



Local Development Framework

Gypsy and Traveller

Development Plan Document

Responding to the Issues and Options 2 consultation

Appendix 1 - Summaries of representations received

14 December 2010

SUMMARY OF ALL THE REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

The following schedules provide a list of all the representations received during the consultation to the documents that formed part of the consultation. These documents are -

1. The Issues and Options 2 report
2. The Technical Annex
3. The Sustainability Appraisal Report
4. The Supporting Documents – Equality Impact Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment

Each schedule goes through the document in chapter order, paragraph by paragraph.

Each schedule has three columns –

- The first column identifies the **ID number of the representation** as recorded in the Council's consultation database, where applicable, the name of the organisation who made the representation. Names of individual respondents are not listed here. The full details of each representation can be found on the Council's interactive LDF consultation website: <http://scambs.jdi-consult.net/ldf>. (Instructions on how to view them are available on the website.)
- The second column indicates the **nature of the representation** submitted from the individual or organisation – object / support / comment.
- The third column provides a **summary of the representation** submitted. Where these summaries are covering the same issues they have been grouped together and a group summary provided.

APPENDIX 1

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED FOR THE ISSUES AND OPTIONS 2 REPORT

Gypsy and Traveller DPD Issues and Options Report 2: Site Options and Policies

Public Participation Report

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue
-----------------	--------	-----------------------

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1

25843 - GO East	Comment	You will be aware that CLG published a revised PPS12 along with revised regulations which are now in place. You should refer to the new PPS in taking forward this DPD.
29089 - Girton Parish Council	Object	South Cambridgeshire District Council conduct a full investigation under the jurisdiction of an independent person into the manner in which the site selection procedure had been undertaken to date.

1.2

25845 - GO East	Comment	Sustainability Appraisal At submission the Authority will need to be able to demonstrate that the DPD's strategy and policies represent the most appropriate response in all the circumstances, having considered all the relevant alternatives, and that they are founded on a robust and credible evidence base; and that all reasonable and deliverable options have been equally presented at the issues and options stage, all underpinned by relevant sustainability information and other evidence.
23596 - The Coal Authority 24880 - Guilden Morden Parish Council 25667 - Network Regulation 26025 - Royston Town Council	Comment	No comment.
25847 - GO East	Comment	Habitat Regulation Assessment We are pleased to note that you have already met the requirement to assess whether an Appropriate Assessment is necessary and to carry out the AA in the preparation of a DPD.
23476 23481	Object	Do not see why tax payers money should be used to provide Travellers sites. Presumably the sites are made available free of charge. The money spent will be wasted when sites are damaged, as has happened at the site adjacent to the A14.
24221 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	Glossary? Northstowe is presented in several places as though it already has a defined shape. The glossary should include a definition of Northstowe that should clarify the distinction between the development boundary and the [future] town of Northstowe.
24907	Object	South Cambs are used an underhand - divide and conquer attitude. 90 different sites is a ridiculous amount and only being suggested to come down to a smaller number. The entire ridiculous proposal should be thrown out!
28805	Object	Council should spend our money fighting illegal traveller sites in the courts and not for providing pitches to integrate Traveller's into existing communities. The Council should fight these plans to develop these traveller sites and on our behalf refuse to implement them.
25939 25940 - On-Set Location Services Ltd 25941 25942 25943	Object	Object.
27041	Object	I want to object to the proposed traveller sites in Great Cambourne. This is not because I am racist or xenophobic, but because I believe that the entire proposal is undemocratic and completely at odds to the stated "benefits to the interests of all involved". I believe that the entire proposal should be shelved on the grounds that it was ill-considered, undemocratic, and provocative. I understand that the process was put in place by an unelected body. May I remind you that the reason we vote in this country is so that we are governed democratically. We do not vote so that private concerns can make money from controlling social change in our towns.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24951	Object	The Plan contravenes the recommendations in the Council's initial sustainability appraisal report of June 2009.
28698	Object	We are concerned over the containment and impact of what is proposed.
23606 23607 23609 23639 23640 23641 24806	Object	Object.
25778 - Longstowe Parish Council	Support	Longstowe Parish Council recognises that the Gypsy and Traveller Communities Strategy addresses some very difficult and controversial issues and considers that the South Cambridgeshire District Council Action Plan addresses these issues responsibly and sympathetically. The potential site options identified for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in South Cambs are totally acceptable to Longstowe Parish Council.
23642 25029 - Little Gransden Parish Council 26026 - East of England Regional Assembly	Support	Support.
26030 - Harlton Parish Council	Support	Harlton Parish Council considers that the whole procedure has been carried out in a fair and impartial manner. The whole process was considered from the number of sites required (following independent consultation), the criteria for the selection of sites and the choosing of possible sites. It agrees that the possible sites should be on public land, outside the Green Belt and meet the planning requirements including embedding the sites in the local community. It strongly backs the consultation with the gypsy and traveller communities.
24901	Support	I strongly support the proposals for new pitches . New sites are urgently needed to ensure Travellers accommodation needs are met locally.
24665	Support	I want my children to have a full time education and a permanent address and garden to play on.
24378 - North Hertfordshire District Council 25026 - Huntingdonshire District Council	Support	Support the approach which is in line with the requirements in the East of England Plan.
<i>1.3</i>		
24590	Comment	The local development framework must include substantial provision for local employment wherever new housing is located. Reason: To ensure the sustainability of new communities and reduce travel to work thereby reducing carbon emissions and energy use.
<i>1.6</i>		
24534 - Girton Parish Council	Comment	This is a key statement. If the Council does not get this right it will condemn both settled and travelling communities to more than a decade of misunderstanding and lost opportunities before the issues are likely to be re-addressed.
<i>1.7</i>		
28617	Comment	We are in the 21st century and there is a case to be made that could make 'traditional' traveller life obsolete and that we are tackling this matter from the wrong start point. For example, the Consultation Document gives as the first key issue, that 'Gypsies and Travellers are part of S Cambridgeshire life' also that ' they can make a positive contribution to the community.
28633 - Caldecote Parish Council 28668	Object	By the very nature of their description, travellers and gypsies choose to live their lives outside of mainstream society. Therefore why do you seek to impose a stationery lifestyle amongst domestic residents who have chosen to live by mainstream rules and pay mainstream taxes etc? Their choice is to have a mobile nomadic lifestyle away from society. Travellers do not generally want to integrate, if some do they are catered for in traditional houses which would ensure their needs are met. Few travellers travel.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
28663	Object	<p>Integration - It occurs to me that it would be more socially cohesive if Travellers were encouraged to integrate instead of being segregated</p> <p>Empty homes - There is an empty home scandal in Britain which is not being addressed. There were a total of 2000 empty homes in South and East Cambridgeshire in 2005. How many homes, which have been empty for two or more years, are there in Cambridgeshire now? Are these homes being made available for all the homeless?</p>
24463	Object	<p>Living in a caravan and travelling is clearly a lifestyle choice. No heritage can be claimed by this anymore than I can claim that living in a brick house is my heritage. Gypsies and Travellers are ethnic groups, just as I am part of an ethnic group. This means that there should be no positive discrimination just as there should be no negative discrimination.</p> <p>If houses are not available to buy I am not going to set up camp in the street, nor should this be used as an excuse to build more houses for me.</p> <p>The same can be said for using this argument to build more pitches for travellers.</p>
<i>1.8</i>		
24464	Comment	Disadvantage in terms of access to healthcare and education is the personal choice of a traveller. No one is forcing them to move about - they can just as easily settle in one place and prevent any disadvantage.
<i>1.9</i>		
23944	Comment	There appears to be an assumption made in paragraph 1.9 that tension between Travellers and the settled community and the more general social exclusion is a phenomenon that only exists on unauthorised sites. I suggest that such tensions exist on all sites, whether authorised or not, and the proposals by the East of England Region and South Cambs District Council to vastly increase the number of approved sites are misguided and not the hoped for panacea.
28710	Object	<p>The main need for a travellers site is to have space available for the police to direct illegal parkers to when they need to move them on from car parks, industrial sites etc.</p> <p>The caravan sites act could cover this, it allows up to six units to stay for up to 28 days max, if you're travelling that meets your needs.</p>
24941 - Whaddon Parish Council 26622 - Swavesey Parish Council	Object	The Council should take action against unofficial and unplanned sites. We have one such site at Mettle Hill/ Chestnut Lane which is very close to our parish and gives concern to our villagers. Planning laws should be strictly enforced on future illegal sites.
28853	Object	I understand that one of the arguments of accommodating these groups is to cut the amount of taxpayers' money spent on preventing them from living on unauthorised sites. This suggests that illegal actions can force the authorities to provide facilities (also at taxpayers' expense). Perhaps this is one of the luxuries afforded to minority groups, but I think it sets a dangerous precedent.
24535 - Girton Parish Council	Object	They will not just "continue"; they will be exacerbated if inappropriate provision is made. "Appropriate" must mean "healthy, safe and socially supportive and where the law is seen to be enforced vigorously and expeditiously".
29102 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	ODPM circular 01/2006 mentions need to encourage effective action when breaches of planning controls occur. There are perceptions that, when it comes to planning control, there is a different set of rules for gypsies and travellers and they are above the law that is applied to others. Need for enforcement action on sites without planning permission.
<i>1.10</i>		
25584 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	South Cambridge District Council has not made a proper assessment of the needs of gypsies and travellers especially in relation to their employment needs. This omission is of substantial importance given that ODPM Circular 01/06 gives positive guidance on the matter. The selection of the site in Spring Lane Bassingbourn is seriously flawed by reason of the omission.
<i>1.11</i>		
28711	Comment	Travelling showmen, under the terms of the Showman's Guild, are allowed to park in lay-bys and to tow more than one trailer making up a road train. Their main requirements is for park ups or stopovers, as they move from one venue to the next and for winter storage. They may need to park up once in a season in a particular area.
24466	Object	Equipment can be stored in any of the numerous storage depot companies available in any phone book. No special treatment should occur.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------

*1.13*23945
24559

Object The Gypsy and Traveller Community Strategy should be developed before identifying sites. The approach undertaken is flawed because consultees cannot know the eventual adopted policy before being asked for views on specific locations. The Strategy may oppose certain site options proposed in the GTDPD. It is also noted that equal rights and responsibilities are correctly stated as being key elements to the strategy. There is no reference to the Traveller community being responsible for the assessed sites.

1.16

24529

Comment About points 1,3: the Council has not been honest, open nor transparent with Longstanton residents in respect of this ongoing G&T DPD consultation; no exhibition had been planned at Longstanton, the Dist. Cllr had to intervene to request one on our behalf. After the exhibition, many realised and complained that main determinations affecting the village were missing, too vague or misleading, particularly about a 1 km proposed search zone beyond the edge of Northstowe AAP site. Online representations are deliberately not being published, disenfranchising consultees from the democratic involvement that they wanted and could have been engaged in: a shameful attitude.

Community Involvement on the GTDPD

25105

Object I note that it says in South Cambridgeshire District Council's New Communities Service Plan 2009-2010 to 2011-2012

3 Service Objectives

Council's Aim

1. We are committed to being a listening council providing first class services to all
5. We are committed to providing a voice for rural life.

In view of the evidence of the numbers who have signed the petition and the numbers at village meetings, the Exhibition and the organised walk does this interpret as being a Council that listens but then takes no notice of what they hear?!

South Cambs should listen and respond accordingly.

*1.17*26608
29101 - Willingham Parish Council

Object The Human Rights of both the settled and Traveller communities should be considered equally.

1.18

28914

Object I object to the process.
I am very disappointed that the consultation period has come so late in the project. If you want to find homes for Gypsies and Travellers then you should check with them how they live culturally and historically before places are rejected or accepted.

24065 - Barratt Strategic & the NW
Cambridge Consortium of Landowners

Object South Cambridgeshire refers to consulting with the Gypsy & Traveller community at a workshop in May 2006 together with consultation involving the Councils Travellers' Liaison Group and the Ormiston Travellers' Initiative. The outcomes of this consultation are not in the public domain and it is, therefore, no clear what the views of the Gypsy & Traveller community were at that time. This information is critical in assessing the most appropriate way forward in terms of site allocation.

*1.22*26089 - FFT Planning
26621 - Irish Traveller Movement in Britain
27410

Comment We question whether consultation has been effective with the local Gypsy and Traveller community. Reliance on formal consultation methods may well be inappropriate with the Gypsy and Traveller community and there is a requirement for local planning authorities to out in place systems so that communication is direct and accessible. If such mechanisms have not been put in place they should be. Travellers found this process difficult to understand. The consultation wasn't explained to the travelling community very clearly, on how to object, as many of my neighbours feel the same as me but were unable to send emails. ITMB are very concerned that the Irish Traveller Community has not been represented at all in this consultation and planning.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
28847	Comment	I would put my name to this but I do not know who I am addressing, so I will not. I will be joining any action group I can and if there is a complaints procedure that I can write to I will write with my name.
27343	Comment	<p>I visited the recent Gypsy and Traveller road show. I was taken aback at the number of Council officials in attendance. At Fulbourn there were six.</p> <p>How many road shows were there within the South Cambs district? 7 if you include the semi permanent display at Cambourne. This adds up to 40 man days. This does not include the amount of hardware and software produced. At what cost? Would it not have been more beneficial to have applied the labour and finances to more needy and numerous population - younger members of our village who are not able to get on housing ladder. Why is no priority given to this category of population rather than the travelling minority?</p>
25844 - GO East	Comment	We commend you for the way in which you have approached this consultation and the forward looking content of your DPD. We are pleased to note that you have held a series of consultation events across the district and have sought to make the document as accessible as possible. We are also impressed by your clear commitment to equality and the articulation of the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community.
27414 27416 27418 27420 27422 27424	Comment	Children are considered well integrated within the local area where they are popular among their peers. Children are very happy in this environment and feel safe and supported by not only their family but by the wider community. As Catholic families they are churchgoers.
25173	Comment	Have the travellers themselves been consulted on where they wish to live?
26012	Comment	<p>I would first like to raise my objection to having to summarise my representation and the fact that unless I do so it will not let me submit my comments online. Is this another way that South Cambs is making it harder and more time consuming for people to make representations with the ultimate goal being to put people off making any comments at all?</p> <p>I would question the need to summarise - does this mean that the full versions of representations do not get read at all</p>
27412	Comment	Travellers represented wanted to acknowledge that they have found this process difficult to understand and feel alienated by the use of planning language and jargon.
28623	Object	Finally from this perspective it is hard to credit that this is an exercise of genuine consultation. It smacks rather more of a done deal with little or no room for adjustment.
25702 25927 29140	Object	The consultation Response Form was too complicated for the ordinary person to complete. The form should be written in plain English and not double Dutch. How am I supposed to know what the heading under 'Representation details' mean? Finally how am I supposed to know the suitability of an alternative site?
23851	Object	<p>I object to your use and interpretation of the 'Race Relations Act' to prevent residents from expressing their genuine concerns to this proposal.</p> <p>I do not consider this proposal suitable as a public consultation as the documentation (which runs into several 100's of pages) is too onerous for the average person to deal with. For this reason the majority of people will be deterred from expressing their rightful opinions. Not everyone has easy access to the documentation via the internet and it should be presented in an easily understandable format for everyone.</p>
27042 28841	Object	The interactive website was too complicated. I use the web and various computer systems for a living and have found this site to be virtually unfathomable to average members of the public. Please address this as it would appear, to an unbiased observer, that it is deliberately convoluted to discourage comment and involvement. I endeavoured without success to use the specific site to express our views but found the site confusing without a clear indication of how to reply, hence this E-Mail.
27030	Object	<p>My concern is that the fears, perceptions and concerns of the non-travelling residents will only be a paper exercise and not truly taken into account. If they were to be considered no traveller and gypsy site would be developed in Spring Lane! I fear that 'Equity and fairness' as quoted in the draft response below would not be applied.</p> <p>I refer to Page 52 of SCDC Draft response (23 Feb 2005) to ODPM consultation paper on 'Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Sites'.</p> <p>'Page 38 The glaring major omission from this document concerns the human rights of residents to peaceful enjoyment of their properties and village facilities and protection from the law of the land applied equally without exception. "Equity and Fairness" says nothing about the law abiding tax paying public</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
29004	Object	Local need for Travellers site There is little evidence of existing gypsy and traveller communities to the south of Cambridge and questions should be raised about the appropriateness of this location when little family etc ties will exist. This contrasts for example with areas to the north and east of Cambridge where existing settlements and historical connections provide a network for the gypsy and traveller community. Thought should be given not just to gypsy and traveller desirability, but also to potential full use.
25653	Object	I feel the consultation process has put a lot of people off saying what they think in Cambourne as people do not realise you don't have to put your name and address on this form.
23492	Object	Objection to the consultation process. After attending the exhibition yesterday I was very dismayed to find that no representative could confirm the proposed use of the intended pitch - rented, traveller, Irish traveller, Romany, private site or warden site. How can this be a consultation and in line with legal representation if you are asking us to consider an application that the council cannot confirm or deny. Should I choose to apply to take over the shop in the village I would have to specify its use to get permission and consultation would rule out specific uses. Very poorly handled
28863	Object	Consultation Defects and discrimination I don't have a PC at home. Printed copy only available at South Cambs Hall in Cambourne, - a bus ride too many for many of us; cost of driving; Cost of purchasing or copying documents here too high. Question availability of CD at local libraries to view documents (library computers only available for half an hour at a time, which is insufficient to read all documents) When Central Library re-opened last week, no disc available. Local libraries not easily accessible Conclusion - SCDC do not want us to comment unless we were computer literate and able, and mobile, and that is a form of discrimination and is also a form of age-discrimination. It has been a long and continuing complaint about availability of information. The Council is discriminating against people in this way.
27350 29008	Object	The site is close to Cherry Hinton village centre and development of the site for both housing and travellers will have an impact on these residents, their services and traffic and therefore they should have been consulted directly by South Cambs District Council and/or Cambridge City Council. We were not approached by either Council before or during this consultation. Consultation means talking proactively to local residents; ensuring they are aware of the implications of the plans and have equal opportunity to respond. This does not seem to have happened in this case. Many Cherry Hinton residents do not know about the plans and so have had no opportunity to respond. We were surprised to be informed that our District Councillors, elected Parish Councillors and the tenant farmer where the site is proposed were not informed earlier of these plans. They were like us and found out by local television.
23558 23967 24582 27356 27359 27362 27364 27368 28994 28995	Object	The documents which form the basis of this public consultation are simply too difficult for ordinary members of the public to understand. Legal mumbo jumbo full of policies, strategies and various criteria. The document is far too expansive and complex for most potential respondents to comprehend and provide adequately considered responses. The process is difficult to understand and I feel alienated by the use of planning language and jargon. The format of the document will deter people from expressing opinions.

