELAA Site 40414) – should be allocated for residential development	58530 (Hill Residential Ltd and Chivers Farms – Hardington – LLP)
Land west of Station Road, Meldreth (HELAA site 40088) – should be allocated for residential development	58538 (Phase 2 Planning), 58546 (Phase 2 Planning)
Land east of Station Road, Meldreth (HELAA site 40089) – should be allocated for residential development	58538 (Phase 2 Planning), 58546 (Phase 2 Planning)
Land at Long Lane, Fowlmere (HELAA site 59408) – should be allocated for residential development	58552 (Croudace Homes)
Land at Ambrose Way, Impington (HELAA site 40392) – should be allocated for residential development	58554 (Martin Grant Homes Ltd)
Land adjacent to A10 and Royston Road, Melbourn (HELAA Site 40262) – should be allocated for employment development	58578 (Endurance Estates)
Land off Station road Foxton (HELAA site 40159) – should be allocated for residential development	58598 (Hill Residential Limited)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land north and south of A428, Croxton (HELAA site 40288) – should be allocated for residential development	58660 (Vistry Group and RH Topham & Sons Ltd)
Land off Whitecroft Road, Meldreth (HELAA site 59398) – should be allocated for residential development	58662 (Artisan – UK - Projects Ltd)
Land off Leaden Hill, Orwell (HELAA Site 47890) – should be allocated for residential development	58689 (Hawkswren Ltd)
Land at St Peters Road Caxton (HELAA Site 40543) – should be allocated for residential development	58713 (R Grain)
Land off Ermine Street Caxton (HELAA site 59433) – should be allocated for residential development	58792 (LVA)
Land east of Bush Close Comberton (HELAA site 40501) – should be allocated for residential development	58834 (Hopkins Homes)
South of High Street, Hauxton (HELAA Site 40283) – should be allocated for residential development	58841 (Redrow Homes Ltd)
Land at and to the rear of 30 and 32 New Road, Over (HELAA site 40552) – should be allocated for residential development	58855 Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited
Land North Of 26 - 46 Elbourn Way Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40328) – should be allocated for residential development	60647 Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited
Land west of Oakington Road, Girton (HELAA site 40329) – should be allocated for residential development	40329 Abbey Properties Cambridgeshire Limited