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****2. CONTEXT****2.2**

25560	Object	<p>It is very difficult to comment on Gypsy/ Traveller sites without considering their way of life. This is not racist. Why else would we have government guidance and criteria for them?</p> <p>This proposal is only acceptable if the sites are constructed and run as mobile home parks with residential occupation.</p> <p>Would all gypsies want this scenario?</p>
25812 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>According to ODPM Circular 01/2006 " Local Planning Authorities should, wherever possible, identify in their DPDs gypsy and traveller sites suitable for mixed residential and business use."</p> <p>As Spring Lane can only be a 'rural exception site' mixed use is not permitted.</p> <p>In that case Authorities should consider the scope for identifying separate sites for residential and for business use.</p> <p>There is no evidence S Cambridgeshire District Council have fulfilled the above requirements.</p>
23569 27016 27083 27342 28555	Object	<p>I object to the considerable cost of providing facilities for a lifestyle choice that is declining and has significant health problems, especially for children. Travelling is traditionally the way of life gypsies have chosen and should they wish to settle down then they should go through the usual channels that everybody does by either renting or buying their houses. If, as stated, proximity to schools and amenities is an important consideration, we should be offering Gypsies and Travellers access to the affordable housing. Providing sites will just help prolong the travelling lifestyle, isolate them and prevent them from integrating successfully into the community.</p>
27304	Object	<p>How many Councillors taking this decision actually live within Cambourne? It's all too easy for Councillors to say they are carrying out the wishes of the government and thereby hide behind any decision, but you as Councillors should listen to the views of your community, the council tax payers and support them when they say that a Travellers' site is not welcome within (or indeed the outskirts) of Cambourne.</p>
25172 28578 28827 - Oakington and Westwick Parish Council	Object	<p>Has it clearly been established that these developments are necessary - is there a local need for travellers to locate in this area as traditional seasonal (farm) work has gone? There have been changes in local employment and an influx of immigrant workers. It is important to ensure local communities are sustainable, with enough jobs available. The job opportunities open to Travellers in the area is diminishing as many are unqualified and unskilled, therefore the need for pitches will decline.</p>
24039 28676	Object	<p>Question the definition of Travellers and how they differ from Gypsies, and whether there is a need for permanent sites if they travel.</p>
29084 - Girton Parish Council	Object	<p>Mindful of its responsibilities to the diverse current and potential future population of Girton, the Parish Council has elected to respond to the site allocation proposals wholly by reference to potential site users identified non-racially. It will therefore in this context make reference only to 'caravanners' - a broad non-racial classification as defined in the Oxford English Dictionary. As neither the Race Relation Act (1976) nor the subsequent case law (eg CRE V Dutton 1989; O'Leary and others V Punch Retail 2000) recognise caravanners as a minority group, any attempt to reject the proposals and comments contained in this letter on grounds of racism will be identified as a deliberate misapplication of the law. Any such malfeasant or misfeasant action shall be regarded as provocative.</p>
24468 28950 28956	Object	<p>Reading the 'Legal Definition of Travellers and Gypsies' for both Planning Guidance Definition and the Housing Act 2004 definition. I was surprised at how lax these definitions were. Such a definition could equally apply to many transient communities in Cambridge, such as academics and students, who stop for temporary periods. Therefore the division between the 'settled' and 'travelling' community is not as great as in other cities. Other people take it upon themselves to organise accommodation and it will be difficult to justify a need for permanent sites in a city with very little 'permanence'.</p>

2.6

24469	Comment	This includes the council's duty to not positively discriminate.
-------	---------	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23556 28614	Object	Object to the Council hiding behind the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 to dismiss responses and ignore peoples' views. This is an emotive subject with a large amount of misinformation, rumour and hearsay - it would be foolish for any decisions to be taken that disregard this. My comments are not racial but based on what we have personally been exposed to in my contacts with Gypsies and Travellers.
<hr/>		
<i>2.7</i>		
26592 - Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service	Comment	All proposals must adhere to Communities and Local Government Guidance Documents. Designing Gypsy and Travellers Sites - Chapter 4, section 4.24 - Access for emergency vehicles; Chapter 5, sections 5.3 - Water Supply; Chapter 6, section 6.3-8 - Fire Safety Model Standard 2008 for Caravan Sites in England. - The standard pt 1, 2 and 3
<hr/>		
<i>2.8</i>		
23848	Comment	Since it is stated elsewhere that the travelling community is disadvantaged in terms of education, few will have formal qualifications. Increasing demands that activities associated with Traveller work be licensed combined with the qualifications gap mean that access to work is diminishing in the eastern Counties. Also there are more employers offering accommodation to migrant workers from the EU. Travellers are less and less able to do the seasonal activities that brought them to East Anglia. There could be a decline in traveller numbers as these economic realities become evident and need for more pitches will diminish.
<hr/>		
<i>2.10</i>		
25106 25552 25561 26712 26838 27002 27078 27291 28771 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 28930	Object	The number of pitches proposed in Cambridgeshire and, in particular South Cambs, is unfair and disproportionate regionally and also nationally. South Cambs has a greater allocation and concentration of sites than other areas in the region. Surely these proposals can be spread more evenly around the county. The historic reasons for locating in this area are no longer valid as there has been a reduction in seasonal agricultural work and few Travellers are now employed in this way.
24955 24991 25001 25011 27058 27069 28616	Object	The Council should not plan for the pitch numbers in the RSS, which was produced by a non-elected, and therefore unaccountable, body. This requires South Cambridgeshire to deliver a disproportionate number of pitches. Instead, the Council should determine and plan for local need in South Cambridgeshire, which should only be met where there is sufficient infrastructure to support them and where they would accord with policies in the adopted LDF.
<hr/>		
<i>2.13</i>		
24471	Object	The number of caravans should not be compared to the number of bedrooms in a house. A complete caravan is likely to be larger than the average bedroom size in a newly built house.
24066 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Whilst South Cambridgeshire may have recorded more Gypsy & Traveller caravans than any other district in recent years, there are a number of districts throughout England, including locally, Fenland District Council, within Cambridgeshire, which has, historically over many years, dealt with a significant Traveller population, both in terms of authorised sites and unauthorised sites in such a way as not to have resulted in the issues which now face South Cambridgeshire. It is not the role of the Local Development Framework process to address historic management issues within Local Authorities.
<hr/>		
<i>2.14</i>		
24472	Object	Chesterton Fen Road area and Smithy Fen already have more than their fair share of permanent sites and therefore should not be considered for more.
<hr/>		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
<hr/>		
<i>2.15</i>		
23946	Object	The Blackwell site is described as unsuitable for permanent residency due to its proximity to the A14. However on the other side of the A14 Local Authority planning permission has been granted for the construction of many hundreds of homes almost up to the boundary of the road. Are these homes being built in the wrong place or is the Council attempting to apply more favourable housing rules to those persons currently occupying the Blackwell site? Why should the Local Authority expect low income families to have to live in affordable homes on one side of the A14, but not on the other?
<hr/>		
<i>2.16</i>		
23947	Object	If the SCDC action to provide additional permissions at already used locations has resulted in a reduction in unauthorised caravans to 29, what factors are driving the proposal to deliver a minimum of 88 pitches (each of which could contain multiple caravans)? The current usage and the planned potential number of additional sites are vastly mismatched and nowhere in this document is the need either identified or explained.
<hr/>		

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue
-----------------	--------	-----------------------

3. VISION AND OBJECTIVES

3.1

24112	Support	Spatial plans should include a vision for the future of places that responds to the local challenges and opportunities, and sets out how the area should develop. It should provide a vision of the future once the plan has been implemented. The GTDPD needs to include a vision of what the plan is aiming to achieve with regard to provision for Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople
-------	---------	--

3.2

24104 - Cottenham Parish Council 28747	Object	<p>Object to the approach adopted by the Council to identifying sites - quantitative rather than qualitative.</p> <p>Problems associated with unauthorised sites also can be found on inappropriately located authorised sites. To address this need to amend the wording of the vision -</p> <p>'South Cambridgeshire will ensure that the accommodation needs of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople who currently live in the district, or who have a genuine need to live in the district by reason of family connection or current employment, will be met by well designed sites in appropriate locations which can demonstrably be assimilated with existing communities. Enforcement action will be taken against unauthorised and illegal encampments.'</p> <p>The requirement to demonstrate a genuine need to live in the district etc will ensure that provision does meet qualitative need as distinct from quantitative provision which would still leave a genuine need unmet.</p>
29091 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	<p>Object to the approach adopted by the Council to identifying sites - quantitative rather than qualitative.</p> <p>Problems associated with unauthorised sites also can be found on inappropriately located authorised sites. To address this need to amend the wording of the vision -</p> <p>' South Cambridgeshire will ensure that the accommodation needs of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople who currently live in the district, or who have a genuine need to live in the district by reason of family connection or current employment, will be met by well designed sites in appropriate locations which can demonstrably be assimilated with existing communities. Enforcement action will be taken against unauthorised and illegal encampments.'</p> <p>The requirement to demonstrate a genuine need to live in the district etc will ensure that provision does meet qualitative need as distinct from quantitative provision which would still leave a genuine need unmet.</p>
24536 - Girton Parish Council	Object	"Reduced" is an inadequate goal. Substitute "addressed vigorously and expeditiously in all cases".
29085 - Girton Parish Council	Object	<p>Girton Parish Council deplores the 'Vision'. Judges it unfit for purpose, potentially incitement to offences under the Race Relations Act (1976)</p> <p>Vision considered sentence by sentence -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sites must be more than 'appropriate'. Should be in ' healthy, safe, environmentally sound and socially supportive locations', or not at all. Caravanners should not be treated unfavourably compared to rest of community. This discriminates against other members of the caravanner community. 2. Accommodation that does not guarantee healthy, safe and socially supportive conditions discriminates against potential caravan site users. Should not be offered. 3. Conflicts with the sustainability objectives: 'Reduce and prevent crime...' Need word 'prevent ' in this sentence otherwise suggests that minimum effort to uphold the law acceptable. Also to expunge fear of crime best to replace 'reduced' with 'eliminated'.

Question Q1

28615	Comment	It is a given that authorised sites are preferable to unauthorised ones and that SCDC have really no alternative but to provide them.
-------	---------	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23526	Comment	Whilst I understand that the District has had many issues with illegal G and T encampments over the years and that allocated sites are preferable, I would strongly re-iterate the clause in the vision that makes reference to sites that are well designed and in appropriate locations. In this case I do not support that Fulbourn is either an appropriate location or a growth area.
23465	Comment	The provision of land / accommodation should not always be in line with increasing living conditions. This is a lifestyle choice.
24153	Comment	<p>Every effort should be made to integrate Travellers into society - placing their accommodation within proposed developments serves this. People purchasing adjacent housing will be aware of the site and market forces will adjust price as appropriate.</p> <p>It seems inappropriate that any group of people should be treated as above the law, when it comes to the occupation of land or that their land claims should be treated any differently from the rest of society.</p> <p>The law should be changed so that illegal occupation of land is made a criminal offence, which can be dealt with by police.</p> <p>Travelling Showpeople have other needs including somewhere to park large lorries overnight, adjacent to main roads with decent facilities.</p>
26084 - FFT Planning	Comment	<p>As it stands this is reasonable but there are some alterations which FFT and TLRP would wish to see made.</p> <p>Add a reference to 'including suitable affordable accommodation' to the second sentence.</p> <p>Add 'by means of ensuring that accommodation needs are met through the planning system' to the end of the third sentence.</p>
24392 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	Rampton Parish Council wish to express a neutral view to the Vision and Objectives by making no comment
23564	Object	I think the sites already available in the South Cambridge District Council are fully adequate.
23889	Object	<p>The wording is not wording of a "vision" but rather an unsupported statement that the document fully complies with regional requirements and will do wonderful things for everyone.</p> <p>The second sentence is fine, but the first and last are statements presented as fact rather than as a vision.</p>
24537 - Girton Parish Council	Object	<p>No. Girton Parish Council cannot agree with the vision as stated, because the preamble is false.</p> <p>Because of the chosen methodology the 'range' of sites offered is unfairly restrictive, and in much of the District will offer no improved conditions for caravanners. Hence the occurrence of illegal and unplanned settlement is not likely to be reduced, while our own community will be put under unreasonable pressure with 40 pitches proposed in our vicinity.</p>
24689	Object	<p>The council has got itself into a catch 22 situation:</p> <p>Either the council believes that this group of people are likely to break the law if provision isn't made and I quote "Occurrences of illegal and unplanned Travelling encampments and development will be reduced" - which could be construed as the council being racist. Or they aren't going to break the law and thus the sites aren't needed.</p> <p>Either way the vision is thus flawed.</p>
23470 24126	Object	The Vision is one-dimensional and does not include reference to the non Gypsy and Traveller community and their needs for the future, or how they might sit together. The Vision does not take into account the needs and concerns of local home owners in South Cambridgeshire where the majority of existing Travellers are located.
23941	Object	The intimidating way this question is phrased makes it impossible to give a clear and honest response
24807	Object	I object fully to the proposal for new travellers' sites especially in small villages such as Cambourne.
24111	Object	You have combined two statements into one. So the Support / object is very course. I don't agree that unplanned / illegal site will be reduced. I don't think that SCDC should contribute "fully" to the regional provision

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24229 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	<p>The vision should clarify that South Cambridgeshire will extend its provision of sites so that it contributes its proportionate share. The vision should be explicit that the district does not expect to contribute more than its reasonable share.</p> <p>The vision should also clarify that provision will be distributed such that the total number of sites is spread uniformly through the district. The current document calls for a grossly disproportionate distribution in the northern half of the District.</p>
24105	Object	I have to say that at the recent so called consultation on the proposals the photographs and presentation material used to promote the sites was very misleading. Your vision of equality and cohesiveness in relation to the Gypsy and Traveller communities is a little naïve and somewhat pompous and dismissive towards the vast majority of the community that do seek to be part of cohesive community.
26776 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	In addition, elaboration of the statement "There will be a range and choice of accommodation" is not given elsewhere in the DPD. There appears to be no differentiation made between the requirements for sites for G/Ts, Travelling Showpeople with large equipment and those with horses. It is contended that not all sites will be suitable for all these needs.
24813 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Cambridgeshire County Council generally supports the vision set out in the draft Gypsy and Traveller DPD. The provision of carefully planned and managed sites will be key to reducing incidences of illegal and unplanned travelling encampments and developments as well as minimising impacts on neighbouring communities.</p> <p>However the vision could be strengthened by adding reference to climate change and the availability of infrastructure, so that it reads:</p> <p>"To address the full range of land-use and planning issues, including sustainability, climate change mitigation and adaptation, the availability of existing and planned infrastructure and good design, that need to be taken into account regarding Gypsy and Traveller sites and Travelling Showpeople sites.</p>
26777 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	It also needs to be categorically stated, that apart from the Blackwell Traveller site at Milton, all other G/T sites will be permanent residential sites and not used as a Transit sites. The Vision needs to make this clear, as the requirements for Transit sites will be different from those for permanent sites.
24361 24503 24705 24768 24770 24771	Object	South Cambridgeshire contributes more than "fully" to the provision of G&T sites and already has a large number of sites, more than in the whole of Norfolk, Suffolk or Bedfordshire. The Council should challenge the equitability of the allocation and the need to provide so many more sites.
23929 24474	Object	The Council should develop housing for anyone working in the area, including affordable housing for people on low incomes. There should not be any special cases. The areas identified would be better for built housing to contribute to Cambridgeshire's housing.
24611 24733	Object	Additional sites will not reduce illegal Traveller sites, as a lack of sites is not the only reason why illegal sites exist. It will still be financially appealing to people inclined to do so, to purchase agricultural land at a low price, illegally put a travellers' site on it which takes many years to fight and remove - by which time the land use has changed and its value is significantly higher, and a profit made. I do not believe this practice will stop after more Gypsy and Traveller sites are provided because significant money can be made from it by those inclined to do so. It will produce over loaded areas and encourage more families to the area than there will be facilities for.
24067 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners 24637 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	It is suggested that the words 'including at major growth areas' should be deleted from the vision as the inclusion of this phrase pre-judges the decision as to where the Gypsy and Traveller accommodation should be. At the very least, the Vision should be amended to state 'including at some major growth areas'.
27089 - Gallagher Estates	Object	Bearing in the relationship and interaction between the City and South Cambridgeshire, the constraints of the city, the strategic nature of site provision around the outside of the City and the work the City Council is understood to be doing on gypsy and travellers sites, it would appear to be advantageous to undertake a joint DPD. Joint work is encouraged in Policy H3 of the RSS. There are a number of initiatives that have been undertaken or are in progress by each authority or where both authorities have an interest. Many appear to be proceeding concurrently and provide both the justification and rationale for a joint DPD.
24699	Support	I support the vision but request that controls be included to prevent a future increase in the numbers above those indicated in the proposals of additional Gypsies and Travellers seeking sites in the South Cambridgeshire area

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23836 24018 - Irish Traveller Movement in Britain 24217 24343 - Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the Univ. of Cambridge 25298	Support	Support the Vision
<hr/>		
3.4		
26706 - Girton Parish Council	Object	On the second bullet-point: (a) The supply is not "adequate" in that large areas of the County are left without facilities (including transit opportunities) for the caravanning community. (b) Sites must not be merely "appropriate", but "healthy, safe and socially supportive".
24127	Object	I have no issue with addressing the full range of land-use and planning issues, including sustainability and good design. But lets also address the suitability of the proposed sites in relation to existing communities such as rural villages like Longstanton. I feel that locating sites within Northstowe should mean not including any area within 1 mile ore even 2 miles of the whole village of Longstanton
29092 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	The provision of gypsy /traveller sites is potentially irreconcilable with other DPDs. Land for gypsy and traveller sites cannot be allocated in the same way as housing land. Objectives need to be amended to reflect the suggested amendment to vision regarding travellers needing to demonstrate genuine need to live in the district. Also have objectives to consider windfall sites. Also suggest having additional objective to have a requirement for community acceptance of proposed sites
26708 - Girton Parish Council	Object	On the final bullet-point: Since the Strategy is still in its Consultation phase, there is no way of knowing whether this is realistic. But in our view, given our critique of the Strategy, this objective will not be realised by this proposed policy.
28748 28972 - Cottenham Parish Council	Object	The provision of Gypsy / Traveller sites is potentially irreconcilable with other DPDs. Land for Gypsy and Traveller sites cannot be allocated in the same way as housing land. Objectives need to be amended to reflect the suggested amendment to vision regarding Travellers needing to demonstrate genuine need to live in the district. Also have objectives to consider windfall sites. Also suggest having additional objective to have a requirement for community acceptance of proposed sites.
24007	Object	Who is this east of england body. I have not had the chance to vote for or against them. Why should unelected people be setting policy?
26707 - Girton Parish Council	Object	On the third bullet-point: The very clarity will discriminate against caravanners who wish to settle in most of the County, and is therefore discriminatory. Girton Parish Council is aggrieved at the paucity of this objective.
29086 - Girton Parish Council	Object	The plan objectives are flawed. Reference to minority groups should be amended to 'caravanners' throughout in order to eliminate the potential for discrimination. Suggested changes to address significant omissions as follows: 'To address the full range of land-use and planning issues, including health, safety, environmental risk, socially supportive circumstances and all other aspects of sustainability and good design, that need to be taken into account regarding ...' 'To ensure an adequate and appropriate supply of healthy, safe, environmentally benign and socially supportive sites to meet the numbers required by the East of England Plan in South Cambridgeshire'. 'To provide a clear framework for making decisions on planning applications regarding accommodation sites for caravanners'. 'To eliminate by all lawful means unauthorised encampments and unauthorised developments'.

Question Q2

24904	Comment	A major objective of the exercise should be to make sure that the placing and numbers of travellers is done in such a way as to enhance and improve community relations between travellers and settled community. Find new planning ways to consider land that is not constrained to the classes described in this document. Keep sites small and at a good distance from each other. Space them out throughout the district so that all can have an opportunity to grapple with the challenge of another culture, but not make it impossible to grapple with.
-------	---------	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26085 - FFT Planning	Comment	<p>The objectives to be amended so that they read as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -To address the full range of land-use and planning issues, including Sustainability, affordability.....Travelling Showpeople sites. - To ensure an adequate, timelyEast of England Plan in South Cambridgeshire. - To provide a clear framework for making to provide effective support and advice to applicants and those in need of accommodation.. - To minimise the numberby ensuring that accommodation needs are met. - Contribute to achieving the aims of the South Cambridgeshire Gypsy and Traveller Community Strategy.
24155	Comment	As far as objectives go these are indeed admirable, but in trying to fill a blank canvas with everything you think you need you will find that until an established network of homes, roads and indeed local amenities exists Gypsy & Traveller and Travelling Showpeople will not want to be further marginalised and put into this new development's (Northstowe) fringes! Why can't they have a location in the centre of the development that is aesthetically pleasing for both them and the surrounding residents who wish to populate the new development?
24504 24808	Object	It is unreasonable that the Eastern Region and Cambridgeshire are required to provide a lot more new sites than other areas.
23890 24367	Object	The assessment "has focused on sources of land that the Council can have confidence can be delivered". To introduce a convenient criteria of this nature will ensure the exclusion of other potential sources, perhaps in the south of the District. The objectives should also include, "to ensure that there is a fair spatial distribution of sites, and that proposed locations account for existing burdens already imposed upon villages for major developments, immigrations centres, and so forth." If there are reasons for the uneven distribution of sites these should be made public and discussed.
23930	Object	The need for land work in this area is increasingly less than it has been in the past so traditional Gypsy roles will decrease significantly. Also, there is little advantage for showpeople to have sites in an area far from where the large fairgrounds exist.
24638 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	<p>There appears to be no differentiation between the requirements for sites for Gypsy/Travellers, Travelling Show People.</p> <p>The sites will need to be larger with greater maneuverability and with good vehicular access. The visual impact resulting from the storage of large circus/fair items will also be far greater and will be inappropriate in visually sensitive areas or on sites immediately adjoining other residential properties. As a consequence, it is considered unlikely that active Travelling Showpeople can be accommodated on sites allocated for G/Ts and that sites specifically for Travelling Showpeople will need to be specifically identified.</p> <p>This is especially important if it is determined that sites be incorporated within Major Development Sites.</p>
24475	Object	Minimising illegal camps should be separate from providing housing. We do not usually punish crime by providing what was being sought. Gypsies and travellers should not get any special treatment - if they are working in Cambridge they should seek out rented or bought accommodation. It is the council's responsibilities to provide total housing stock to meet these needs, not needlessly use land for only one ethnic minority.
23565 24035	Object	There are already enough sites available. I do not agree the need for these sites. If more are needed they should be located around Cambridge and at present this is not the case.
24616	Object	Again, these sites will encourage more travellers to the area than there are facilities for. We also do not currently have adequate infrastructure and services for current residents; it will reduce already inadequate services to the local community.
23471 24540 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Clarify what the range of land use and planning issues includes and whether this includes issues associated with both the Traveller and settled communities. It appears from the objectives that this is biased towards only issues affecting the G&T community, and not the planning issues associated with siting a new G&T community in an existing community -or the impacts therein. The issue of site sizes has not been addressed at all.
26778 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	<p>In addition, it is considered that those sites suitable for the provision of small stables also need to be identified for the avoidance of doubt.</p> <p>Again it is queried whether any of the proposed sites associated with Major Growth Areas will be appropriate for the keeping of horses owing to the potential impact on residential amenity.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24691	Object	I believe in the equality. All law abiding members of the community should be treated equally. Thus equal planning rules, and rights should apply to all. There are recognised legal planning routes that any citizen can apply through. This is what living in a democracy is all about, there shouldn't be one rule for one group and one for another. The current strategy is therefore flawed as it allows relaxed planning rules for a particular diffuse and diverse group of individuals who have chosen a particular lifestyle, and doesn't allow similar flexibilities in planning rules for other groups in society.
24230 - Longstanton Parish Council 24395 - Rampton Parish Council 24570	Object	The Objectives should make it clear that South Cambridgeshire will only contribute to its fair share of sites, and that sites should be distributed uniformly throughout the district. The current document calls for a grossly disproportionate distribution in the northern half of the district. Objectives should include a statement that location will take account of other significant public works and development already approved within communities ensuring that each community contributes its fair share to needs of local, regional, and national government.
24541 - Girton Parish Council	Object	No, and Yes. The stated objectives do nothing to address the needs and concerns of either community. A better considered set of objectives, realistic explicit and measurable, must be framed which will demonstrate the supposed claim to meet the needs (including freedom to travel, freedom from fear of oppression or crime) of all members of our community.
24906	Object	As previous - I reject these proposals on the grounds of lack of infrastructure. I also reject on the misuse of 'Northstowe' as a general area when this could also contain villages such as Longstanton!!
23942 23943	Object	The plan is unrealistic and will not work.
24811 25297 - Oakington and Westwick Parish Council	Object	Defining 'adequate and appropriate' supply of sites is problematic, as there is a difference between need and demand. Traditional employment opportunities that until relatively recently attracted Gypsy/ Travellers to this region in large numbers have greatly reduced and consequently their lifestyle is no longer sustainable. Many people would like to live in Cambridgeshire, driving up demand, but fewer people need to.
26779 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	The specific requirements for transit sites also needs to be stated.
23536	Support	I agree with the vision provided there are adequate safeguards to police the sites and proper infrastructure is put in to support the additional demands the sites will make on the existing village communities.
23837 24016 - Gamlingay Parish Council 24113 25299 26018 - Natural England	Support	Support the Objectives
24344 - Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the Univ. of Cambridge	Support	The University supports the proposed objectives, which are relevant to the preparation of the DPD as well as development control decisions once the Plan is adopted. The objective to address the full range of land use and planning issues is particularly relevant to consideration of the University's site at North West Cambridge (Site Option 5), where land has been released from the Green Belt for development to meet predominantly University and related needs. Provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches would not be consistent with that approach, as it is neither University- related development, nor enabling development.
24019 - Irish Traveller Movement in Britain	Support	Irish Traveller Movement in Britain supports these objectives. We would like to see reference to the issues of having separate Irish Traveller and English Gypsy sites and the use of the term Irish Traveller throughout.
24700	Support	I agree with the objectives on the condition that with regard to the provision of a clear framework for making decisions on planning applications regarding Gypsy and Traveller sites and Travelling Showpeople sites, then the Council should consult the public for their views as to the contents of the above mentioned framework, before these can be agreed.

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue
-----------------	--------	-----------------------

4. REQUIREMENT FOR NEW SITES FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

4.1

24477	Object	This will take up more space than an average new build flat. Surely it would make more sense to use the land to build flats for housing.
23891 24036	Object	Clarify how many people in a household, for example whether it includes extended family. Caravans are capable of housing a family. It is therefore misleading to describe a caravan as representative of a bedroom in a house.

4.2

25670 - Steeple Morden Parish Council 26037 26052 26895 28655	Object	There are already a large number of sites in South Cambs. There has been no demonstrated need for more sites in South Cambs. It represents a disproportionate allocation of land for travelling communities in Cambridgeshire, which is significantly higher than any other county in the Region. The requirement for new sites should be spread more evenly around the Eastern Region, and more proportionately around the country.
24038	Object	I don't understand the reason why we suddenly have been forced to provide these sites. I travel on the continent and tour using a range of existing sites, which I pay for at the going rate. If there is no site I have to move to a place where there is a site. Am I being discriminated against or will more steps be provided in the rest of Europe?
23948	Object	The requirement to meet a 3% compound annual growth rate appears to have been plucked from thin air and is not based on any supporting documentation. The quoted numbers are stated to be "minimum requirement", raising the expectation that even more pitches will be planned throughout South Cambs. The latest UK Population Growth figures from the ONS show an average rate of approximately 0.7%, a figure well below the 3% quoted in the report. It is suggested that the overall Traveller household growth figure needs to be re-examined and evidence put forward to support any chosen figure.
24737 24751 24773 24942 - Whaddon Parish Council 25022	Object	South Cambs already has a large number of sites and it is unclear why it is expected to provide such a large proportion of new sites. They should be spread more evenly throughout Cambridgeshire and to the south of Cambridge.
24037	Object	I am not sure who has produced this plan locally and nationally
23986 24055 24290	Object	There are already a large number of sites in South Cambridgeshire. It is unclear why is there a need to provide more, especially as the majority do not travel.

4.3

26086 - FFT Planning	Comment	Requirement for New Sites The GTDPD covers the period to 2021 and the EiP Panel report is clear that there should be a review of the policy as soon as possible after 2011. This may also require revision of the pitch numbers used in the DPD in the light of a new needs assessment. The DPD should include this eventuality and measures laid out for review.
24478	Object	Surely the long term aim should be not to continuously provide pitches forever but concentrate on proper sustainable housing for those people that work within Cambridgeshire.

4.4

24011	Object	Why must the plan consider these things?
-------	--------	--

Table 1: Gypsy and Traveller Pitch Requirements

26064	Object	In the case of a number of rejected sites Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology Service has recommended rejection. No supporting evidence is given. That service has not recommended rejection for the proposed Spring Lane site despite evidence of nearby Iron Age workings. An investigation would be necessary at the planning stage. This indicated that the Cambridgeshire County Archaeology Service is unconvinced. However as the District Council is directed to find a minimum of 88 sites by EERA and the Portfolio Holder has stated that only 88 will be selected from the 149 currently proposed, it is difficult to see how any of the 88 sites taken forward could be rejected without the district council failing to meet the directive of EERA? This is a flaw in the proposals.
-------	--------	--

*Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue***5. POTENTIAL SOURCES OF LAND FOR NEW SITES****5.1**

24479	Object	The accommodation needs are unjustified. There is a large number of rental properties available. Expecting the council to produce land just so that you can have a caravan is not consistent with other people within the council's jurisdiction.
-------	--------	---

5.2

28632 - Caldecote Parish Council	Comment	Villages are generally full and no suitable sites are available.
28866	Object	<p>The practice of putting travellers on agricultural land stemmed from the days when they travelled from place to place picking fruit and veg as work, returning each year. This was the case in the early 80's Cottenham. They did not own land. Changes in national circumstances meant that land became less available, lifestyles changed, so the old rules should no longer apply.</p> <p>To my knowledge none of the travellers and gypsies in Cottenham and Chesterton currently pick fruit or veg. Same in Willingham?</p> <p>I believe that none of those currently occupying green belt land in Histon are doing fruit-picking for work. So why do they have the exemption used to allow them to occupy this piece of green belt agricultural land? Because they can - outdated practice.</p>
28751 28975 - Cottenham Parish Council 29095 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	Problems arise not only on unauthorised sites but also on inappropriately located authorised sites and there is a clear need for community acceptance of new site provision. Public perception of travellers will affect community relations. Rural areas can be more able to accommodate the consequences of the traditional livelihoods of travellers where they may have more limited impact. They cannot be located where they will cause real problems both to settled community and to travellers themselves. Travellers prefer a degree of separation (Para 11.3).
23892	Object	It is unclear how locating sites within developed areas will reduce occurrence of unauthorised sites. The paragraph specifically acknowledges that the GT community prefers rural settings, and yet specifically proposes locations contrary to the GT lifestyle. Surely this will lead to a continued use of unauthorised sites or, where the new proposed sites are used, it will lead to conflict with existing communities since the sites are not ones to which the GT community are accustomed.
24480	Support	There should definitely not be any building in green field sites anymore than this would be allowed for brick buildings.

5.3

28741	Object	Clarification of why they are dispersed across numerous sites. I should like to know why you seem unwilling to put all the pitches together. Surely they would enjoy the community of being surrounded by like-minded people? If they wish to live in villages like Cambourne as part of the community it is a simple matter of buying or renting a fixed traditional property like everyone else.
24581	Object	ODPM/circular/01/06/para.21: 'The data collected through the GTAA process will inform the preparation of DPDs.... One of the tests of soundness of a submission DPD at its examination will be whether it is founded on robust and credible evidence.' Evidence of sustainability is such evidence. Thus 'considering locating sites either within settlements, or outside but close to settlement frameworks, with any allocations identified specifically for use as a Gypsy and Traveller sites' must be rested for actual sustainability: impossible until Northstowe infrastructures and services are operational. Potential Gypsy & Traveller families residents of Northstowe should not buy a pig in a poke.

5.4

26087 - FFT Planning	Comment	FFT and TLRP welcome the testing of a range of sites as identified in paras 5.5.- 5.14.
----------------------	---------	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26210 - MCA Developments Limited	Comment	<p>Circular 1/2006 makes clear however that there are a number of ways in which local authorities can identify specific sites and make land available, which does not seem to have been explored.</p> <p>a) Local authorities have discretion to dispose of land for less than best consideration.</p> <p>b) Authorities should consider making full use of the registers of unused and under-used land owned by public bodies as an aid to identifying suitable locations.</p> <p>c) Authorities should consider exercising their compulsory purchase powers to acquire an appropriate site.</p> <p>d) Cooperation between neighbouring authorities, possibly involving joint DPD's can provide more flexibility in identifying sites.</p>
28642	Comment	There are plenty of open areas that the travellers could use so why choose Bassingbourn village.
24568 24577	Object	Most of the land being considered by SCDC is owned by them. Object to the proposed Northstowe settlement as a location for 20 pitches that could be placed near or on the edge of the settlement rather than within it. I would not support a proposal to construct new sites within the boundaries established for the villages affected by Northstowe.
23893 24747	Object	By definition 'major development' would be contrary to the rural setting that is preferred by the Gypsy and Traveller community. The major developments do not exist yet. As a result there is no infrastructure in place to support the sites and the sites may not come forward.
24232 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	The "Major developments" source must be caveated to state that sites will be provided only once the development's infrastructure exists to support the sites.
24544 - Girton Parish Council 24545 - Girton Parish Council 25235	Object	The Council should widen the search to include private land, as the majority of land in the district is privately owned. It cannot be assumed that sites are not deliverable unless discussions have taken place with the land owners. If necessary the Council has the powers of compulsory purchase.

5.5

24481	Object	Chesterton Fen Road Milton already has too many pitches and therefore should not be under consideration.
-------	--------	--

Review of Existing Authorised Sites

23557	Object	It is general knowledge that a proposed traveller site will lower house prices - many parts of Cambourne are still in the developmental stages and reliant on future house sales in order to progress (which is extremely difficult in the current climate) and this could have a detrimental, i.e. negative effect on future house sales. Surely it is much more prudent to use existing traveller sites as an extension to these sites will not incur the upset of neighbouring communities or threaten developing communities - the travelling community will be expanding within their own community on existing sites in the knowledge that they are being welcomed with no ill feeling.
-------	--------	---

5.7

25285	Object	<p>New sites</p> <p>There are already sites in the Bassingbourn area. The site on the A1198 at Whaddon could surely be extended and there is a site on the Kneesworth Road at Meldreth which was used as a transit site and could cheaply be altered into a settlement at less cost than that for an inaccessible green field site.</p>
-------	--------	---

5.8

24743	Support	Seems sensible
-------	---------	----------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
5.9		
24909	Object	<p>In addition to the new sites proposed I believe that those with temporary planning should be made permanent giving these pitches permanent status as part of this plan, in fact any new sites will not actually mean any new site and therefore not alleviate the problem of inadequate pitches.</p> <p>I believe giving those pitches permanent status will not only be less costly for the taxpayer , it will also allow those traveller families to remain in their homes which can only have a positive impact on their health, childrens education and overall well being.</p>
5.10		
24482	Object	There should be no unauthorised tolerated sites. All trespass should be considered illegal.
5.11		
24954 26144 26153 26163	Object	The Council should not allow retrospective planning permission as this makes a mockery of the planning regulations and encourages future flouting of the law.
28672	Object	Why don't you keep the Gypsy and Traveller Communities where they are now and make the sites authorised encampments as this will save an awful lot of time and money and stop making people in South Cambridgeshire angry with these proposals and disrupting our lives.
28674	Object	Why don't you keep the Gypsy and Traveller Communities where they are now and make the sites authorised encampments as this will save an awful lot of time and money and stop making people in South Cambridgeshire angry with these proposals and disrupting our lives.
5.12		
23581	Support	I support this proposal to continue to close these two small council run sites on the basis that other suitable temporary/emergency stopping sites are provided for travellers who are passing through the county of Cambridgeshire and are better located in terms of access to facilities
5.13		
26793 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The County Council intends to explore with local Registered Social Landlords the possibility of these organisations taking responsibility for the management of any existing and new sites in the County Council's ownership. The long-term future and management of County Council owned sites will be reviewed in a subsequent report to be considered by the County Council's Cabinet.
24068 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners 24071 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners 24915 - Oakington and Westwick Parish Council 25234	Object	The Council should carry out a more thorough review of County Council and other public bodies' land. Cambridgeshire County Council is a key organisation involved in the delivery of G&T sites / services and its ability to provide further land within the district to accommodate this use should be explored in detail. Other public land to explore includes Bassingbourn and Waterbeach Barracks. It is questionable that there is no suitable land in the ownership of the Environment and Highways Agencies.
23895	Object	<p>Assessment of public land must include consideration of the lost opportunities due to use of the site. For example, would use of land as a GT site preclude its use as part of a strategic reserve for future major developments?</p> <p>The rest of the statement seems fine.</p>
Major Developments		
24908 26691 - North Hertfordshire District Council 28868	Object	Any new development in the future should allow for new pitches. This would ensure they are considered at the planning stage and reduce costly and lengthy consultations. Major developments provide key sources of sustainable mixed communities and will allow sites to be incorporated in the most appropriate manner.

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****5.14**

23527	Comment	Major developments may be appropriate for future G & T sites, however, the site at Ida Darwin Fulbourn should not be a major development and is not a suitable site for any form of residential development.
25690 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	While accepting Major Developments can play a role. This should be restricted to those in the early stages of Master Planning not those which have been largely completed, making provision harder to integrate into the master plan process. Cambourne as with all Major Development sites are disadvantaged because the proposal is for the whole village and is not site specific. This means it is difficult to object using the specific design criteria. This process potentially means that an allocation for pitches is made when there is no suitable land available for the pitches. The process is fundamentally flawed.
24956	Object	It should not be assumed that Travellers pitches should be provided at every major new settlement; considerations of need and the process of preparing a master plan for a new settlement should not be prejudiced.
24738 24749	Object	It does not seem fair to locate new sites in major growth areas, as there are no residents to comment on the location of the sites, and surrounding areas will already be suffering from development of the site without the added strain of accommodating extra sites.
23446 28626 - Caldecote Parish Council	Object	New developments are reliant on builders being able to sell market homes. New developments are already contributing to the housing need by enabling up to 40% social housing, including re-homing travellers. They simply will not be able to sell homes that are even threatened by traveller sites nearby. There is a real risk that targets set for home building will not be achieved.
23896 24235 - Longstanton Parish Council 24575	Object	This paragraph should be amended to make it clear that no new sites should be delivered until appropriate infrastructure is in place to support the sites.
25294	Support	New sites such as 3 and 4 and Northstowe (site 6) and Cambourne (site 7) would be more appropriate as there would be better access roads and provision for schooling, medical and other services to meet the needs of the travelling community. These sites would mean the general public would mix more with the travellers and understand them better.

5.15

24483	Object	Too many areas are under consideration as there should be far fewer pitches than planned.
24070 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	1.1 Whilst there is acceptance in principle that there is a need to provide further Gypsy & Traveller sites during the plan period based on the RSS, this objection comprises three specific elements. 1 South Cambridgeshire's proposed strategy for the location of Gypsy & Traveller sites as part of major developments 2 Site specific matters relating to Site 4, land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge 3 the deliverability of Gypsy & Traveller sites as part of major developments.