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land at 92 Old North Road, Longstowe (HELAA site 40422) – should be allocated for residential development	58863 (S Grain)
Land West of London Road, Fowlmere (HELAA site 40116) – should be allocated for residential development	58869 (Wates Developments Ltd)
Land West of London Road, Fowlmere, northern parcel only (HELAA site 40252) – should be allocated for residential development	58869 (Wates Developments Ltd)
Land adjoining 107 Boxworth End, Swavesey (HELAA site 40042) – should be allocated for residential development	58903 (Axis Land Partnerships), 60645 (Axis Land Partnerships)
Land East of Papworth Everard (HELAA Site 40429) – should be allocated for residential development	58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation)
Land to the west of Papworth Everard (Parcels A and B) (HELAA Site 40428) – should be allocated for residential development	58920 (Varrier Jones Foundation)
Cockerton Road, Girton (HELAA site 40555) – should be allocated for residential development	58925 (St John's College Cambridge)
Land off Cambridge Road, Gt Shelford (SHLAA Site 40413) – should be allocated for residential development	58951 (Great Shelford - Ten Acres - Ltd)
Land off Butt Lane in Milton (HELAA Site 40365) – should be allocated for employment development	58955 (Carter Jonas)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land to the East side of Cambridge Road, Melbourn (HELAA site 47757) – should be allocated for residential development	58976 (Wates Developments Ltd)
Land to the south of Hattons Road, Longstanton (HELAA site 40518) – should be allocated for residential development	59038 (Varrier Jones Foundation)
Land at Frog End, Shepreth (HELAA Site 40085) – should be allocated for mixed use development	59083 (Scott Properties)
Land at Slate Hall Farm, Bar Hill (J25 Bar Hill site) (HELAA site 40248) – should be allocated for employment development	59092 (Lolworth Developments Limited)
Land South of Newington, Willingham (HELAA site 59349) – should be allocated for residential development	59167 (Silverley Properties Ltd)
Land to the south of the Causeway Bassingbourn (HELAA Site 40216) - should be allocated for residential development	59176 (Scott Properties)
Land to the west of South Street, Comberton (HELAA Site 40310) - should be allocated for residential development	59226 (Scott Properties)
Land west of Station Road Fulbourn (HELAA site 40293) - should be allocated for residential development	59310 (Countryside Properties)
Brickyard Farm, Boxworth Farm, Boxworth (HELAA site 47353) – should be allocated for employment development	59317 (Avison Young)
Heydon End, 87 Chishill Road Heydon (HELAA site 47352) - should be allocated for residential development	59457 (M Carroll)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land at Rectory Farm Milton (HELAA site 54906) - should be allocated for mixed use development	60265 (Gonville & Caius College)
Land off Shelford Road Fulbourn (HELAA site 51610) - should be allocated for residential development	60299 (Miller Homes)
Land south of Cambridge Road Melbourn (HELAA Site 47903) - should be allocated for residential development	60306 (Miller Homes)
Land north of Craft Way, Steeple Morden (HELAA sites 40440, 40442 - new site boundary submitted 59416) - should be allocated for residential development	60326 (Daniels Bros – Shefford - Ltd)
South of Chestnut Lane, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40073) - new site boundary submitted 59416) - should be allocated for residential development	60542 (Beechwood Homes Contracting Ltd)
Land at Silverdale Close, Coton (HELAA site 40079) - should be allocated for residential development	60581 (Martin Grant Homes)
Land off Water Lane, Melbourn (HELAA site 40274) - should be allocated for residential development	60615 (CALA Group Ltd)
Land Rear of Fisher’s Lane, Orwell (HELAA site 40496) - should be allocated for residential development	60619 (Endurance Estates)
Land East of Redgate Road, Girton (HELAA site 40241) - should be allocated for residential development	60627 (NIAB Trust), 60628 (NIAB Trust)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land north-east of Villa Road, Impington, (HELAA site 40236) – should be allocated for employment development	60630 (NIAB Trust), 60635 (NIAB Trust) 60699 (NIAB Trust)
Land West of South Road, Impington (HELAA site 40232) – should be allocated for employment development	60635 (NIAB Trust), 60701 (NIAB Trust)
Land at Thorpes Farm, Swavesey (HELAA site 40191) – should be allocated for employment development	60658 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Station Fields Foxton (HELAA site 40084) - should be allocated for a new sustainable community	60662 (Axis Land Partnerships)
Land east of Long Road, Comberton (HELAA site 40497) - should be allocated for residential development	60664 (Thakeham Homes Ltd)
Land at Scotland Farm for the Scotland Farm Travel Hub (Related to HELAA sites 56252, 51608 & 56252) - should be allocated for a travel hub	60665 (Hallam Land Management Limited)
Site on Whaddon Road, Meldreth (HELAA site 55082) - should be allocated for residential development	60669 (Mill Stream Developments)
The Drift, Harston (HELAA site 40535) - should be allocated for residential development	60675 (Bidwells)
Land Between New Road and Water Lane Melbourn (HELAA site 40500) - should be allocated for residential development	60676 (Savills)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Kings Gate site, Villa Road, Impington (HELAA site 40041) - should be allocated for residential development	60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd)
Kingsgate Land off Villa Road, Impington (HELAA site 40239) - should be allocated for residential development	60679 (Cirrus Impington Ltd)
Land South of St.Neots Road Hardwick (HELAA site 40273) - should be allocated for residential development	60690 (Pigeon Land 2 Ltd)
Land at Brook Road, Bassingbourn (HELAA Site 40342) - should be allocated for residential development	60692 (Gladman Developments)
Land at Whitecroft Road, Meldreth (HELAA Site 40338) - should be allocated for residential development	60693 (Gladman Developments)
Land at New Road, Melbourn (HELAA Site 40337) - should be allocated for residential development	60694 (Gladman Developments)
Land at Station Road, Over (HELAA Site 40551) - should be allocated for residential development	60696 (Gladman Developments)
Land at Willingham Road, Willingham (HELAA Site 40340) - should be allocated for residential development	60697 (Gladman Developments)
East Goods Yard Oakington (HELAA site 59328) - should be allocated for residential development	60700 (S Collis)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
East of Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 47647) & West of Ditton Lane, Fen Ditton (HELAA site 40516) - should be allocated for residential development	60706 (Countryside Properties)
Land between 12 and 14 Station Road, Steeple Morden (HELAA Site 40054) - should be allocated for residential development	60707 (Steeplefield)
Land east of Highfields Road, Highfields Caldecote (HELAA site 51599) - should be allocated for residential development	60708 (Vistry Group - Linden Homes)
Land at Branch Road and Long Road, Comberton (HELAA site 40261) - should be allocated for residential development	60710 (Endurance Estates)
Land to the southwest of St Michael's, Longstanton (HELAA Site 40521) - should be allocated for residential development	60711 (S&J Graves)
Land East of A10, south of Church Road Hauxton (HELAA site 45674) - should be allocated for residential development	60716 (W Garfit)
Land to the West of Elizabeth Way, Gamlingay (HELAA site 40030) - should be allocated for residential development	60718 (Wheatley Group Developments Ltd)
Ely Road, Milton (HELAA site 40345) - should be allocated for residential development	60720 (Lancashire Industrial & Commercial Services)
Land adjacent to St Georges Way and Woodcock Close, Impington (HELAA site 40282) - should be allocated for residential development	60721 (Bidwells)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Bedlam Farm, Milton Rd, Impington (HELAA site 40389) - should be allocated for residential development	60722 (Bidwells)
R/O 89 Rampton Road, Cottenham (HELAA site 59330) - should be allocated for residential development	60723 (S&D Raven)
Land West of Beach Rd, Cottenham (HELAA site 59409) - should be allocated for residential development	60724 (BDW Homes Cambridgeshire & The Landowners - Currington, Todd, Douglas, Jarvis, Badcock & Hartwell)
The Boundary, High St, Horningsea (HELAA site 59410) - should be allocated for residential development	60725 (M Asplin)
Shepreth Rd/A10 at Foxton/Shepreth (HELAA site 59399) - should be allocated for residential development	60727 (Clarion Housing Group)
Land South Bramley Ave, Melbourn (HELAA site 59396) - should be allocated for residential development	60728 (Carter Jonas)
Land West of Fox Rd, Bourn (HELAA site 59395) - should be allocated for residential development	60729 (P, J & M Crow)
Land South of Long Lane, Fowlmere (HELAA site 59393) - should be allocated for residential development	60730 (Orchestra Land)
Telephone Exchange, Fowlmere (HELAA site 59392) - should be allocated for residential development	60731 (Orchestra Land)
Land South of Bartlow Road, Castle Camps (HELAA site 59337) - should be allocated for residential development	60733 (The Critchley Family)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Land adjacent to 61 Waresley Rd, Gamlingay (HELAA site 59336) - should be allocated for residential development	60734 (J Swannell)
Land off Rampton Rd, Cottenham (HELAA site 59407) - should be allocated for residential development	60735 (R Agnew)
Bar Hill Golf Course (HELAA site 59381) - should be allocated for residential development	60736 (R. Cambridge Propco Limited)
N Wilbraham Rd, Six Mile Bottom (HELAA site 59380) - should be allocated for residential development	60737 (Lanpro Services)
The Stables, Primes Paddock, Chiswick End, Meldreth (HELAA site 59434) - should be allocated for residential development	60755 (M Prime)
High Street, Longstowe (HELAA site 40387) - should be allocated for mixed use development	60756 (Bidwells)
Land South Of Milton, North of A14 (HELAA site 47943) - should be allocated for employment development	60760 (U+I Group PLC)
Land south of Haden Way, Willingham (HELAA site 59431) - should be allocated for residential development	60825 (Carter Jonas)