Question Q3

25642	Comment	New Site Option Trumpington Meadows where it has planning for 1200 new homes. Suggest 5 gypsy and traveller pitches. Cannot believe it was not put forward as one of the final 22 sites as it is more sustainable than Cambourne. It has great transport links ; it is close to other traveller sites in Cambridge which travellers want ; it will be fully sustainable ; close to Addenbrookes hospital. Opportunity for SCDC to integrate a traveller site here . Must be included in the next stage of consultation.
-------	---------	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25609 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Comment	<p>New Site Option</p> <p>Land to the West of Cambridge Road , Sawston</p> <p>This would be a new site in the SE corner of S Cambs thus meeting one of the Council's objectives of ensuring a geographical spread of locations.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to a rural centre, fulfilling all the criteria, with access to the undernoted facilities all within 2000m - primary school; secondary school; medical centre; post office; bank; full range of shops.</p> <p>In addition there is a good public transport, with a half hourly bus service to Cambridge and the site has good links to major road network including the M11.</p> <p>Believe land to be owned by Cambridgeshire County Council.</p>
28912	Comment	<p>Suggested new sites</p> <p>We would recommend that South Cambridgeshire considers using the Development sites at all the Park and Rides as this would be beneficial to the Gypsy and Travellers as most of these sites will be due to development and would make intrusion far more acceptable to all, The sites also have good access and Transport Links to all amenities.</p>
28900	Comment	<p>Suggested new sites</p> <p>We would recommend that South Cambridgeshire considers using the Development sites at all the Park and Rides as this would be beneficial to the Gypsy and Travellers as most of these sites will be due to development and would make intrusion far more acceptable to all, The sites also have good access and Transport Links to all amenities.</p>
27090 - Gallagher Estates	Comment	<p>As part of the Site Specific Policies DPD process the District Council tested reasonable alternative site options to address the housing shortfall. It is proposed that some of these sites are re-examined for their suitability as gypsy and traveller sites. Chapter 7 of the Technical Annex to the Site Specific Policies DPD identifies a number of non-strategic green belt sites and other sites on white land at Rural Centres in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The sites are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GB6 (East of Cambridge Road, Great Shelford) - WL3 - Land at Caravan and Camping Site, off Cabbage Moor, Great Shelford. - WL8 - Land to the east of Units 1-6 Ash Road, Breckenwood Road, Fulbourn - WL10 - Land rear of 36-42 Aphorpe Street, Fulbourn
25608 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Comment	<p>New Site Option</p> <p>Bartlow Road and east of The Ridgeway , Linton</p> <p>This would be a new site on the south east corner of S Cambs thus meeting one of the Council's objectives of achieving a geographical spread of sites.</p> <p>The site is on the edge of a minor rural centre and fulfils all the criteria with access to the following facilities all within 2000m - primary school; secondary school; doctors surgery; range of food shops; post office; building society.</p> <p>Hourly bus service to Cambridge.</p> <p>Near to Linton by-pass affording close access to A11 and the main road network.</p> <p>Believe the land to be privately owned.</p>
24396 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	<p>No. Although Rampton does not have the required infrastructure for sustainability as outlined in the consultation document we appreciate SCDC has to meet its targets.</p>
25659 - Jesus College (Cambridge)	Comment	<p>New Site Option</p> <p>Land East of Chesterton Fen Road, Cambridge</p> <p>This land is shown on an attached map and totalling 1.489ha is available and deliverable as a site for gypsy and traveller site provision</p> <p>In support of this are submitted the following documents -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainability Appraisal - Transportation Assessment - Drainage and Flood Risk Assessment - Site Assessment.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26185 - Windsor Road Residents	Comment	The necessary number of pitches could be accommodated elsewhere and we suggest the new pitches are located at : Cambourne, Bassingbourn, Swavesey, Willingham, Cambridge East, Chesterton Fen Road, Fulbourn, Milton and Northstowe. 139 pitches have been identified in these regions taken together.
26088 - FFT Planning	Comment	This question is beyond our competence. There may be land in the hands of Gypsies and Travellers which has not come forward during the consultation process. We note that only one site was brought forwards during the consultation process. This may be a reflection of the ineffectiveness of the consultation process.
25606 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Comment	<p>New Site Option</p> <p>Green End Comberton</p> <p>This would be a new site to the W of Cambridge and would thus contribute to the Council's objective of achieving a geographical spread of sites.</p> <p>The site is on the edge of a group village and fulfils all the criteria for access to following facilities within 2000m - primary school; secondary school; foot shop; doctors surgery; post office.</p> <p>In addition there is an hourly bus service to Cambridge.</p> <p>The village has good access to the major road network being close to A1303 and M11.</p> <p>Believe the land to be privately owned.</p>
25965	Comment	I am alert to the success of the Council's Whaddon Gap site and it has much to recommend it , though it is in a position far more favourable to movements of vehicles than Spring Lane and has the advantages of access to a major road (a point favoured by many travellers) and seems to have little impact on any village community. A mirror image of this site posted elsewhere would be a sensible and worthwhile investment.
25611 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Comment	<p>New Site Option</p> <p>Land to the east of A10 (behind old Slap Up Inn) and north of Car Dyke Road, Waterbeach.</p> <p>This is a new site adjacent to a minor rural centre and fulfils all the criteria with access to the following facilities all within 2000m - primary school; doctor's surgery; post office and full range of shops.</p> <p>There is good transport with either trains or bus offering at least a half hourly service to Cambridge. The site is adjacent to the A10 giving access to the major road network.</p> <p>Believe land to be owned by Cambridgeshire County Council.</p>
25605 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Comment	<p>New Site Option</p> <p>Land East of B1040 and north of The Ridgeway, Papworth Everard.</p> <p>This would be a new site to NW of S Cambs thereby meeting one of SCDC's objectives of achieving a geographical spread of sites.</p> <p>The site is on the edge of a minor rural centre and fulfils all the laid down criteria within 2000m access to primary school; health centre; food shops; post office.</p> <p>There is an hourly bus service to Cambridge.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to A1198 and within easy reach of major road network via A14</p> <p>Believe land to be in private ownership.</p>
24814 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The County Council is not aware of any new sites, beyond those already considered, that may be suitable for Gypsy and Traveller provision.
24393	Comment	I am surprised a site around Melbourn was not on the short list, as it has many more facilities as well as many employment opportunities. Also SCDC already own land within the framework of the village, which I have been told is one reason why sites have been short listed.
26609	Comment	<p>New Site suggestion</p> <p>Nominating potential site in Linton on land north of the A1307 and south of Mill Lane</p> <p>We believe that the land is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and to fulfil all the criteria with regards to schools, doctors' surgery, shops and transport.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25607 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Comment	<p>New Site Option</p> <p>Land at junction of Ermine Street and new-by-pass , Papworth Everard.</p> <p>This would be a new site in NW of S Cambs thus meeting one of the Council's objectives of ensuring geographical spread of locations.</p> <p>The site is on the edge of a minor rural centre, fulfilling all the criteria, having access to the following facilities within 2000m - primary school; health centre; post office; full range of shops.</p> <p>Good public transport to Cambridge with hourly bus service (No1)</p> <p>Within easy reach of the A14 linking to the major road network.</p> <p>Believe land to be owned by Cambridgeshire County Council.</p>
25900	Comment	<p>New Site Option</p> <p>Land rear of 3 Meadow Road, Willingham.</p> <p>See planning application Ref S/1308/09F Site satisfies required criteria. It lies adjacent to existing established gypsy site and would be a 'rounding off'.</p>
28928	Comment	<p>If the gypsies need somewhere to stay, a site could be provided near the junction of A10 and A14 adjacent to the rubbish dump.</p>
25610 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Comment	<p>New Site Option</p> <p>Land south of Station Road, Waterbeach and west of railway line.</p> <p>This would be a new site located in a minor rural centre and fulfils all the criteria with access to the following facilities all within 2000m - primary school; doctors surgery; post office; full range of shops.</p> <p>There is good transport services either by train or bus with at least a half hourly service to Cambridge. The village adjoins the A10 giving access to the major road network.</p> <p>Believe land owned by Cambridgeshire County Council.</p>
23566	Comment	<p>All sites for travellers/Show people should be run by the council, as they have the available authorities to assist them, and they have better knowledge of land available</p>
24693	Comment	<p>There are numerous legal camping and caravanning sites that these individuals could use if they chose to. I would suggest that in the first instance existing facilities are utilised. As a reserve then Cambridge airport has plenty of space, plenty of good transport links, is close to Cambridge city and has good amenities.</p>
25612 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Comment	<p>New Site Option</p> <p>Land north of Station Rd and east of A10 , Melbourn.</p> <p>This is a new site in a minor rural centre and fulfils all the criteria with access to all the following facilities within 2000m - primary school; secondary school; doctor's surgery; post office; building society ; full range of shops.</p> <p>There is a good public transport with an hourly bus service to both Cambridge and Royston. The site has good links to the major road networks being adjacent to A10</p> <p>Believe land to be owned by Cambridgeshire County Council.</p>
25613 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Comment	<p>New Site Option</p> <p>Orchard Park Cambridge, Northern Fringe, Site 1 parcel L2</p> <p>As the site is approved for affordable housing it is assumed that it is also suitable for a gypsy and traveller site.</p>
25604 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 28607	Comment	<p>A new site option is proposed in Bar Hill on land east of Craft Way and South of Watermead. This would be a new site in the NW of Cambridge and would contribute to a geographical spread of sites. It is located on the edge of a Minor Rural Centre with a range of services and facilities and has excellent public transport link to Cambridge. The land is believed to be privately owned.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23971 24978 24987 24997 25007 25197 25678 - Cambourne Parish Council 26904 27025 27047 27068	Object	The Trumpington Meadows site should be considered. Although the masterplanning has taken place it has not yet been built. Its facilities and services are better established and it is more sustainable than other options. This should be carried out as part of the review of affordable housing on the site. Part of the proposed site for the Country Park could be considered. Also consider Clay Farm.
23472 28669	Object	There are a number of disused small industrial sites which should be considered. They would reuse brownfield sites and offer sites for one or two caravans which would be easier to integrate into the community. There is also brownfield Crown Estates land to consider. There are numerous areas within Cambridgeshire which meet this criteria.
25137	Object	New Site Details Reclaimed land next to Cambridge Pet Crematorium, Thriplow
24129 25054	Object	Sites should be located near to facilities and services, such as schools, police and utilities, found in large towns and villages.
24014 24869 25287 27098 28550 28776 28821 28838 28931	Object	There are already existing sites in the area. It would be cheaper, more cost effective, and the most publically acceptable solution to extend or reuse any other existing site than create new sites. This approach would also have less of an impact on the environment and local communities.
23627	Object	A site in the countryside nowhere near other villages would be far better for all concerned.
27017	Object	I feel that the Fens would be a good area to site gypsies as they have always has a close affinity with this part of East Anglia and it has provided work for them in the past as it is mainly agriculture.
26973	Object	Haslingfield / Harlton - suggested new sites.
24969	Object	Alwyn Park, Over Road, Willingham (Three permanent pitches) The Site is located close to and within easy walking distance of the village of Willingham. It has an existing , safe vehicular access to the highway and has all the necessary services, including a facilities building. The site is level, extremely well screened by existing hedgerows and will have no visual impact on the area. It is immediately available , is adequate in size and will not result in any cumulative problems in view of its location west of the village. (All other G&T sites located to the east of the village.)
23868 23894 24233 - Longstanton Parish Council 24368 26002 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	There is an unfair distribution of new sites in the north of the district where the majority of existing sites are located. There seems to be a paucity of sites in the south of the district. It would be more reasonable and equitable for a greater proportion of new sites to be located in the south of the district.
26894	Object	I feel that other sites in the proposal clearly offer better options and improved opportunities for integration for travellers. I also feel that there are other developments that have not been included in the proposals e.g. Trumpington Meadows and Clay Farm that should be considered.
25727	Object	There are a lot of proposed sites north of Cambridge that can offer much better provision , with much better amenities and access to Cambridge. The new developments can allow better provision and integration as the traveller sites there can be developed and planned along with the permanent housing estates.
25914 - Meldreth Parish Council	Object	The proposal to add 2 pitches to the New Farm, Whaddon , a new site of 5 pitches at Spring Lane Bassingbourn and to add 6 plots at the Showman's site at Meldreth would , when added to the existing 17 traveller pitches in Meldreth and Whaddon and 21 Showmen's plots in Meldreth, in our view constitutes a concentration of sites in the Meldreth, Whaddon, Bassingbourn area and should be avoided under Policy GT2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25491	Object	<p>New Site Details</p> <p>Proposing new site on land we own west of Rampton Road, Rampton.</p> <p>Enclosed is a flood risk evaluation and it is noted that the highway visibility is good in both directions with a public footpath linking it to Willingham Village.</p>
27040	Object	I realize and accept that Travellers and Gypsies have the right to chose to live how and where they please and with this in mind I know there are areas much better suited for this purpose than Cambourne.
25936	Object	<p>New Site option - Paddock Area opposite Longstanton church / Nether Grove</p> <p>I would like to register my objection to a traveller site in the Paddock area. To consider a travellers site in the centre of a village is totally flawed and no respect for the character of the surrounding area.</p>
25502	Object	<p>New Site Suggestion</p> <p>Extension of existing site in Whaddon.</p> <p>Why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would save money because services are already there. - Limited impact on landscape - Access to shops, schools, doctors as all have vehicles
24678 25543 25998	Object	Bassingbourn already has a site. There are other more suitable sites in other villages that do not currently have sites.
25296 - Oakington and Westwick Parish Council	Object	In our view all forms of temporary living accommodation should rightly be judged as being appropriate to this consultation. Accordingly there is already large scale provision within our parish, in the form of some 26 and possibly more, mobile homes situated at the Oakington Tomatoe Farm on Dry Drayton Rd, Oakington. Importantly a significant number of these are only occupied on a seasonal basis. These units are mainly used to accommodate Eastern European immigrant workers who for all intents and purposes are Travellers in the sense of this consultation .
24684 26679 28538 28807	Object	Cambourne is such a large village and it has benefits as a site toward the travelling community. The Council should consider other site options in Cambourne. It should either be delivered with social housing (i.e. within the upper Cambourne development) or look for sites at the Cambourne / Caxton border and next to the Council offices.
24804 25118 25167 25858 - Fourways 4 Business Limited 26004 28662	Object	The Sunday Market site in Bassingbourn should be considered as a potential site option. It has suffered multiple Traveller incursions over the past 5 years. It is a large site that has existing hard standing and access onto the A1198, as well as water and electricity to the site. The site has access to a doctor's surgery, post office, primary school and local shops in Bassingbourn and Tesco in Royston. It is well screened from nearby housing and is close to local services and facilities.
25121	Object	<p>New Site Detail</p> <p>Parkers Piece Cambridge</p>
24156	Support	As mentioned in my response to Question 2 why can they not exist in the centre of the new development and why are they constantly being marginalised to the fringes of a new development. Do not push them into an older established landscape (i.e. Longstanton's boundaries), but make them a part of the new and thriving community proposed by the development comities and the council. Why was a centrally located, but aesthetically well appointed Gypsy & Traveller and Travelling Showpeople site(s) rejected at the time of planning? Is it not retrofitting to suddenly think they need inclusion now?
24020 - Irish Traveller Movement in Britain	Support	Irish Traveller Movement in Britain does not know of any other land but suggest the council enforces some compulsory purchase when it comes to current sites which are not being used.

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****6. THE APPROACH TO SITE TESTING****6.1**

25842 27033 - Fen Drayton Parish Council	Comment	We agree there should be no sites in Fen Drayton due to lack of facilities and transport links.
26692 - North Hertfordshire District Council	Comment	<p>The Council see the logic in using a tiered approach, however it should be noted that mitigation can mean that certain issues may be acceptable when a holistic view is taken. With regard to services paragraph 54 of Circular 01/06 states:</p> <p>"Rural settings, where not subject to special planning constraints, are acceptable in principle. In assessing the suitability of such sites, local authorities should be realistic about the availability, or likely availability, of alternatives to the car in accessing local services. "</p> <p>Nevertheless, the sites proposed in this document appear to be appropriately located in terms of national and regional policy and good practice guidance.</p>
24968	Object	I share the view of many of my constituents that we understand the need for the provision of Travellers sites, but the scale of, and criteria for, this selection of this site is wrong. It should provide clearer evidence that particular sites meet travellers needs. It treats the criteria for traveller sites as if they were permanent accommodation. It presupposes that all need should be met which is far from the case for housing need in the settled community and it makes assumptions about physical access to schooling, healthcare and local services which bear no relation to experience of other residents in rural villages. Need to reopen the consultation based on more open set of criteria and a more testing examination of the choices proposed.
28768 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	<p>It is noted that criteria for site consideration included a maximum proximity to a shop, Dr Surgery and Public transport. With the closure of many village stores and Post Offices and reduction in Public transport services to villages, many villages in rural Cambridgeshire do not even fulfil these criteria. The distance from Green End, Fen Ditton to the nearest shop is over 2 km, now that the local Post Office has closed</p> <p>Other criteria such as not building on Green Belt Land, not building on Flood Plain and following guidelines on the size of sites, seem to have been given a lesser priority.</p>
24890 25805 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	The combination of the site selection criteria with a decision in principle to exclude any potential sites in Green Belt; not to make use of Compulsory Purchase Orders; to focus only on land in public ownership has resulted in a disproportionate distribution of sites across the district. Failure to identify sites in South East of the district represents an unreasonable and unfair approach. The Council needs to find planning zoning ways to consider land that may not be available now but might become so in areas with no or very few traveller pitches.
24900	Object	I do not believe there is enough infrastructure in place to justify and support these traveller sites within small villages such as Willingham and Longstanton.
28549	Object	<p>The document sets out a number of parameters that are important for the ideal site. However there is no order of priority, or weighting given to different parameters.</p> <p>I urge our council members to consider in consultation with potential residents the relative weighting of factors, and probably additional factors, which are important in planning any development.</p>
28629 - Caldecote Parish Council	Object	Greenfield sites are not considered suitable for traveller use which seems to have ruled out some large communities such as Sawston, yet Cambourne will have to expand into greenfield sites to cope with the need for a secondary school and fourth primary school as there are simply no other sites available.
25822 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council 26067	Object	The criteria have not applied consistently to sites in the Bassingbourn area. Site 18 should be rejected on various grounds, particularly in regard to the historic environment, proximity of footpaths and recreational use, poor drainage, transport and the consequential impact of noise and disturbance on a vulnerable community, access of emergency vehicles, sufficiency of local amenities and cost. The assessment indicates Site 18 more closely meets the criteria than is justified and in some cases to interpret the data in a way that does not stand up to close scrutiny.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
6.2		
25586 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>Issues and Options Report 2 and the Technical Annex does not take account of the written submission by East of England Development Agency to the RSS (October 2008) emphasising the importance of access to training and education for adults and for pitches to be located close to economic centres.</p> <p>Friends, Families and travellers submitted evidence to EiP for the RSS that preferences and locational need of the gypsy and traveller population should be the main guide to location. The report does not recognise this.</p>
25596 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>It is submitted that the Council's approach through the three-tier approach to selection is flawed because of the failure to implement an improvement to site testing identified and accepted at the Issues and Options Report 1 stage.</p> <p>The failure to of South Cambridgeshire District Council to incorporate essential amendments to the three-tier approach to site assessments renders the Issues and Options Report 2 consultation fatally flawed.</p>
25689 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	<p>Tier 1: Location and Key Constraints & Tier 2 : Infrastructure</p> <p>The Parish Council support the approaches but clarification of schooling should be made to ensure Primary and Secondary Education is included within those facilities that should be available within 2000m to ensure good quality education is available close to proposed plots.</p>
25568 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>The ODPM Circular 01/06 states the need to provide sites that meet the current working patterns of gypsies and travellers. In view of the changes in their working patterns these may not be the same areas they have located in or frequented in the past. Issues and Option Report 2 contains no evidence that this requirement has been considered. Furthermore the District Council demonstrates the lack of importance attached to this element of site selection by excluding it from the any of the assessment criteria applied to the site. This is flaw in the selection of this site.</p>
25671 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Support	<p>The LPA has generally sought to follow the sequential approach to site selection detailed in the core strategy and has directed site location to the more sustainable settlements in the District. This approach is supported by the Parish Council as Group Villages, because of their lack of facilities, jobs and access to services, are not suitable locations for Gypsy and Travellers pitches</p>
6.3		
24546 - Girton Parish Council 28603	Object	<p>Object to this selection of criteria. Tier 1 makes unwarranted assumptions about facilities in different categories of village. Tier 2 unreasonably rejects the results of the I&O1 Report. Measuring distances as the crow flies is inappropriate. These criteria appear to be for officer convenience, not for community benefit and this suggests malfeasance.</p>
6.4		
26209 - MCA Developments Limited	Comment	<p>South Cambridgeshire has at face value applied a non-traveller specific methodology to the choice of suitable sites for the development of new traveller pitches.</p> <p>One of the key factors in the selection of Cambourne as a candidate site for the consideration of new traveller pitches is its high sustainability scoring. Whilst Cambourne's sustainability is not contested, it is clear that the choice of Cambourne for a new traveller site has been largely based on the methodology used to prescribe sustainable locations for affordable housing for the settled community. As such, it is submitted that this search methodology has not therefore demonstrated that proper account has been taken of the socio-economic and cultural factors which are important to the travelling community in selecting locations for transit or long-term settlement.</p>
6.5		
24593	Comment	<p>A major concern when locating appropriate sites must be the education of the children. I am aware of a number of schools in the District which are barely viable because of the small number of children in their catchment. This should surely be made a major criterion in the selection process: it would help the school to survive while ensuring that there is place available for travellers' children.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23899	Object	<p>The criteria must set out that any site must meet *both* the criteria (a) being in a suitable location according to strategic objectives (e.g., within an existing major development) *and* (b) having access to suitable infrastructure</p> <p>It is noted that the map demonstrates that Northstowe does not exist (there is no dashed line around it, because there is no infrastructure, because it exists only on paper). Therefore, the site manifestly does not qualify.</p>
24381	Object	<p>This is doing away with the requirement of integrating G&T sites at Northstowe: Issues/Options Report 1 recommends not just 3 amenities but also 'bank, pharmacy, secondary school, leisure and community centres, public park' and more. SCDC reduction to the bare minimum prioritised by the circular - 'e.g. shops, doctors and schools' - may not meet the intention of ODPM circular 1/06 (para 65) stressing the importance of 'access to local services'. SCDC determination for Northstowe does NOT follow the GTDPD Report 1's finding that fully understood governmental guidance.</p>
27300 28624 - Caldecote Parish Council	Object	<p>Sites must be located near to a large town or city in the same way as the settled community in order to avoid car dependency.</p>
28670	Object	<p>The terminology "traveller" indicates by definition that this grouping has the potential to be mobile. Therefore the consideration for close access to shops and support services should not be relevant.</p>
25233	Object	<p>The document only appears to say that 'Public land' should be looked at for possible sites. I cannot see where sites outside of village envelope are preferred and therefore there must be a presumption that sites within the envelope should be looked at first.</p>
23966 23968 24237 - Longstanton Parish Council 24371 24382 24383 24384 24505 24600	Object	<p>The rule that sites should ideally be within 1,000m of a target settlement is unacceptable. For Northstowe this would include the villages of Longstanton and Oakington, which is unacceptable, as the desirable facilities and services will be in Northstowe. Sites at Northstowe should be within the built area of Northstowe, and should avoid the Green Separation.</p>
24484	Object	<p>There is no reason that sites need to be within 1km. 2km is still an easy walking distance. There is likely to be far more space available if they are within 3km of key amenities.</p>
23949	Object	<p>The Tier 1 criteria to determine potential locations, with access to a doctors surgery or medical centre, a primary school, and a food shop, all within 2,000m, is a laudable aim, but shouldn't this requirement be applied to all developments and not just Traveller sites. The document describes its approach as providing "equal access to services", but by targeting potential Traveller sites in locations with amenities nearby, SCDC appears to be applying a policy that is biased in favour of Travellers rather than being equal to the community as a whole. I would have no objection to the Tier 1 criteria if SCDC applied it to the entire community at large.</p>