Support for sites rejected

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Kings Gate site, Villa Road, Impington (HELAA site 40041)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt; landscape; traffic; water resources; flooding; strategic highways impact; access to facilities; and site access 	<p>56811 (M Colville), 57765 (C Harding), 58862 (R Mervart), 58844 (R Donald)</p>
<p>Land west of South Road, Impington (HELAA site 40232)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt; landscape; traffic; water resources; flooding; strategic highways impact; access to facilities; site access; scale; and conflict with Neighbourhood Plan 	<p>56811 (M Colville), 57765 (C Harding), 58862 (R Mervart), 58844 (R Donald)</p>
<p>Land north-east of Villa Road, Impington (HELAA site 40236)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt; landscape; traffic; water resources; flooding; strategic highways impact; access to facilities; and site access 	<p>56811 (M Colville), 57765 (C Harding), 58862 (R Mervart), 58844 (R Donald)</p>
<p>Kingsgate Land off Villa Road, Impington HELAA site 40239)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt; landscape; traffic; water resources; flooding; strategic highways impact; access to facilities; site access; scale; and conflict with Neighbourhood Plan 	<p>56811 (M Colville), 57765 (C Harding), 58862 (R Mervart), 58844 (R Donald)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Site adjacent to Walnut Tree Close, east side of North End, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40020)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	<p>56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)</p>
<p>Land to north and south of Ashwell street, Bassingbourn-Cum-Kneesworth (HELAA site 40106)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	<p>56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)</p>
<p>Land at Beauval Farm, Old North Road, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40202)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	<p>56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)</p>
<p>Land south of The Causeway, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40203)</p>	<p>56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	
<p>Land at Clear Farm, South End, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40204)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)
<p>Land off Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40227)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)
<p>Land off The Causeway, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40228)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Land off Poplar Farm Close, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40230)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC)
<p>Land at Wireless Station Park, Chestnut Lane, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40311)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)
<p>Land north of Elbourn Way and The Limes, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40328)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)
<p>Land east of Ermine Street, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40330)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions	
Land off Brook Road, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40342) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)
Land off North End, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40398) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)
Land adjacent to Bassingbourn Nr Royston Hertfordshire (HELAA site 40560) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)
Land North and South of Chesnut Lane and Kneesworth Road, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40105)	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	
<p>Land to the east of Old North Road, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40299)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; and transport related emissions 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)
<p>Land south of Chestnut Lane, Bassingbourn Cum Kneesworth (HELAA site 40073)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; transport related emissions; and adverse impact on the road network 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)
<p>Land west of South End, Bassingbourn (HELAA site 40164)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in 	56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; transport related emissions; and adverse impact on the road network</p>	
<p>Land to the south of The Causeway, Kneesworth (HELAA site 40126)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; transport related emissions; loss of woodland; and adverse impact on the road network 	<p>56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)</p>
<p>Land north of Chestnut Road, Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth (HELAA site 40463)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: sufficient housing identified elsewhere; amount of windfall development in Bassingbourn; lack of sustainability; transport related emissions; and adverse impact on the road network 	<p>56875 (Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC), 60558 (Whaddon PC)</p>
<p>Land south of Wimpole Road, Great Eversden (HELAA site 40027)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill 	<p>58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)</p>

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options	
<p>Land off Chapel Road, Great Eversden (HELAA site 40212)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options 	58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)
<p>Land at Chapel Road, Great Eversden (HELAA site 40404)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options 	58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)
<p>Land west of Chapel Road, Great Eversden (HELAA site 40443)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options 	58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)
<p>Land behind Low Close, 52 Harlton Road, Little Eversden (HELAA site 40004)</p>	58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options 	
<p>Land east of Leetes Lane, Little Eversden (HELAA site 40026)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options 	58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)
<p>Land adjacent to 9 Lowfields, Little Eversden (HELAA site 40035)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options 	58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)
<p>Land off High Street, Little Eversden HELAA site (40211)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options 	58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Land off High Street, Little Eversden (HELAA site 40405)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: green belt location, outside of development boundary, exceeding scale for infill village, weak existing infrastructure, ecology impacts, lack of public transport and active travel options 	<p>58249 (Little & Great Eversden PC)</p>
<p>Land to the north, east and south of Six Mile Bottom HELAA site (40078)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: impact on local landscape; wider impact of proposal beyond more limited proposal assessed through HELAA 	<p>60443 (Westley Waterless PC)</p>
<p>DB Group (Holdings) Ltd, Wellington Way, Bourn (HELAA site 47529)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for rejection on grounds of: it is necessary to check that all surface water drains to the west, away from Highfields. If it were to be allowed to drain to the east, it would run into the Highfields Road drainage system, and there would be a high risk that it would cause flooding in Highfields 	<p>60560 (M Claridge)</p>

S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area

Hyperlink for all comments

Open this hyperlink - [Policy S/RRP: Policy areas in the rest of the rural area](#) > then go to the sub-heading 'Tell us what you think' > click the magnifying glass symbol

Number of Representations for this section:

23

Abbreviations

- PC= Parish Council DC= District Council TC= Town Council

Executive Summary

General support for the policy areas in the rural area from parish councils. A number of individuals supported the lack any proposals to develop in the area of Little Linton which protects its identity and Fen Ditton PC support exclusion of any sites within their parish. In contrast a developer claims there is a contradiction between wanting rural villages to thrive and only proposing to allocate a limited number of sites and are promoting land for development.

There is general support for the provision of new open space and community facilities at **East of bypass, Longstanton (S/RRP/L)**. However, there were mixed views on the type of housing proposed, questioning the need for affordable housing and suitability of sheltered and older persons housing given the distance from local facilities, whilst suggesting there is a shortage for assisted living.

No objection to carrying forwards **Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate (S/RRP/H/5)**, being mindful of potential impact on heritage assets.

Support for a flexible approach to allow for mix-use development at **Papworth Hospital (S/RRP/E/6)** should healthcare and employment not be successful. Concern for mitigating potential impacts on ancient woodland and heritage assets adjacent to the site.

Site promoter seeking amendments to the **Imperial War Museum, Duxford (S/RRP/E/7)** proposal whilst Historic England are concerned for mitigating potential impacts on heritage assets on the site.

One representor strongly supports **Mixed Use Development in Histon & Impington Station Area (S/RRP/E/8)**, which is endorsed by the Neighbourhood Plan. Historic England have concern for mitigating potential impacts on heritage assets near the site.

Historic England are concerned for mitigating potential impacts on heritage assets on and near the **Papworth Everard West Central (S/RRP/H/4)** site.

Table of representations: S/RRP - Policy areas in the rest of the rural area

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support for the policy areas	56588 (Gamlingay PC)
Agree areas designated in 2018 Local Plan should be carried forwards	56876 (Bassingbourn PC)
A number of Rural areas already have Neighbourhood plans. This should be respected.	57804 (Histon & Impington PC)
Support proposals which exclude any development in the area of Little Linton. Settlements of Linton and Little Linton have historically had distinct identities. The direction of future development to other more sustainable locations is appropriate and will ensure that Little Linton and Linton retain their identity.	57845 (S Nickalls), 57871 (A Nickalls), 57910 (S Foulds), 57924 (H Lawrence- Foulds), 57955 (C Mackay)
HIGHLY SUPPORTIVE of exclusion of any sites for development in green belt, village envelope and conservation areas in Fen Ditton parish. Plan accords with Parish policies on development especially in Green Belt – specifically extant green lungs/corridors including Ditton Meadows, in backland areas and in adopted Conservation Plan.	59909 (Fen Ditton PC)
Proposing land for development - Flint Cross, A505, south of Melbourn (HELAA site 59402)	58516 (Dencora)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
GCSPS wants rural villages to thrive and sustain their local services. Not reflected within policy S/RRA or S/RRP, which propose very limited number of allocations. Strategy needs to include appropriate distribution of growth in villages. Promoting land for development - Land Rear of Fisher's Lane, Orwell (HELAA site 40496)	60620 (Endurance Estates – Orwell Site)