Map 1: Areas of Search for Gypsy and Traveller Site Options

23862 23897 23993 24027 - Swavesey Parish Council 24034 24228 24236 - Longstanton Parish Council 24706 24739 24741 24750 25175 25236 25672 26678 26716 26905 28699 28752 29096 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	<p>There are already a large number of sites in the north of the district. The proposed sites should be spread sites across district, particularly in the south. An overdependence of sites to north act as a 'honeypot' for further unauthorised sites. Villages with 30 existing pitches should be excluded from further allocations.</p>
---	--------	---

Map 1: Areas of Search for Gypsy and Traveller Site Options

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25553 25558 28923	Object	There are already sites in the Bassingbourn area, including at Whaddon Gap, Mettle Hill and The Hawthorns on Kneesworth Road, Meldreth. This is too many in one vicinity. It is clearly unfair that we should carry this volume of sites when there are parts of South Cambs that have no pitches.
24313	Object	The proposed Spring Lane site would be the 4th site within a 3 mile radius around Bassingbourn, residents of the 3 established sites already use the village facilities, schools, shops, health services etc - this seems to us to be overburdening one small village / rural area with a higher proportion of provision for gipsies and travellers than for other areas with greater population and wider facilities within the district / county.
24337	Object	Consideration should be given to include areas that have been excluded such as Sawston It is not acceptable to say they don't have anywhere suitable when it is quite obvious they have
25911 - Meldreth Parish Council 25931 26328	Object	The Issues and Options 1 report stated that there should be a proportional distribution of sites throughout the district. There are already a large number of sites in the north and south west of the district. Most of the new pitches are proposed in these areas which will lead to a concentration of pitches. Adding more pitches to these areas will add pressure to local services and facilities. Meanwhile there are large parts of the district that have no pitches.
23454 23467 23635 25295 29100 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	There is an uneven distribution of sites across the district. The maps are misleading as they do not show existing sites. Willingham, Cottenham and Rampton already have a large number of sites and more are proposed. Proposals to make permanent temporary and illegal sites and create new ones simply exacerbate Willingham's already intolerable situation. Why keep sites in one area, spread sites across district instead of concentrating sites in the north. We do not have any sites south of Cambridge. SCDC proposals are based on flawed logic, and run counter to government policy by discounting proportionality.
28732 28806 28864 28976 - Cottenham Parish Council	Object	Spreading the sites across more villages will reduce the resource impact on local communities. Villages around Cambourne and to the south and west of the district should be considered, including Linton, Sawston and Melbourn which have a good range of services and facilities.
6.6		
24238 - Longstanton Parish Council 24591 24626 24629 25837 - English Heritage	Object	Sites cannot be located within the Green Separation or Conservation Area as it would be contrary to adopted LDF policies. The text should make it clear that these areas are inappropriate areas.
The Green Belt		
26090 - FFT Planning	Comment	FFT and TLRP welcome the testing of existing sites in the Green Belt. However we are concerned that potential sites, otherwise suitable and deliverable but in the Green Belt may have been excluded from further consideration. In our view such sites should have been given further consideration and judged against other potential sites on their merits.
23567 23876 24485 24486 24782 24783 24786	Object	There should be no development of any kind within a Green Belt area as it would then cease to be Green Belt.
6.8		
24072 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners 24073 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners 25104 28754 28978 - Cottenham Parish Council 29097 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	Green Belt does not necessarily rule out use for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. If affordable housing is being made an exception on Green Belt land this exception should also be applied to travellers. The text should clarify that Green Belt locations will be considered in exceptional circumstances where sites meet the criteria. Land held by public bodies in the Green Belt should not be dismissed without proper assessment given the ability to deliver land with public ownership. Green Belt locations can, in some instances and given some particular circumstances, be deemed appropriate locations for Gypsy & Traveller sites.
Tier 2: Infrastructure		
23491 - Anglian Water Services Limited	Comment	Anglian Water's duties as an undertaker are set out with regards to providing water and sewerage services.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
6.10		
24789	Comment	Access to pitches must be from main roads.
24788	Comment	Specific mention should also be made to the vital provision foul water drainage and refuse collection prior to pitch occupation. We are aware of the Smithy Fen, Cottenham fiasco in January last year as reported in the Daily Telegraph 29 Sept 2009.
24636	Comment	Access Proper road access would have to be assessed individually, therefore it is not possible to decide in advance of road infrastructure implementation where within Northstowe a G&T site would be: ODPM 01/06 states 'projected vehicle movements for gypsy and traveller sites should be assessed on an individual basis for each site.' This leads back to the impossibility of approving of a policy for Northstowe that cannot be submitted to actual sustainability tests of traffic flow and safe access.
23877	Comment	This is indeed an important test and one, if the process is undertaken correctly, will clearly demonstrate that the Ida Darwin site due to its very poor access is not suitable for any future development.
24239 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	While the general thrust of the section is sound, the phrase, "Sites need to have appropriate road access" must be clarified to "Sites must be served from main roads."

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****7. SITE OPTIONS FOR CONSULTATION****7.1**

23871	Object	Longstanton has not been listed although it almost entirely falls within the 1km proximity of Northstowe. Any reader of these documents could be forgiven for thinking that Longstanton and its residents do not exist or at least that their existence is conveniently forgotten.
-------	--------	--

7.2

26208 - MCA Developments Limited	Comment	The demand for the above self-employed business activities, which are likely to be found at a new traveller's site in Cambourne, will come predominantly from Cambridge City and other nearby urban locations, which indicates that South Cambridgeshire should be considering more peripheral City sites and working in cooperation with the City Council on a jointly developed Travellers DPD. Such joint working is encouraged by the Circular, particularly where an authority has strict planning constraints in its area, as is the case with South Cambs.
28750 28974 - Cottenham Parish Council 29094 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	Distinguish any proposed allocated sites from windfall sites and indicate whether allocated sites are to be public or private and where the necessary investment might come from to properly fund the provision - this is fundamental to allocations since without it (unlike the case with market housing) such allocations are meaningless; vague assertions about using section 106 contributions are unrealistic and not sufficient to address this shortcoming.
28627 - Caldecote Parish Council	Object	There is no provision in the current plans for business use in housing areas; travellers do tend to run businesses from their sites.
27088 - Gallagher Estates	Support	Notwithstanding objections to gypsy and traveller accommodation being proposed at Northstowe, if pitches are provided they should be residential rather than mixed uses incorporating employment. The residential nature of sites specified should extend to address the type and size of vehicles permitted on or associated with the pitches. Gallagher seek confirmation that all such controls will be provided either through planning conditions or provisions in a lease agreement.
25839 - English Heritage	Support	In general terms none of the identified sites appear to adversely impact on the historic environment and we do not object to any of these allocations at this stage.

7.4

25807 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	Concern at the numbers of sites included in Issues and Options 2. Concern at the deliverability of Sites 3 to 8 in Major Developments within time scale of plan. Easily deliverable sites are likely to be brought forward first.
---	--------	---

7.5

28869	Comment	Crime and Fear of Crime: One of the objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (Scott Wilson report) is to "reduce and prevent crime, and reduce the fear of crime". I will refer you to the submission made by the Cottenham Resident's Association, and by myself, as owner of the orchard land, to the PINE VIEW PUBLIC ENQUIRY in 2004.
26022 - Natural England	Support	We generally support the scope, detail and conclusion of the sustainability appraisal and are satisfied that this has been undertaken in accordance with the regulations.

7.8

26092 - FFT Planning	Comment	We are disappointed that 8 currently occupied pitches have been rejected from further consideration. Clearly an effective way will have to be found of connecting the inhabitants of the rejected sites with new sites in a way which meets the needs of the people concerned and without eviction proceedings until alternative sites are found. Ways will need to be found of ensuring that people who want and currently enjoy owner occupation are not disadvantaged by having to move from their own land to elsewhere. Land-swaps may be a way through this difficulty.
25838 - English Heritage	Comment	Our comments have been compiled on the basis of a rapid desk-top assessment only and cannot be considered to capture all potential effects. We have not looked in detail at those sites already rejected; however we note that eight of the rejected sites are based on advice of County Council Archaeology Service and welcome the consideration already given to the impact on the historic environment. If these sites are taken forward contrary to their advice we reserve the right to comment on them in more depth at a later stage.

Table 2: Site Options for Consultation

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
<i>Table 2: Site Options for Consultation</i>		
24197	Comment	It is noted that the 20 sites identified can be only potentially delivered by 2016. It should be noted that the site put forward at Chesterton Fen Road can be delivered immediately.
26027 - East of England Regional Assembly	Comment	It would not be appropriate for the Assembly to comment specifically on the individual merits of the sites being put forward in this DPD. However, it does note the inclusion of Northstowe and Cambourne as having potential to accommodate permanent traveller pitches. These site options would be consistent with the notion of mainstreaming traveller provision alongside new housing development.
25307	Comment	I know 88 site must be identified out of 149 - it may be a good idea to rank the sites in terms of desirability / suitability.
26091 - FFT Planning	Comment	We endorse and support the options listed in Table 2 and are glad that a number of sites with temporary consents are included for consideration. This makes eminent sense but we are disappointed that 8 currently occupied pitches have been rejected from further consideration.
23846	Comment	<p>Having done a short analysis of sites proximity to other traveller sites I discovered that sites 2,6, and 14-18 fell within that category. Of those sites only 2 and 6 passed the test of being within 1000 metres of 5 or more amenities. Chesterton and Northstowe. Northstowe isn't even through planning yet. So Chesterton is the only site for the foreseeable future that meets both criteria deemed acceptable for a Gypsy and Traveller site.</p> <p>It was one of the major wishes of the travelling community that any new provision should be near existing provision.</p>
24821 - Cambridgeshire County Council 26786 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The County Council is not aware at this stage of any constraints that would prevent the allocation of the majority of these sites in the DPD subject to the requirements of policy GT2 and the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. Further assessment may be needed in the next stages of consultation and examination of the DPD, and also in the preparation of masterplans for these major development sites.
26019 - Natural England	Comment	<p>None of the proposed sites, except for Site 5 are located in close proximity to any statutorily designated conservation sites; it is therefore unlikely that any of these sites will be adversely affected by the proposals.</p> <p>Some of the Site Options lie within or close to locally designated sites of biodiversity interest and/or support protected/biodiversity species. The local Wildlife Trust should be consulted for their views and advice regarding the potential impact of development on these sites. Potential impacts on wider biodiversity will need to be fully assessed should any of these proposals progress to the project/planning application stage and suitable mitigation identified where necessary.</p>
26119 - Homes and Communities Agency	Comment	The HCA notes that in Table 2, potential delivery of the pitches at Northstowe is identified as taking place by 2016 or between 2016 and 2021. In order to secure the delivery of the Northstowe site, the HCA and partners will be revising the delivery timetable for Northstowe. Table 2 should be amended - reversed to read "2016-21 or by 2016." to reflect this. Retaining the emphasis of the policy on the early phase of delivery of Northstowe risks gypsy and traveller sites becoming established before key services and facilities have been provided. Creating a sustainable community at Northstowe is dependent on these services and facilities being phased in relation to the delivery of all housing, including gypsy and traveller provision.
25688 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	The delivery date of 2016 appears to be optimistic the option for Cambourne relies on the s106 agreement for the additional 950 dwellings which is going through protracted negotiations and a viability assessment exercise. This is delaying provision/ improvement of facilities to meet existing needs of Cambourne and those for the additional 950 dwellings. It is not viable to rely on s106 agreements on partially completed major developments. The requirements submitted in 2007/08 for S106 agreement as already tabled places significant demands on the developers, which are difficult for them to meet in the current economic climate.
24255	Object	It is unrealistic to expect that site 6 (Northstowe) will be available before 2016. Even if houses are built before 2016 the associated amenities (schools, shops etc) will not be ready by then.

Table 2: Site Options for Consultation

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26204 - MCA Developments Limited	Object	<p>MCA wishes to raise objection to the identification of Cambourne (Site 7) in the Gypsy and Traveller DPD as a site for consideration for the provision of 10 Gypsy and traveller pitches.</p> <p>The objection is based primarily on the principle of prematurity and the council's imposition of a land acquisition policy before it has been tested for sustainability against other alternative sites which may emerge as part of the consultation process. The policy is therefore inappropriate until such time as it has been fully tested under examination conditions and found to be sound by an appointed Planning Inspector.</p>
24240 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	Provision of any sites within Northstowe must be timed to follow rather than lead provision of all required infrastructure. The dates must therefore not include "by 2016".
24547 - Girton Parish Council	Object	No justification is given for the unit of 10 pitches which appears to be used throughout the exercise. This is inappropriate both for Gypsies (who we gather from discussion with representatives would prefer smaller units) and for Travellers (who we gather from discussion would prefer larger units). It is therefore an arbitrary and discriminatory choice. Girton Parish Council is aggrieved that such inappropriately-sized units might be placed in our vicinity.
23903	Object	It would be very useful to have a map of these proposed sites. It seems more than coincidental that they are so disproportionately located to the North of Cambridge rather than having a more uniform spatial distribution.
24487	Object	Chesterton Fen Road Milton already has a substantial site and no further pitches should be added. All other sites should be investigated first.
28913	Object	<p>I object to all proposed site</p> <p>I reject all of the nominated sites chosen by the council. I believe they have been located in obscure places to ensure that they do not get passed. There is NO provision for Irish Travellers in any of the plans and historically it has been seen that mixed sites have caused lots of problems in Cambridge.</p>
27355 27358 27361 27365 27367 28993 28996	Object	I am also concerned that no other Irish Traveller sites in the whole district have been considered and so this would mean I would have to be located on a Gypsy site. I am not comfortable with this process and historically this has caused huge problems for council run sites.
27094 - Gallagher Estates	Object	<p>1. To acknowledge the importance of sites capable of being delivered at the earliest opportunity a further category in the 'Potential Delivery' column called 'By 2011' or alternatively 'Immediate' should be used.</p> <p>2. The indication of the 'Potential Delivery' of gypsy and travellers sites at Northstowe should therefore be amended and reversed to read '2016-21 or by 2016'.</p> <p>3. Gypsy and travellers sites may be identified within a reasonable distance of facilities. This fact should be properly reflected in the description of proposed sites/ locations. The word 'Northstowe' should be replaced with the phrase 'Northstowe and surrounding area'.</p>
23900	Object	<p>Northstowe should not be considered until it actually exists. Given it the "address" of Northstowe is misleading. No such address exists.</p> <p>Once it actually exists, it may well prove a suitable site. But there is not yet even an approved Master Plan, meaning it is only now aspirational.</p> <p>One cannot help read "Northstowe" as meaning "Longstanton" since the bulk of AAP boundary is Longstanton land. We have a 500-home development, an immigration removal centre, and Northstowe on the plans. We've done our part; it's time to let others do their fair share.</p>
28867	Object	To achieve good community relations need careful consideration of size and spacing of sites and location sites. What is wanted presumably by everyone is that there be good relationships between travellers and settled community and you will not get that with the present site proposals, or at least with most of them.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
<i>Sites 1 and 2 - Chesterton Fen Road, Milton</i>		
23990 - Old Chesterton Residents Association	Comment	<p>There has been a consistent pattern of unauthorised development which has later been approved retrospectively, occasionally with limiting conditions to protect the flood plain.</p> <p>The Association is not objecting to this proposal as we recognise the problems of trying to reverse history and also the fact that those who live on the sites are settled with their families using local services and their children attending local schools.</p> <p>We recommend: that there be no further expansion of traveller sites on Chesterton Fen until its serious deficiencies as a long-term residential location have been fully addressed.</p>
24815 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	<p>Impact on local schools</p> <p>In the case of the proposed sites in the Chesterton Fen area which currently have the benefit of temporary planning permission, the County Council would have significant concerns about any sites being located within this area in addition to those which are currently identified in the DPD. This is as a result of the local catchment primary school (Shirley Primary School) currently being at capacity in some year groups, and the further pressures being experienced across Cambridge City generally as a result of rising birth rates.</p>
26785 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	<p>Flooding</p> <p>A number of these sites are subject to river flooding and/or include areas susceptible to surface water flooding based upon the latest information produced by the Environment Agency. It is suggested that South Cambridgeshire District Council obtain further advice from the Agency about how these issues could be addressed if these sites are to be brought forward.</p>
28943 - Old Chesterton Residents Association	Comment	<p>Another issue is that of security and policing. We are also aware that there appear to be some gangmasters who have switched operations from agriculture to building and landscaping trades which appear not to fall within the ambit of the recent controls on gangmaster activity. We understand that work is going forward to address these issues and this will be welcomed by both residents of East Chesterton and many residents of Chesterton Fen.</p>
28939 - Old Chesterton Residents Association	Comment	<p>Flood Plain</p> <p>Further tipping and building up of nearby sites indicated an intention to add further unauthorised sites to the Fen but this activity appears to have ceased for the moment and a quantity of unauthorised tipped waste has been removed. We are concerned that previous tipping has limited the capacity of Chesterton Fen as part of the active flood plain of the River Cam and there should be no further encroachment on this capacity given that we appear to be entering a distinctly wetter climatic period.</p> <p>We recommend: that there should be no further expansion of waste treatment facilities or deposition of waste on Chesterton Fen.</p>
25427 26927 26954 26961 26964 26966 27000 27010 27122 27129 27136 27143 27177 27189 27201 27213 27225 27237 27249 27261 27273 27308 27320 27332 28682 28761 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	<p>Retrospective planning permissions</p> <p>Giving retrospective planning permission makes a mockery of planning regulation that the rest of the UK population are bound by and encourages further flouting of planning law in the future.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24974 25324 25350 25378 25381 25390 25392 25395 25620 26148 26158 26168 26617 26958 27182 27194 27206 27218 27230 27242 27254 27266 27278 27313 27325 27337 28767 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	Easy option - Whilst site 1 and 2 may be the quickest option for the Council to deliver, the sites do not comply with guidelines on design and layout and have serious deficiencies as a long-term residential location. This plan flouts the recommendations in their own Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report of June 2009
28873	Object	Site location From the travellers' point of view the large railway lines complex right next to it seems to go against the recommendations for permanent sites - not next to railway lines.
27156	Object	Impact on local schools, services, police etc I understand that even the police are unwilling to enter these sites to 'police' them.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23579 24948 24972 25328 25356 25360 25371 25388 25396 25400 25403 25413 25421 25425 25615 25619 25621 25627 25747 25784 25789 26146 26156 26165 26616 26825 26925 26956 27011 27118 27125 27132 27139 27179 27191 27203 27215 27227 27239 27251 27263 27275 27310 27322 27334 28687 28688 28762 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 28872	Object	Green Belt - The site is in the Green Belt. Would need to be exceptional circumstances to justify the allocation of a site for Gypsy and Travellers. Enough land has been taken out of Green Belt for housing.
25415 25420	Object	House prices will be affected by the proposals.
24932 26967 28604 28606	Object	Impact of noise from the site -suggestion that businesses are run from there and the traffic generated by the site creates noise and pollution.
27001	Object	Impact on environment There are environmental concerns over the existing site, flooding, sewerage, green belt ingress to name but three issues. Infrastructure issues such as road access, flood plain , increased traffic flows , do not conform with SCDC 's own Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report of 2009.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24949 24971 25323 25327 25334 25351 25357 25364 25370 25375 25385 25393 25404 25414 25416 25426 25617 25624 25748 25783 25788 26145 26154 26164 26615 26821 26924 26955 26965 27009 27123 27130 27137 27144 27158 27178 27190 27202 27214 27226 27238 27250 27262 27274 27309 27321 27333 28686 28764 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	Flood plain - Site 1 and 2 are on the river flood plain in Flood zones 2 and 3 which was partly flooded earlier this year (2009) It is unknown whether a flood risk assessment has been carried out. Concreting over would result in loss of flood plain and risk to Ditton Meadows and houses near the river The meadows are subject to flooding now and will be so increasingly in future due to climate change risk.
24975	Object	There is inadequate information for an informed appraisal