S/RRP/L: East of bypass, Longstanton

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Only very small part at east of site within a MSA for sand & gravel.	56943 (Cambridgeshire County Council)
Revised proposal no longer for employment is very good but question the need for housing – too far from local facilities for sheltered or older persons' housing. Could be used for recreation and open space.	57003 (P Coldrick)
Support to provide new open space, community facilities and affordable housing.	57363 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Support use for assisted living, which there is a shortage of in the village, but not for general affordable housing.	57466 (Longstanton PC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Would like to see suitable infrastructure improvements as part of the plan.	

S/RRP/H/5: Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
No objection to carrying forwards policy which promotes legacy of network of smallholdings and sustainable living	57363 (Huntingdonshire DC)
Fen Drayton Conservation area and listed buildings lie to the east. Development has potential to impact heritage assets and their settings. Recommend prepare an HIA to inform policy wording. Include reference to heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain them and any mitigation in policy and supporting text.	59666 (Historic England)

S/RRP/E/6: Papworth Hospital

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Support. Need flexibility, given its size and nature, to allow for mix-use development should healthcare and general	57363 (Huntingdonshire DC)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>employment not be successful. Allows for greater certainty of redevelopment to perpetuate the sustainability of the village.</p>	
<p>Adjacent to an area of ancient woodland known as Papworth Wood at TL29116299 (8.5 Ha). We would like to see a suitable buffering strip to protect this woodland if development takes place on the site.</p>	58985 (Woodland Trust)
<p>Site includes part of Papworth Everard Conservation Area and adjacent to and in setting of grade II* listed Papworth Hall, scheduled monument moated site and close to grade II listed Lodge. Development has potential to impact heritage assets and their settings. Recommend prepare an HIA to inform policy wording. Include reference to heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain/enhance them and any mitigation in policy and supporting text.</p> <p>Keen to work with Council in preparing a Design Guide SPD for this site to ensure that full consideration is given to conservation and enhancement of historic environment. HIA would help to refine the content of the design code.</p>	59665 (Historic England)

S/RRP/E/7: Imperial War Museum, Duxford

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
IWM and Caius responded to the 2019 and 2020 “call for sites” (Site reference 40095) which included IWM Duxford. Submission expands on previous submission.	58015 (Imperial War Museum/Gonville and Caius College)
Multiple designated assets on site including Duxford Airfield Conservation Area, five grade II* listed buildings and over 20 grade II listed buildings. Development has potential to impact heritage assets and their settings. Recommend prepare an HIA to inform policy wording, draw on Conservation Management Plan and emerging masterplan. Include reference to heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain/enhance them and any mitigation in policy and supporting text.	59663 (Historic England)

S/RRP/E/8: Mixed Use Development in Histon & Impington Station Area

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
Strongly support. Also endorsed by the Neighbourhood Plan which was strongly endorsed in the referendum	57792 (J Pavey)
No designated heritage assets within site but Histon and Impington Conservation Area and associated listed buildings lie	59667 (Historic England)

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>to north. Development has potential to impact heritage assets and their settings. Recommend prepare an HIA to inform policy wording. Include reference to heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain them and any mitigation in policy and supporting text.</p>	

S/RRP/H/4: Papworth Everard West Central

Summary of issues raised in comments	Comments highlighting this issue
<p>Site includes Papworth Everard Conservation Area, pair of listed cottages and 2, Church Lane. Nearby designated heritage assets include grade II* St Peters Church and Papworth Hall, and several other grade II listed buildings. Development has potential to impact heritage assets and their settings. Recommend prepare an HIA to inform policy wording. Include reference to heritage assets and the need to conserve/sustain them and any mitigation in policy and supporting text. Note a large permission has been substantially built out - appropriate to adjust the boundary of the policy area accordingly?</p>	<p>59664 (Historic England)</p>