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24875 24876 24877 24935 24950 25128 25340 25372 25380 25391 25397 25412 25417 25745 26211 26827 26830 - Milton Parish Council 26968 27120 27127 27134 27141 27183 27195 27207 27219 27231 27243 27255 27267 27279 27314 27326 27338 28647 28690 28766 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 28941 - Old Chesterton Residents Association	Object	<p>Fen Road is a minor residential road ending in a dead end, totally inadequate to deal with the current traffic, let alone expanded traffic generated from further developments. Cars speed along this road. The sites do not have good access to Cambridge.</p> <p>There is only one access road to these large sites and this road crosses the railway line. Apparently a station is planned for Chesterton Sidings and there is the possibility of increased use of the sidings by the rail company. With this in mind there being only one access road to the site could pose a serious problem if for any reason the level crossing had to be closed. Where is the alternative route for any emergency vehicles to this populous site?</p>
24934 25130 28940 - Old Chesterton Residents Association 29148	Object	<p>Access - Road access to the area is severely limited. The only present access is over the railway crossing on Fen Road and this is unsatisfactory and potentially dangerous. It produces a large volume of traffic.</p> <p>There is a need for an alternative exit from the Fen area. A link road from Chesterton Fen direct to Milton Road via Cowley Road is included in County 's TIF bid. Proposed as a busway only but should be for all local traffic.</p> <p>Members of the traveller community have suggested a road link that runs alongside the A14 rather than from Cowley Road which could be incorporated into the proposed A14 improvements.</p> <p>Suggestion that a link road from the Fen to Milton Road alongside the A14 should be included in this DPD as a priority issue. This would free up Fen Road for purely local residents and move for safer thoroughfare.</p>
26960	Object	<p>Integration of travellers</p> <p>What is the definition of a traveller? What evidence is there that the residents of Sandy Park or indeed sites 1 and 2 travel?</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23601 25330 25359 25361 25365 25376 25386 25628 26147 26157 26166 26826 27180 27192 27204 27216 27228 27240 27252 27264 27276 27311 27323 27335 28763 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 28944 - Old Chesterton Residents Association	Object	Concerns about the proximity of the development to the River Cam, which is important to the setting of Cambridge. This is a green link between the east side of the city and the open countryside. This is emphasised in the Cambridge Horizons Green Infrastructure Strategy. Fen Ditton and its meadows are a designated Conservation area. and there is a responsibility to preserve this for our future generations. Concern about the impact of the development on the river and its associated wildlife.
28826	Object	Experience of not being able to get a taxi to other side of level crossings.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23987 24450 24883 24887 24896 24899 24933 24947 24970 25321 25326 25331 25352 25355 25358 25362 25363 25366 - Fen Ditton Village Society 25368 25369 25373 25382 25384 25394 25398 25402 25410 25418 25424 25614 25616 25623 25746 25779 25781 25786 26141 26151 26161 26745 26822 26832 - Milton Parish Council 26943 26953 26959 26962 26999 27012 27013 27174 27186 27198 27210 27222 27234 27246 27258 27270 27305 27317 27329 28605 28648 28683 28685 28758 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 28870	Object	<p>This site is considered to be too large already and it is unclear why Chesterton Fen is being considered in this consultation as two sites when they are adjoining each other.</p> <p>It far exceeds Government guidelines on design, which suggest 15 pitches per site since the new proposed sites will be adjoining to the 151 existing authorised pitches. Sites should not dominate their nearest settled community which this does with Fen Ditton.</p> <p>Smaller sites have been shown to be more successful and are preferred by Travellers themselves. Larger sites inhibit integration with the local settled community.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25322 25325 25332 25379 25389 25399 25411 25419 25626 25782 25787 26143 26152 26162 26614 26824 26831 - Milton Parish Council 26923 26963 27176 27188 27200 27212 27224 27236 27248 27260 27272 27307 27319 27331 28759 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	Impact on local schools - The size of the site at Chesterton Fen puts pressure on local schools with the special educational needs of the Travellers' children.
27157	Object	Site location The fact they are in the green belt is a cop out by the Council who should find 'brown' sites where they may live comfortably but without hindrance to other residents.
24973 25129 25337 25377 25387 25625 26926 27119 27126 27133 27140 27181 27193 27205 27217 27229 27241 27253 27265 27277 27312 27324 27336 28765 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 28942 - Old Chesterton Residents Association 29145 29146 29147	Object	Impact on environment There are serious health and environmental concerns about the current management of sewage on these sites, specifically relating to adequate cesspool capacity and regular emptying and disposal of waste. There has been some infill of drainage channels with sewage contamination of nearby ditches, opposite the gardens of the Plough public house, which is of environmental concern and associated foul smell could affect business at the Plough. Priority now needs to be given to installing a mains sewerage system Pollution was identified in ditches in 2006 yet remains unresolved. Question the authority of the Council and the law with respect to privately run sites. Sewage pollution creates a threat to all wildlife Sites do not fulfil the recommendations in the Council's own Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report of June 2009 - should be rejected.
28684 28689	Object	Integration between the settled and Traveller communities.- Negative perception of this area because it is in isolated location. Does not encourage integration. Not just Travellers living in this area now. It is too large for integration.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26828	Object	Impact on environment If the sites remain and are increased in size, what is the evidence that additional residents and traffic CAN be accommodated with a proper infrastructure; this includes sewage and waste, cesspool capacity etc. Therefore, there are serious questions about viability as a long-term residential location. This goes against the Initial Sustainability Report of June 2009.
24898 - Milton Parish Council 25329 25367 - Fen Ditton Village Society 25374 25383 25629 26613 26823 26957 27175 27187 27199 27211 27223 27235 27247 27259 27271 27306 27318 27330 28646 28760 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 28871	Object	Impact on Fen Ditton and Chesterton - The large scale of the Traveller's site at Chesterton Fen will have an impact on the nearby communities in Fen Ditton and Chesterton. Government design guidelines recommend that sites should respect the scale of and not dominate the nearest settled community. The site is directly opposite Fen Ditton, a settlement of some 331 dwellings. The proposed 196 pitches for Travellers, each pitch housing up to 4 caravans is well in excess of the 331 dwellings. Adjacent communities have had to put up with problems associated with being close to the Travellers sites at Chesterton Fen.
25618	Object	Why should Travellers need a permanent STATIC site.
28977 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Support Chesterton since in reality it relates to Cambridge City.
24718	Support	No reason to object.
25926	Support	Play area Whilst supporting that the site is to be allocated as a site for travellers there is concern at having a play area when none of the other plots have one.
28753	Support	Support Chesterton since in reality it relates to Cambridge City.
24882 - Highways Agency	Support	The Highways Agency has no objection, as the site will not have an adverse impact on the A14.
25012 25147 25804 25924 25928 27383 27384 27385 27386 27387 27388 27390 27392 27393	Support	Support from families who are currently living on Chesterton Fen and like living there. Are there with their families and are integrated into the local community since their children attend local schools and they are registered with the local GP and shop in the local area.
25925 27389 27391	Support	Support for the sites from people who are happily living there and wish to remain. The families have improved their pitches which are not within the flood plain and are not visible to the surrounding area.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
<i>Site 1 - Sandy Park, Chesterton Fen Road, Cambridge</i>		
24201	Comment	This potential site has the benefit of temporary permission & is considered an appropriate site for allocation, due to its sustainable location. Green Belt & potential flood risk issues are outweighed by the opportunity to contribute towards meeting identified need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches. The adjacent site at Chesterton Fen Road should also be considered as appropriate for the same reasons.
25876 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle, FRA will be required and surface and foul water drainage agreed.
24488 26742 26804 - Milton Parish Council 26942	Object	Size of site - This site is considered to be too large already. Any further pitches will reduce the quality of living for those people that live at the site and for the surrounding communities. It far exceeds Government guidelines on design, which suggest 15 pitches per site since the new proposed sites will be adjoining to the 151 existing authorised pitches.
26597 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Impact on environment The City Council has concerns regarding the proposal in the absence of further detailed assessment of the site's noise issues. Suitable mitigation measures would need to be in place to address noise from the railway line and nearby businesses, and land contamination issues at the site. Any noise mitigation measures would need to take into account that caravans or mobile homes have worse sound insulation properties than bricks and mortar housing and residents will suffer more from noise.
25148	Object	I live on a plot on Sandy Park, Fen Rd and support that this should be made a permanent site for travellers. However I don't want a play area on the site - it would harbour all the children from Fen Lane site, as the kids on here play on their own plots.
28947 29150	Object	Impact on local services - The local amenities are sparse. Although close to the centre of Cambridge, it takes 20-minute walk to access any of the local amenities. The Chesterton Fen site is isolated.
24884 - Milton Parish Council 26944	Object	Impact on Fen Ditton / Chesterton - 196 pitches in total would exceed the Fen Ditton total settlement (which it adjoins by virtue of being directly opposite Green End, Fen Ditton, separated by the stretch of river), which is 331 in the 2001 Census. Government recommendation are that sites should respect the scale of, and not dominate, the nearest settled community.
26947	Object	Impact on river and open countryside/ green finger from City There are environmental concerns about the impact on the river; it's meadows and its wildlife, all of which will be affected.
27111 28949	Object	Site location - Is this the right location? There is no requirement for gypsies and travellers to live this close to Cambridge and many of the other proposed sites are more suitable and will provide a better overall quality of life. With the proposals for the Chesterton Railway Station going ahead and the guided bus about to come into action - is this the right time start strategically allocating land to permanent dwellings in this location?
26949	Object	Impact on environment The Council acknowledges that there are problems with infrastructure - this includes sewage and waste, cess pool capacity etc. Therefore, there are serious questions about viability as a long-term residential location. This goes against the Initial Sustainability Report of June 2009.
24709 26596 - Cambridge City Council 26741 26941	Object	Flood plain - Site 1 and 2 are on the river flood plain in Flood Zone 2 and 3. If the flood plain is built on there could be problems associated with this. Given the highly vulnerable status of caravans, mobile homes and trailer park homes, and the potential for sewage overflow if the drainage systems become flooded, further confirmation is needed from the Environment Agency that this site is acceptable for permanent residence.
26946 27113 28946	Object	Green Belt - The site is in the Green Belt. Would need to be exceptional circumstances to justify the allocation of a site for Gypsy and Travellers.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23957 - Cambridge City Council 26802 - Milton Parish Council 26948 27110 28948	Object	<p>Access - Concerns about access to the site being along Fen Road which is a minor residential road ending in a dead end - totally inadequate to deal with the current high volume of traffic which speeds along it.</p> <p>There is particular concern about the nearby railway crossing on Fen Road and the safety of those using the crossing, including residents of the nearby sites, particularly children attending local schools. In the light of the restricted road infrastructure, further transport assessment work should be undertaken to confirm the acceptability of the proposed permanent site's access arrangements including the nearby level crossing, footways to the site and the impact upon the residential roads in Cambridge, which provide access to the site.</p>
24895	Object	<p>Integration of travellers</p> <p>My objections to the proposal to extend this site are as follows; I emphasise that my comments are in the context of supporting equality of access to services etc for gypsy & traveller communities and other communities alike, supporting proper integration for all communities and wanting to eliminate discrimination.</p> <p>In the light that plans go against elements of the council's own statements and against Government guidelines, I believe the proposals are likely to impact adversely on inclusion.</p> <p>Retrospective planning permission is potentially inflammatory for other local residents; it will encourage flouting of planning law in future and, worst, cannot be justified in terms of equality of treatment.</p>
24648	Object	<p>Retrospective planning permissions</p> <p>I understand the case made for creating permanent travellers' sites at Chesterton Fen Road. However, I object to making the temporary sites permanent. Changing the status of Fen Road's temporary sites to permanent sites might be a 'quick win'/checkbox exercise' for the council however the sites in Fen Road have the biggest legal objection of all the proposed sites.</p>
26803 - Milton Parish Council 26945 27112	Object	<p>Impact on local schools - The size of the site at Chesterton Fen puts pressure on local schools with the special educational needs of the Travellers' children.</p> <p>The local schools are nearly full. Chesterton Community College has turned down a large number of children this year and Manor Community College is nearly full. Shirley School does not have capacity to cope with additional children.</p>
24719 25657 - Jesus College (Cambridge)	Support	Support proposed site
24021 - Irish Traveller Movement in Britain	Support	Irish Traveller Movement in Britain supports this site. We would like to see reference to the issues of having separate Irish Traveller and English Gypsy sites and the use of the term Irish Traveller throughout.
25196	Support	<p>I live on a plot on Sandy Park and support that this area should be made into a permanent site for travellers and that it should be used for as many pitches as possible.</p> <p>The site is a good family site close to friends and family as well as shops, doctors and schools. It has a good atmosphere.</p>
24697	Support	Close to existing communities for support, facilities and support requirements growing would benefit existing site users too.
<i>Site 2 - Plots 1, 3 & 5 Sandy Park, Chesterton Fen Road, Cambridge</i>		
25877 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle, FRA will be required and surface and foul water drainage agreed.
26594	Comment	I think its unfair that this is supposed to be about travellers needs when only the travellers who live at Sandy Park know what their individual needs are.
24888 - Milton Parish Council	Comment	Impact on Chesterton
23827	Object	<p>Milton Parish Council is concerned because the number of traveller sites at Chesterton Fen has a big impact on Chesterton.</p> <p>I bought my plot several years ago for a home for me and my mother to be close to my only existing family who live at Sunningdale Park. Since then I have been travelling to get my living, to help pay for a concrete stand ,and a mobile home ,I have put hardcore down to level it ,I have also had a fence put round it, I have had to pay for water& electric to be on there, so you can imagine my shock when i heard about the proposal, there are only 28 proposed when there are more than this number of pitches here. I am now worrying about losing my home.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24651	Object	Retrospective planning permissions I understand the case made for creating permanent travellers' sites at Chesterton Fen Road. However, I object to making the temporary sites permanent. Changing the status of Fen Road's temporary sites to permanent sites might be a 'quick win'/checkbox exercise' for the council however the sites in Fen Road have the biggest legal objection of all the proposed sites.
24489 26744 26807 - Milton Parish Council	Object	Size of site - There is already an excess number of pitches on this site and it is already unsustainable. Any further pitches will reduce the quality of living for those people that live at the site and for the surrounding communities.
24897	Object	Integration of traveller community My objections to the proposal to give permanent planning permission and to extend this site are as follows- I emphasise that my comments are in the context of supporting equality of access to services etc for gypsy & traveller communities and other communities alike, supporting proper integration for all communities and wanting to eliminate discrimination. In the light that plans go against elements of the council's own statements and against Government guidelines, I believe the proposals are likely to impact adversely on inclusion; Retrospective planning permission is potentially inflammatory for other local residents; it will encourage flouting of planning law in future and, worst, cannot be justified in terms of equality of treatment.
26599 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Impact on environment The City Council has concerns regarding the proposal in the absence of further detailed assessment of the site's noise issues. Suitable mitigation measures would need to be in place to address noise from the railway line and nearby businesses, and land contamination issues at the site. Any noise mitigation measures would need to take into account that caravans or mobile homes have worse sound insulation properties than bricks and mortar housing and residents will suffer more from noise.
23958 - Cambridge City Council 26805 - Milton Parish Council 28954 28983	Object	Access - concerns about access to the site being along Fen Road a minor residential road ending in a dead end totally inadequate to deal with the current high volume of traffic that speeds along it. There is particular concern about the nearby railway crossing on Fen Road and the safety of those using the crossing, including residents of the nearby sites, particularly children attending local schools. In the light of the restricted road infrastructure, further transport assessment work should be undertaken to confirm the acceptability of the proposed permanent site's access arrangements including the nearby level crossing, footways to the site and the impact upon the residential roads in Cambridge, which provide access to the site.
28952 28985	Object	Green belt - The site is in the Green Belt. Would need to be exceptional circumstances to justify the allocation of a site for Gypsy and Travellers.
28955	Object	Future Developments With the proposals for the Chesterton Railway Station going ahead and the guided bus about to come into action - is this the right time start strategically allocating land to permanent dwellings? The area is expected to change massively in the next 5 years and I would want to see how the infrastructure develops before deciding if this is the right site.
24711 26598 - Cambridge City Council 26743	Object	Flood plain - Site 2 is on the river flood plain in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and development would result in the loss of this flood plain and the problems associated with this. Given the highly vulnerable status of caravans, mobile homes and trailer park homes, and the potential for sewage overflow if the drainage systems become flooded, further confirmation is needed from the Environment Agency that this site is acceptable for permanent residence.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26806 - Milton Parish Council 28953 28984	Object	Impact on local schools, services, police etc - Although close to the centre of Cambridge, it takes 20-minute walk to access any of the local amenities. The proposed permanent sites are even more isolated and cut off from shops, schools and services. Schools are at full capacity - eg Shirley Infant School. Lack of local amenities. Will lead to poor quality of life for travellers and neighbours.
26593	Object	Also about the children's play area, most gypsies do not let their young children out of their sight, only the older kids i.e. teenagers, would be allowed to play there and as neither, Sunningdale, Newfields or Grange Park have a play area, we would be inundated with teenagers. So no one would be happy with a play area next to them especially, as the plots are so narrow ,ball games would be dangerous.
24885 - Highways Agency	Support	The Highways Agency has no objection to the site as the likely impact on the A14 will be negligible.
24698 - Cambridgeshire County Council 25654 - Jesus College (Cambridge)	Support	Support for the site.

Site 3 - Cambridge East

25878 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle provided that any subsequent strategic drainage infrastructure is designed and constructed to accommodate additional discharges from the proposal. Consult IDB and Council Engineer.
24816 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Flooding A number of these sites are subject to river flooding and/or include areas susceptible to surface water flooding based upon the latest information produced by the Environment Agency (July 2009). It is recommended that South Cambridgeshire District Council obtain further advice from the Agency about how these issues could be addressed if these sites are to be brought forward.
26883	Comment	Access The traffic is already atrocious in this area and the added pressure on the roads of another new community will not work.
24798	Comment	I have major concerns because it is not clear how or where such sites would be located and integrated into any future development in this area. What will happen(?): 1)if Marshalls remains in place and there is no significant housing development and 2)if there is a boundary review and the areas identified for sites move into Cambridge city.
23989 24953 25214 25317 25401 25785 26150 26160 26171 27124 27131 27138 27145 27185 27196 27209 27221 27233 27245 27256 27269 27281 27316 27328 27340	Object	It is not possible to respond to proposals for Site 3 as South Cambs District Council were unable to provide adequate information for an informed appraisal at this point in time. What is proposed for the Cambridge East development? When adequate information is available for comment please send it to me for comment. Site 3 should be dropped from this particular Issues and Options 2 Report.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23959 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The City Council supports the principle of Gypsy and Traveller accommodation at Cambridge East. However, given the limited land availability within Cambridge, it may not be possible for the City Council to find suitable locations to meet the provision for Gypsy and Travellers required by the East of England Plan. Given this, and the scale of development at Cambridge East, the City Council considers it appropriate to split the provision (20 pitches) between the City Council and SCDC. It will then be for the masterplanning and pre-application discussions to determine the best locations for such provision in each district.
28874	Object	I think a much smaller site would possibly be appropriate - maximum of 8 pitches. If the Cambridge East site (3) goes ahead, Fen Ditton will find itself between three large travellers sites.
23964 - Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited	Object	Cambridge East is to be a high quality, vibrant and distinctive high density new urban quarter for Cambridge. The provision of two sites for gypsies and travellers to provide 20 pitches for up to 60 caravans is incompatible with this requirement. Gypsy and traveller sites cannot be accommodated in a high density urban extension. The investment and physical consequences are unacceptable.
28770 - Fen Ditton Parish Council	Object	It is not possible to respond to proposals for site three as SCDC has not provided adequate information for informed appraisal and it is difficult to see how this can be done at the present time. However, it is evident that sites of 10 pitches soon seem to become sites of 30 pitches, which is wholly unacceptable and against Government guidelines.
24004 25014 26768	Object	I do not think the location of an authorised site will be suitable already close to a major new development of houses, which are already trying to forge a new community. Travellers and gypsy are generally known for their expertise in construction or the fairground industry both using large vehicles, most gypsy and traveller sites never are big enough to accommodate this. How can site 3 propose two new sites of ten pitches each on the Cambridge East development. What is wrong with Chesterton? To what extent have the travelling community been consulted about the suitability of the sites suggested - since the sites appear to follow a fairly standard formulaic and numerical logic being linked to new development rather than any expressed demographic need.
28971 - Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited	Object	Investment in housing, for sale and to rent, will be threatened. Gypsies and travellers will not want to live there. The prospects for successfully delivering Cambridge East will be fundamentally damaged.
24491	Support	Good site for new pitches. Area is ripe for development and travellers sites can be developed in conjunction with other housing to provide better integration. Removed from green belt and can therefore be developed. New infrastructure will be created in line with the many dwellings planned here. Good access to services and closer to amenities than site 1 and 2.
23592	Support	I support this in line with traveller provision on major site development. However I do have a concern that the proposal of 20 plots is too low given that there is potentially a provision of 10-12,000 dwellings. I think that this could be increased to at least 40 plots.
24717	Support	No reason to object.
23441	Support	The site is close enough away from social housing to serve an adequate site or travellers and their extended families.
28839	Support	I note from your consultation documents that sites 3 & 6 are also under consideration. Surely it would be sensible to put the additional plots that you require there so that the general public can buy into those locations should they want to. At Cambourne you are not giving us this choice, which is neither fair nor reasonable.

Site 4 - North West Cambridge - Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

28875	Comment	Good principle to put new pitches within development areas, excellent idea. However the next one (5) is too close. One site with 15 pitches would be better than these two, though at a pinch I would say the two if genuinely no more than 10 pitches might be alright provided it did not become larger and larger.. As it is presented on the map, it lacks proper approach tracks, or roads. That apart it seems that it might provide a good site
28737	Object	Unacceptable location Gypsies / travellers would conduct businesses including scrap metal which is unacceptable for a residential area.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26714 - Girton Parish Council 28736 29087 - Girton Parish Council	Object	The Parish Council is persuaded that entirely insufficient care has been exercised in respect of the assessment of sites 4 and 5. The report by the contractors shows a deplorable lack of sound information on which to base safe, proper and acceptable judgements. In particular, the report contains no adequate reference to proper environmental impact assessment of either the former NIAB land or the University farm. The failure properly to identify any residual hazards following the experimental use of these lands is almost certain to be culpably reckless. It certainly suggests wilful negligence to anyone who has experience of environmental auditing, as the presence of any harmful biological (including trans-genetic), chemical or radioactive materials used in the research programmes will constitute a hazard to any person inhabiting the site. That may be particularly the case for families with children. This is land, which has been used for experimentation, including the growing of GM crops. There is therefore a presumption that the land will be heavily contaminated with chemicals, GM waste and possibly radio-isotopes. In the absence of a fully comprehensive site soil analysis and risk assessment, Girton Parish Council regards granting permission for its use by a vulnerable mobile population as a failure of duty of care. Such a site would result in a blight on the housing proposed development for NIAB and NIAB extra and would be too close to NIAB trial grounds on which important GM and other trials are conducted.
28553	Object	Cost of site Would be expensive to the taxpayer in terms of sustainability.
28842	Object	Although the sites indicated are not close to the village, nevertheless their presence may cause problems if past experience is anything to go by. We do not have any argument with well regulated sites provided there is enough space for their caravans and all family vehicles. We presume you have a Liaison Officer who can be contacted should the need arise.
25714	Object	Agricultural land Site 4 is land which has hitherto been designated Green Belt . It is good quality agricultural land, cultivated for many years by NIAB. Once highly cultivated land has been adopted by travellers it can never be returned to its agricultural state.
28734	Object	Impact of adjoining A14 Too close to existing properties lying within the Cambridge boundary but which would result in a second site being built within site and adjacent to the A 14 a major strategic artery within UK.
24548 - Girton Parish Council 24550 - Girton Parish Council 25715 25717	Object	There is no justification for the number of pitches (10) being proposed. There are no demographics offered to suggest an appropriate size of school and the likelihood of it being provided. Girton Glebe school is already not able to accommodate the number of children in the village. There is no nearby secondary school. The site cannot be regarded as deliverable. Site 4 has no electricity, no water and only rudimentary natural drainage (already modified by adjacent A14). There is no assessment of the appropriateness of what will be a suburban area as suitable to the needs of travelling people.
24817 - Cambridgeshire County Council 25879 - Environment Agency 26601 - Cambridge City Council	Object	A number of these sites are subject to river flooding and/or include areas susceptible to surface water flooding based upon the latest information produced by the Environment Agency (July 2009). The City Council questions the suitability of the Gypsy and Traveller provision in relation to flooding, as South Cambridgeshire District Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies the drainage ditch on the north-west boundary of the site as subject to flooding a small way into the site. A more detailed assessment of these issues should therefore be undertaken prior to taking this document forward. It is recommended that South Cambridgeshire District Council obtain further advice from the Agency about how these issues could be addressed if these sites are to be brought forward. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle provided that any subsequent strategic drainage infrastructure is designed and constructed to accommodate additional discharges from the proposal. Consult the Council Engineer.
25716	Object	Premature Sites such as site 4 should not be developed until full development of Northstowe is completed. In this development provision can be included for the region's quota of traveller sites.

Site 4 - North West Cambridge - Land Between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24005	Object	Site location I do not think the location of an authorised site will be suitable already close to a major new development of houses, which are already trying to forge a new community. Travellers and gypsy are generally known for their expertise in construction or the fairground industry both using large vehicles, most gypsy and traveller sites never are big enough to accommodate this.
23960 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Impact of adjoining A14 No objection in principle to the provision of GT site. However, the City Council is concerned that a suitable living environment could not be provided in relation to air quality and noise, if the site is located on the edge of the development close to A14. Mobile homes have worse sound insulation and residents will suffer more from noise. The proposed A14 widening work may give rise to increased traffic with further negative impacts. We recognise that the best location for the site should be determined through Masterplanning. The siting of the proposed GT site away from the A14 is key.
28815 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Whilst there is acceptance in principle that there is a need to provide further Gypsy & Traveller sites during the plan period based on the RSS, this objection comprises three specific elements. One of which is site specific matters relating to Site 4, land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, Cambridge
25718 26600 - Cambridge City Council 26884 28551	Object	The City Council is concerned about the transport implications arising from such provision, particularly in combination with the other developments proposed in this area of the City. The traffic is already atrocious in this area and the added pressure on the roads of another new community will not work and it would add to traffic congestion. Access to the site can only be achieved by developing a residential road (either Thornton Way or Close).
28735	Object	House prices Properties in the immediate area would be de valued in my opinion.
24597 28552	Object	There are too many pressures on this area. As SCDC Councillor for Girton I note the deep unease expressed by many villagers who feel yet another pressure on our resources at a time when we feel beset on all sides with major new developments. Our own rural way of life is threatened; our school is not able to support our own children as it is. Our population of vulnerable groups (the elderly, foreign students) already exert significant strain on services in the village, and I hear many voices saying that enough is enough. This does not constitute a planning objection per se but it is vox populi. It would make it very difficult for the village of Girton to absorb an even greater number of people (as two major developments are already planned), in particular, in the domain of health care. The 2 local surgeries are full (Residents have to register with other surgeries located outside the area.) It would have a negative impact on the natural landscape and wildlife.
23838 24033 26180 - Windsor Road Residents 26184 - Windsor Road Residents 28844	Object	The pitches have to go somewhere, and our concern is that there should not be a disproportionate impact on the village of Girton and Castle Ward and adjacent parts of Cambridge. These comments apply both to Travellers Pitches in the City and in South Cambs. New developments in the area (Orchard Park, NIAB, NIAB extra and the University NW Site) are already having, and will in the near future have, major impact on the environment and community culture of Girton and Castle Ward. We are in danger of losing our village identity. We have suffered traffic noise from the A14 for nearly 30 years and this will intensify with the new proposals to widen the carriageways. The consequences of further developments for the existing community, which is a very effective model of good practice, must be taken very seriously. When Northstowe is eventually built, traffic will seek the shortest route into Cambridge which is most likely to be through Girton. Any extra impact of Travellers pitches should be kept to an absolute minimum. We would reluctantly be prepared to accept a maximum of 10 pitches on either NIAB Extra or the University Farm site, assuming that there are no new Travellers' Pitches in Castle Ward within the City of Cambridge. The University Site would be preferable. The NIAB site within the City Boundary is totally unacceptable for any new pitches.
24720	Support	No reason to object.
23591 24492	Support	Support this on the basis that significant new site development should make provision for travellers. Dwellings are already planned in this area and so can be developed alongside this. The area is already identified for development. Further local amenities and infrastructure including roads will be developed in line with the new housing stock. Good plan for development.

Site 5 - North West Cambridge - Land Between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road (University Site)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
<i>Site 5 - North West Cambridge - Land Between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road (University Site)</i>		
28877	Comment	Impact on environment I would ask for some kind of enhanced protection of Green Belt land, which must be conserved at all costs. The size of the site seems reasonable
24818 - Cambridgeshire County Council 25880 - Environment Agency	Comment	A number of these sites are subject to river flooding and/or include areas susceptible to surface water flooding based upon the latest information produced by the Environment Agency (July 2009). It is recommended that South Cambridgeshire District Council obtain further advice from the Agency about how these issues could be addressed if these sites are to be brought forward. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle provided that any subsequent strategic drainage infrastructure is designed and constructed to accommodate additional discharges from the proposal. Consult the Council Engineer.
26021 - Natural England 26023 - Natural England	Comment	Natural England generally support the scope, detail and conclusion of the sustainability appraisal and are satisfied that this has been undertaken in accordance with the regulations. Although development at Site 5, Edge of Cambridge / Girton, is unlikely to have an adverse effect on the nationally important geological interest features of the Traveller's Rest Pit SSSI, the report should recognise the need for this to be properly assessed at the development stage. Just because this site is designated for its geological rather than its biodiversity interest does not mean that the designated conservation interest features of this site are not sensitive to development.
23839	Object	The large development already planned for this site will have a major impact on the environment and community culture of Girton. The planned development is predicated on the needs of Cambridge University. To lever in further development piecemeal because different plans have been approved, is unacceptable in principle. The consequences for Girton are potentially very damaging and the more new plans are slipped through the more likely that is. Girton is a very effective community, which is a model of good practice in many ways, and should not be put at risk.
24006	Object	Access I object on the grounds the traffic is already atrocious in this area and this added pressure on the road is not acceptable. Travellers and gypsy are generally known for their expertise in construction or the fairground industry both using large vehicles, most gypsy and traveller sites never are big enough to accommodate this.
23961 - Cambridge City Council 23992 24345 - Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the Univ. of Cambridge 24476 - NAFRA 24551 - Girton Parish Council 24569 24959 25152 26705 - NAFRA 26787 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The NWCS s in a completely different category from all the other major commercial developments in the area. The recent Inspectors' Report for the North West Cambridge Action Area Plan (AAP) stressed the importance of releasing the Cambridge Green Belt for predominantly University related uses, it is suggested that the District Council should consider whether the proposed allocation of Gypsy and Traveller pitches is consistent with the provision of the AAP, in particular policy NW30 Phasing and Need, which requires a needs assessment to be submitted with any planning application in the AAP area. The City Council objects to the allocation of 10 pitches on land at North West Cambridge on the grounds that such provision does not accord with the very specific policy requirements for Green Belt release in this area, namely meeting the needs of the University of Cambridge and for predominantly University-related uses as set out in Saved Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and the North West Cambridge Area Action Plan. In addition, such provision would reduce the capacity of the site to help contribute towards meeting the proven needs of the University of Cambridge. The University objects to the allocation of land at North West Cambridge for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches, for the following reasons; the North West Cambridge Site is allocated for predominantly University-related uses; Gypsy and Traveller pitches are not supported by planning policy for North West Cambridge; Gypsy and Traveller pitches would displace University uses for which need has been demonstrated; and the University cannot demonstrate a need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches - an AAP policy requirement for land to be released for development. Depending on where the provision was located, it could damage a sensitive Green Belt location. NAFRA opposes the inclusion of Gypsy and Traveller provision on the NWC site on the grounds that it would place an undesirable constraint on the University's ability to develop the site in the way best calculated to meet those needs; and - depending on where the provision was located, could damage a sensitive Green Belt location.

Site 5 - North West Cambridge - Land Between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road (University Site)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26181 - Windsor Road Residents 26182 - Windsor Road Residents	Object	The pitches have to go somewhere, and our concern is that there should not be a disproportionate impact on Castle Ward and adjacent parts of Cambridge. These comments apply both to Travellers' Pitches in the City and in S. Cambs. New developments in the area (Orchard Park, NIAB, NIAB extra and the University NW Site) are already having, and will in the near future have, major impact on Castle Ward and so any extra impact of Travellers pitches should be kept to an absolute minimum. We would reluctantly be prepared to accept a maximum of 10 pitches on either NIAB Extra or the University Farm site, assuming that there are no new Travellers' Pitches in Castle Ward within the City of Cambridge. Given the proposed housing density on NIAB and NIAB Extra, and the proximity of Girton village, the University Site would be preferable. NIAB site within the City Boundary is totally unacceptable for any new pitches.
24879 - Coton Parish Council	Object	Coton Parish Council wishes to make a comment in respect of site 5 to the effect that the Parish Council would not wish the pitches to be located anywhere in the vicinity of the footpath that leads from Madingley Wood to Girton.
29088 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Impact on environment The Parish Council is persuaded that entirely insufficient care has been exercised in respect of the assessment of sites 4 and 5. The report by the contractors shows a deplorable lack of sound information on which to base safe, proper and acceptable judgements. In particular, the report contains no adequate reference to proper environmental impact assessment of either the former NIAB land or the University farm. The failure properly to identify any residual hazards following the experimental use of these lands is almost certain to be culpably reckless. It certainly suggests wilful negligence to anyone who has experience of environmental auditing, as the presence of any harmful biological (including trans-genetic), chemical or radioactive materials used in the research programmes will constitute a hazard to any person inhabiting the site. That may be particularly the case for families with children.
28843	Object	Although the sites indicated are not close to the village, nevertheless their presence may cause problems if past experience is anything to go by. We do not have any argument with well regulated sites provided there is enough space for their caravans and all family vehicles. We presume you have a Liaison Officer who can be contacted should the need arise.
24601 26620 26623 28845	Object	We hope that acceptance of these sites will not add to the raw deal Girton has had and may have in the future. As SCDC Councillor for Girton I note the deep unease expressed by many villagers who feel yet another pressure on our resources at a time when we feel beset on all sides with major new developments. Our own rural way of life is threatened; our school is not able to support our own children as it is. Our population of vulnerable groups (the elderly, foreign students) already exert significant strain on services in the village, and I hear many voices saying that enough is enough. This does not constitute a planning objection per se, but it is vox populi. This area does not have the infrastructure in terms of schools, doctors etc to cope with another new community, you wait for a week for a doctors appointment. The majority of children already travel by bus to school. We have suffered noise from the A14 for nearly 30 years and this will intensify with the new proposals to widen the carriageways, and we are in danger of losing our village identity with developments on the NIAB site and the W. Cambridge (University) site. Finally when Northstowe is eventually built, traffic will seek the shortest route into Cambridge which is most likely to be through Girton. There is also the proposed large scale housing developments in the region of the Huntingdon Road.
28876	Object	Sites, 4 and 5 are too close to each other. One site with about 15 pitches, the maximum suggested by the Select Committee of MP's report, seemed like a better idea. At Smithey Fen, once we had the Setchell Drove Site and the Water Lane site, the land in between became tracked with people going between the two and then, the land got settled by the travellers without planning permission.
23590 24493	Support	On the basis of the following I support this provision "the aim of the Area Action Plan is to produce a balanced, viable and socially inclusive community and there is a high level of need for Gypsy and Traveller provision in the district and as such it is also possible to take the view that the site should make provision in a consistent way with the other major development sites". It would also ensure that traveller site provision is more widely spread within South Cambridgeshire. Land already identified to be released from Green Belt therefore no further Green Belt areas will need to be used if this area is accepted. If developed in line with University building plans infrastructure and amenities could be put in place. Would also be a more inclusive site and demonstrate the inclusiveness of the University, City and the travellers.
24335 24721	Support	Support.

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue
-----------------	--------	-----------------------

Site 6 - Northstowe

25518 - Waterbeach, Swaffham and Old West Drainage Boards 25881 - Environment Agency 26788 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	It is assumed that flood risk and surface water accommodation will be addressed as part of the whole development for this site and therefore we have no comments to make at this stage. A number of these sites are subject to river flooding and/or include areas susceptible to surface water flooding based upon the latest information produced by the Environment Agency (July 2009). It is recommended that South Cambridgeshire District Council obtain further advice from the Agency about how these issues could be addressed if these sites are to be brought forward. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle provided that any subsequent strategic drainage infrastructure is designed and constructed to accommodate additional discharges from the proposal. Consult IDB and Council Engineer.
25638	Object	Suitability Northstowe is a high density urbanised development and totally unsuitable for the proposal of 20 Gypsy and Traveller pitches.
28755	Object	Proposed allocation of twenty sites in Northstowe is ill considered and unsatisfactory. It may threaten investment in the project.
24125 24394 25183 26665 26666 26675 26722 26916 28937	Object	There are no minimal local services within the proposed Northstowe settlement, e.g. shops, doctors and schools, as shown in annexed map D2 but the legend refers to Northstowe AAP NS3: there is no indication in NS3 that any Northstowe educational provision for Gypsy and Travellers accommodation are to be applied within 1 km of the development framework. Furthermore AAP NS7 defines Northstowe as a free standing settlement: a free standing settlement will provide all the required services for its future all inclusive community of residents. It is fundamentally wrong to map out Longstanton Primary School as the Northstowe educational facility for G&T pupils. It is essential that key services and facilities should be available within Northstowe before any GT sites are established otherwise they will have to rely on the inadequate facilities (Primary school, food shop, health centre) within Longstanton. With a site near the village, Travellers will be more likely to use facilities in Longstanton than anywhere else. With such an increased population, the pull on these facilities may well increase to the point that they are virtually unusable by permanent residents. By adding a G&T site to the area it will put more strain on the already stretched resources in Longstanton due to the extra 500 houses at St Michael Farm development. As no extra facilities have been put in place to help with this amount of extra residents then how would we cope with any more? The amenities in the surrounding area of Longstanton are not sufficient to accommodate extra population in terms of e.g. primary school, which is already oversubscribed and is not predicted to cope with the increased birth rate in the village generated by the Home Farm development. Objecting on the grounds that the schools will be overcrowded and my children's education will suffer, this is a growing community as it is and as future development is already planned further crowding in not needed. The medical centre is already full. It is essential that key services are available within Northstowe before any GT sites are established. With the building of the guided bus, and all the new homes and the lack of facilities i.e. only one shop and public house. When is it going to stop. I moved to the village from a town for the lifestyle. We are losing our village identity.
24147 24150 24704 27079 27286 28818	Object	Both my partner and I live in Longstanton and strongly oppose any Gypsy and Traveller sites in the village of Longstanton. This would have an immediate and irreparable effect on house prices in the area, which, especially but not exclusively to today's current climate is unacceptable. We purchased our property eighteen months ago and had we known that these proposals were in discussion we may not have done so but chosen to move to a different area. First reason for objecting to Northstowe without making any comment on Traveller culture, the 'perceptions' of that culture by local residents and those coming in to Longstanton are such that the property values will be driven down. In a market that is already severely depressed and unlikely to recover any time soon, this is a serious issue. The whole character of Longstanton will change and you will see a great deal of residents moving out which will result in house prices falling and the whole character of the village changing. I do not want Gypsy & Traveller sites anywhere near my house or village because they will lower house prices and effect resale chances. It is a quiet village at the moment and we want it to stay that way.
27092 - Gallagher Estates	Object	Northstowe does not offer a 'good opportunity' to integrate new gypsy and traveller site provision with the new town. The proposal to provide land for gypsy and traveller accommodation at Northstowe is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The Sustainability Assessment is one such piece of evidence that plainly does not support the proposal for sites in the new town. In addition there are no clear mechanisms for implementing gypsy and traveller sites in or around Northstowe and crucially monitoring the positive and negative impacts, including social and economic considerations and the viability of the new town.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26715 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Size of sites No justification is offered that 2 sites of 10 pitches rather than (say) 4 sites of 5-8 each; and/or one of 15 are most appropriate. Girton Parish Council after consultation with representatives of the Gypsy and Irish Traveller communities regards 10 as the wrong size and requests that the sites should be withdrawn.
23873 24216 24333 24530 25158 25184 25304 25674 25935 26624 26789 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	ODPM Circular 1/06 (36): 'Local planning authorities should facilitate early involvement in the preparation of DPDs (front-loading) by consulting with the community and all stakeholders. Frontloading is particularly important when the DPD is dealing with site allocations. Local planning authorities should ensure that sites are brought forward early in the process so that the community can be consulted, and they can be subjected to sustainability appraisal' Object on the basis that until it is made clear where exactly pitches will be placed consultation is almost meaningless. It is imperative that if there is to be a Gypsy & Traveller site, it is made clear where it is to be located. Simply blocking out entire area of Northstowe and stating the site will be within the borders is not sufficient information. No sites were identified or apparently could be at this stage, no time for establishment could be given nor the precise boundaries for the new development. Inviting us to give our views on a very large allocation of pitches for a site covering hundred of hectares without jurisdictional boundary, masterplan or precise site options is rather meaningless. The consultation is incapable of contributing seriously to any local process of the plan. Such a consultation should involve the clear presentation of facts and known and detailed plans in order for the public to offer a response. Masterplanning for Northstowe has so far not included any allowance for Traveller sites. The County Council has concerns that the location of pitches within "close proximity" to Northstowe and Cambourne development areas is not clearly defined in the consultation document which will lead to uncertainty and have the potential to hinder the delivery of these sites. It is therefore recommended that the District Council re-consult on this issue with more site specific proposals to give local communities and other interested parties an opportunity to comment on this matter.
24617	Object	Site 56 will not be suitable as the B1050 cuts the area off from the proposed new town of Northstowe. Therefore the amenities of schooling shops etc are not within the area.
28936	Object	Already Traveller sites in the area There are already three Traveller sites near enough to Northstowe (in Fen Drayton, Cottenham and Willingham; granted, privately-owned and not council-run, but still there) that a site in Northstowe will be redundant.
25308	Object	I believe your Tier 1 assessment to be misleading. Tier 1 Criteria 3c asks 'is the site within or in close proximity to a valued area? Your consultation document records 'no' for Northstowe but there is a conservation area demarcated on the map which suggests that it falls within the category of valued area and the 'no' should have been a 'yes'.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23870 23921 23965 23980 23994 24101 24117 24123 24140 24148 24149 24152 24212 24328 24342 24375 24571 24670 24800 24805 24809 24868 24905 24910 - Oakington and Westwick Parish Council 25159 25160 25161 25162 25174 25210 25305 25637 25673 25735 25791 - Longstanton and District Heritage Society 25934 26007 26612 26677 26727 26755 26784 26915 27015 27285 28671 28673 28700 28756 28817 29104	Object	<p>The Traveller sites should be within Northstowe, once the infrastructure is in place, not on the edge or close to. The other site proposals do not attach an arbitrary distance. If a site were located to the east it would conflict with Northstowe Area Action Plan - key objective C1/b. The document states that a Travellers site may be placed within 1km of Northstowe. That includes most of Longstanton and Oakington. There is neither space or available services and facilities in Longstanton or Oakington to support such a site. Longstanton is oversubscribed for sewage, water, flooding and traffic already. Our primary school and doctors surgery will be burdened. Any Travellers sites associated with Northstowe must be kept within the boundaries of Northstowe, where all support facilities can be built in, and not encroach upon surrounding villages. It is important that the villages retain their separate identities. The Traveller sites must not be located in the green separation or impact on Conservation Areas, otherwise this would conflict with adopted LDF policies (NS/4, NS/12a and CH/5). The local community has already been forced into having Northstowe, so we should be excuse having to make further contributions in the form of Traveller pitches. Longstanton experienced our first encounter with a travellers when the area near the new bypass was occupied by them. This caused a significant amount of unrest in the community and much ill feeling. The area occupied quickly became very unkempt and Longstanton an uncomfortable place to live. After the travellers moved on things returned to normal.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23863 23872 23898 23901 23910 23931 24098 24102 24130 24141 24154 24264 24359 24385 24386 24552 - Girton Parish Council 24567 24662 24712 24735 24753 24756 24757 24766 24854 24957 26611 26643 26717 - Longstanton Parish Council 26718 - Longstanton Parish Council 26728	Object	<p>No masterplan, no physical and jurisdictional boundaries have been agreed at all. The town does not exist. It is grossly irresponsible to make policy decisions as though it does. The timing of Northstowe is extremely uncertain. Its construction has been delayed indefinitely. Northstowe isn't even built yet and plans to advance its progress are very low key. The continuing delay in the Northstowe project means that it is most unlikely that any GT pitches can be included in Northstowe before 2016. If timing is as important as is claimed, then this location must fail this test, especially because the infrastructure elements will not be built to satisfy the short term objectives.</p> <p>The masterplanning for the Northstowe site has already taken place and makes no allowance, I believe, for GT pitches. It cannot be expected to include them retrospectively. It assumes housing densities which would seem to be incompatible with GT pitches. It is deceptive and misleading to say that the new town will include a good range of new services and facilities that will meet the needs of new Gypsy & Traveller sites in this area. It is well known that only after some considerably time that houses have been built within any new development that additional facilities become available. Until services and infrastructure are in place, it cannot possibly be deemed sensible to even consider it. Any reference to Northstowe must include caveats to restrict GT site provision until the new town exists. Studies of socio-economic feasibility and sustainability in providing the right type of accommodation for this specific social group within the future new town have yet to be carried out by the promoters that could indicate suitably specific locations in a masterplan.</p>
24390 24573 24578 24589 24603 24619 24634 24655 25636 25933 28701	Object	<p>Northstowe has no master plan and no physical and jurisdictional boundaries have been agreed at all. The town does not exist. Sites at Northstowe are premature as Northstowe is not as yet finally planned to be built and with the infrastructure not agreed then siting sites in this area is inadvisable. Northstowe will not be sustainable for any of its residents until infrastructure and services are established. It appears that it may be very difficult to fulfil ODPM Circular 01/06 paragraph 32 that requires that 'criteria based policies must be fair, reasonable, realistic and effective in delivering sites'. Is it realistic, effective and fair to propose Gypsy and Traveller families a settlement location that is unsustainable because it may not exist for decades? I don't think so. The Northstowe site cannot be assessed for its social, economic and environmental impacts yet. ODPM circular paragraph 65 states 'In deciding where to provide for gypsy and traveller sites all sites considered as options for a site allocations DPD must have their social, environmental and economic impacts assessed in accordance with the requirements of sustainability appraisal.' A settlement that is non-existent cannot be assessed for its existing impacts to thus inform the decision of where to locate pitches. The Conclusion is inadmissible, contrary to Government guidance requiring an assessment of existing amenities and services at the considered nearest settlement location Northstowe. Studies of socio-economic feasibility and sustainability in providing the right type of accommodation for this specific social group within the future new town have yet to be carried out by the promoters that could indicate suitably specific locations in a master plan. What we have to rely on here are broad, wishful thinking 'thoughts' of little value to the G&T community. It is completely unrealistic to expect that the infrastructure of Northstowe will be ready for any GT sites before 2016.</p>
28916	Object	I would like to object to the sites on housing estates too, in particular SITE 6.
25163 25164 25165 25182 25209	Object	<p>There has been a suggestion that a site is proposed at the top end of Rampton Rd opposite the church yard. This is a Conservation Area and is in the village of Longstanton which is supposed to have a separation area from Northstowe. It is also on a very busy road with so many bad bends and where the traffic already travels too fast for safety. Another site exiting on to this road would be a further danger to this area. Also the sewage for this road is very bad now - it has been known for it to have come back up in the houses and they have never sorted it out. It has been stated that any traveller site needs to be near schools and local amenities and it would seem that a site that is actually in Longstanton would not meet this criteria. It is rumoured that a proposed site might be on the paddock area opposite the entrance on Nether Grove in Longstanton. Object to the use of The Paddocks in Longstanton as a site for travellers if it is proposed. The Paddocks is a Conservation Area with archaeological interest and wildlife and has a very well used public footpath going through it and is used for cattle grazing. It surrounds a lovely old Manor House and is opposite our historic church all in the middle of the village. The entrance proposed is onto a very busy road which is a no through road. This is not part of Northstowe.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
28878	Object	Reduce it to 15 pitches; it seems that to make provision for travellers within a new development is a very good idea indeed, and hopefully this can be done here.
28938	Object	An increased population also leads to an increase in crime. Longstanton is currently fairly crime-free (except for when someone stole the only phone cable into the village a couple of years ago!). We do not have a local police station or a local police foot patrol. Longstanton has virtually no police presence
24576 24587	Object	Northstowe has been mentioned in many places. The Area Action Plan has been settled after an extensive report by HM Govt Inspector. This is a legally binding document and all aspects of this proposal should be in accordance with that Report. The masterplan for Northstowe has been arrived at following a report by HM Government Inspector. This legal document must take precedent over all other considerations, and it would be irrational to start planning for these sites till after the masterplan has had formal approval.
24022 - Irish Traveller Movement in Britain	Object	Irish Traveller Movement in Britain objects to this site. It will be too close to the settled community without adequate planning.
24658	Object	Specific site ? It would appear that the council has already allocated locations. Land owned by County Council to the back of Striplands Farm Longstanton plot 56 is land that is seen as suitable. I strongly disagree with this for reasons stated earlier. Northstowe needs to be planned and have suitable infrastructure in place before sites can be approved.
23845 23995 24223 24241 - Longstanton Parish Council 24242 24262 24374 24543 24558 24566 24708 24710 24724 24752 24755 24799 25790 - Longstanton and District Heritage Society 25932 26001 26006 26610 26642 26664 26667 26676 27014 29098 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	By stating that the provision of the sites should ideally be located within 1km of the edge of Northstowe would bring the whole of both Longstanton and Oakington and could also impinge on Willingham, therefore Willingham Parish Council objects to this site so far as it might affect Willingham. This is highly misleading since reference is not made to these villages in the GTDPD consultation. Object to the use of "near too" in the context of Northstowe. The wording "sites within or on the edge of" is very ambiguous. Locating sites "on the edge" of Northstowe is code word for "within Oakington and Longstanton" and must not be permitted. Proposing that G&T sites 'could be located close to the edge' of Northstowe is flawed: this location determined as 'the nearest settlement' must not breach the approved AAP/D3/11 statement determining Northstowe as 'an entirely new freestanding settlement'. The wording must remove all references to anything other than provision of sites within the boundary of Northstowe. In order to be socially inclusive it is important that the Traveller sites be located wholly within the proposed Northstowe development and the construction of Northstowe provides an opportunity to fully integrate sites. Any such sites should be created as part of the Northstowe masterplan (probably though s.106 agreements). Their construction should take place alongside the construction of Northstowe. The Traveller sites should not be constructed before the Northstowe infrastructure is itself constructed. A map showing a 1km G&T sites inclusion zone, from the settlement edge outwards is omitted. Failure to publicise the 1km proposal (Clause 6.5 GTDPD) means this consultation is flawed. Thus consultees interpret the map as showing the G&T sites inclusion zone from the edge towards the centre of the development. The location map is of the Northstowe AAP area, not the town of Northstowe. It includes green separation from Longstanton and Oakington, which itself includes Conservation Areas. The note below the map should be clarified to include this information. The map must show the extent, purpose and determination applied to Longstanton Conservation Areas/Green Separation as specified in Northstowe approved AAP.
25306	Object	The intention is, I believe, for Northstowe to be a truly sustainable place that encourages the use of sustainable travel but the G&T community rely on vehicles for transportation of caravans. Have the G&T community agreed to reduce parking facilities in Northstowe compared with other development sites? If not how does one reconcile the truly sustainable nature of Northstowe if that is not applied equitably across all types of residence?
23589 24494 24696 24722 25057 26845	Support	All major new developments should include provision for travellers. Ideal site - the site can be integrated from the start and is close to Cambridge. Council could insist on good public transport links as part of planning. Excellent site and opportunity to develop site and infrastructure at once. Can ensure social inclusivity. New schools, etc can be built to suit all areas of the community. More than 20 pitches could be built here - 30-40 would be more reasonable size. I suggest that Northstowe be an alternative to Cambourne as this is still in its planning stages and the specialist needs that the travelling community may require could be built into these plans. There would be more resources and better services for the travellers near the large towns and villages that at present have no pitches. Sites such as Cambourne (site 7), Bassingbourn (site 18) and when built Northstowe (site 6) would be better equipped to take more pitches.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
28840	Support	I note from your consultation documents that sites 3 & 6 are also under consideration. Surely it would be sensible to put the additional plots that you require there so that the general public can buy into those locations should they want to. At Cambourne you are not giving us this choice, which is neither fair nor reasonable.
26118 - Homes and Communities Agency	Support	<p>The HCA agrees with the Site Options' analysis for Northstowe.</p> <p>The HCA Corporate Plan 2009/10 to 2010/11 identifies within the East of England six major priority sites that will deliver a mix of homes, jobs and communities that will make a real positive impact. One of these sites is Northstowe, where the HCA is committed to creating a balanced and exemplar sustainable community on surplus public sector land ensuring the early provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>The HCA sees the provision of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation as being crucial to it's aspirations for Northstowe</p>

Site 7 - Cambourne

25882 - Environment Agency 26790 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	A number of these sites are subject to river flooding and/or include areas susceptible to surface water flooding based upon the latest information produced by the Environment Agency (July 2009). It is recommended that South Cambridgeshire District Council obtain further advice from the Agency about how these issues could be addressed if these sites are to be brought forward. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle provided that any subsequent strategic drainage infrastructure is designed and constructed to accommodate additional discharges from the proposal.
26207 - MCA Developments Limited	Comment	<p>The traveller site provision could only reasonably be provided in the southern or eastern peripheral areas of Upper Cambourne, which is yet to be fully developed. Locating a traveller site here would have a detrimental impact upon residential amenity in both Upper Cambourne and Great Cambourne by reason of the identified nature of traveller employment requirements.</p> <p>Circular 01/2006 paragraph 17 outlines the nature of employment activities of travellers Upper Cambourne is predominantly residential in nature, complemented by other community-run uses. There is no proposed employment activity here and so the quasi-industrial nature of a typical mixed use traveller site would be an alien feature in this wholly residential village environment.</p>
23488 27036 27048 27059 28795	Object	I think it is inappropriate to consider Cambourne as a proposed traveller's site as it should be remembered that Cambourne is not yet completed and many of the promised facilities are yet to be delivered. The latest school is temporarily sited on the cemetery. The sports centre has yet to be delivered. It is not appropriate to consider additional spend when Cambourne has not been fully developed and does not at present have the sustainability to meet the current resident's needs. Cambourne is a new community. As a recent resident I find it lacks social cohesion & many of the aspects of a mature community. This is clear with the antagonism between the private & social housing. The imposition of a traveller community would increase the social discord & increase the existing "new town" problems that Cambourne is facing. Travellers and Gypsies by their very nature have transient lifestyles which hardly lend themselves to a village / town that is still finding its feet and where people are looking to establish themselves long term. The site should be made in a mature environment. Obviously, if you asked Travellers they might indeed express a preference to having a site in new developments but that's just because of the idea that new = better. In Cambourne this is plainly not the case.
28809 29105	Object	Having seen other Traveller sites particularly the one at Milton, it is indisputable that the issue of litter becomes vastly more pronounced. Within Cambourne we already have a running battle with litter which we are slowly winning. Noise levels will be bound to increase ruining the lives of near by residents. Changing the character of the village and making the current residents consider their positions.
25652 27115 27296 28631 - Caldecote Parish Council	Object	Cambourne was carefully planned to be a family-friendly village with a relatively high density of housing that is compensated by open spaces and good amenities. The housing density is already increasing and making space available for new sites would increase the density still further. This would detract from the original concept of Cambourne. I feel we will not meet government density figures if we put a traveller site at Cambourne because if the site were social housing we would have more people per square metre than if it were caravans. To have sites available that the traveller community agree would suit their needs is unlikely bearing in mind the level of housing density that the government require.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23450 23468 23509 24763 25645 25972 25983 25992 26632 26775 26811 26815 26819 26833 26847 26860 26903 26988 - Cambourne Parish Council 28780 28895 28907 28924	Object	Cambourne is an isolated, rural community and a considerable distance from Cambridge. It has a poor bus service and cars are an essential means of getting around. We should surely be encouraging the use of public transport which travellers I do not believe would use. The increased pollution and high car dependency of the Gypsy & Traveller community's residents is therefore against the sustainability principles that Cambourne was originally founded upon. Given that every almost every planning policy is seeking to reduce car use and CO2 emissions, then this statement alone should preclude Cambourne from any further consideration. This aspect of the proposal conflicts with the aims of the South Cambs Sustainability Appraisal. Cambourne is not close to any amenities and as such I think there are far better more well placed sites closer to amenities to site these plots. Cambourne is a growing community with new, untried and developing services provisions. The process of achieving beneficial social capital for the current community will take at least another decade. I therefore object to the inclusion of a Travellers or travelling showpeople site within the Cambourne Development area on the grounds that Cambourne is as yet not a sustainable community and the nature and design of any inclusion would do nothing to enhance the sustainability and reduce social capital now being built within the permitted developments of Cambourne. There is very little work available in Cambourne as it is mainly a residential area. This will mean that a site for travellers will put further strain on public transport or the already overcrowded roads in to Cambridge for employment. Most people commute to Cambridge, London, Huntingdon or other surrounding villages. Cambourne is becoming more unsustainable. It was rejected as location for more housing by RSS Review panel in April 2009.
23473 26858 26871 26882 26991 - Cambourne Parish Council 27297 27302 28723 28927	Object	Any development in Cambourne would be made on greenfield land. Greenfield sites are not considered suitable for traveller in some large communities such as Sawston yet Cambourne will have to expand into greenfield sites to cope with the need for a secondary school and fourth primary school as there are simply no other sites available. Houses are built close together with green areas provided for recreational purposes. Any traveller site would, therefore, have to be built on greenfield land and the location of the travellers site may remove some of the green spaces that are important to the residence of Cambourne. If the site is not properly maintained (for example rubbish is left) that this will affect the wildlife that is now established in Cambourne. There will also be an increase in noise levels which will detract from quietness we live in now. The aesthetics of a traveller site cannot be integrated into surrounding development of residential homes. It would seem a better option to integrate G&T into smaller community sites family by family making use of existing brownfield sites.
26933 26938 27054 28728 28892 28904	Object	Cambourne is not a suitable place for a site due to the lack of suitable local employment for travelling folk. There is not the traditional work in and around Cambourne that travellers seek. The main employment areas in Cambourne are White Collared and Retail, this will lead to no Job opportunities for the Gypsy and Travellers unless a great deal of Travelling is involved. Cambourne has a large density of Social Housing and unemployment. There is no site that has the facilities to run a business, which the travellers would wish to do except in the business park. There is very little piecework and none on the land in this areas, what there is is done by Eastern Europeans.
28967	Object	Taken from a SCDC own report the following statement indicates that even when pitches are provided unauthorised sites "Unauthorised caravan numbers have fluctuated, declining in the 1990s but rising sharply since about the year 2000. They are scattered in mostly rural locations, some on small, single-family sites, but increasingly in recent years have tended to concentrate on a few larger, high-profile sites, often next to authorised sites. They cause tensions and receive much negative publicity. Unauthorised caravans and pitches set up adjacent to authorised ones, fact SCDC own report.
25661 28786	Object	Having read, with the utmost dismay and anger, the article in the latest Cambourne Crier of July 2009 of details of a possible Traveller (Gypsy) site in Cambourne I am writing to register my complete opposition to the possible location of any Traveller or Gypsy community site in or close to Cambourne. Just for your information, every single person I have spoken to in Cambourne about this - family, neighbours, friends, casual acquaintances in pub etc., are also totally against this for many reasons. The force of opposition leads me to believe that it is within the realms of possibility that civil unrest will ensue. I vehemently urge you to reject this proposal out of hand.
26861	Object	Ownership of site Evidence from other council owned sites proves that these are often prone to failure in their management - how will SCDC ensure that this is any different to protect themselves from legal action?
28832 28899 28911	Object	What would travellers pay? Where is the money coming from to pay for this? It is unknown how South Cambridgeshire District Council will be able to enforce a site in Cambourne, are they going to compulsory purchase the land or are the Travellers and Gypsy community going to have to buy very expensive development land?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23452 23479 23510 24103 24124 24161 24162 24976 24988 24998 25008 25198 25648 26668 26773 26820 26855 26869 26875 26879 26891 26902 26929 27055 27065 27114 28556 28560 28564 28569 28573 28714 28724 28790 28837 28897 28909 28963	Object	Travellers require business use for their activities, and housing areas in the Masterplan are not allowed business use. Restrictive covenants prevent residents from conducting a business from home, thus ensuring controls over volume of traffic, size of vehicle, noise and general appearance of the community. These specifically prohibit existing residents from keeping commercial vehicles or caravans on their land as well as specific requirements on the visual appearance of front gardens and borders. For owners of caravans, a secure parking area is provided close to the entrance to Cambourne. Establishing a Traveller site within the boundary of Cambourne will allow the transportation of trailers and caravans on a variety of unsuitable roads and by doing so may encourage others to follow suit and damage the current 'caravan-free' environment. The introduction of a traveller site would severely compromise the look and feel of Cambourne. Any development of a traveller's site would need to make special dispensation in planning which is against the Cambourne vision and values and would have an impact on the existing community. If the proposed sites are approved the Council must be responsible for enforcing the same standards which are legally binding on the community. If they do not then the Council runs the risk of legal action against it to take enforcement action and for compensation. In permitting one section of the community to do as it wishes could lead to general anarchy and flouting of the rules.
23519	Object	I object to the travellers site in Cambourne because Cambourne is saturated and is losing its village identity.
23453 23614 28819 28830 28982	Object	We find it incredible that the Council would consider this as a potential site especially in today's financial climate. Bullrush Lane is desirable, with a good view of the lake, and sought after location for which we paid a premium when purchasing our property. By building a gypsy and traveller site in this road would considerably affect the value of our property and the ability to sell the property on in the future, a point you could not possibly ignore or dispute!!!! When choosing to move to Cambourne 9 years ago, one of the reasons we chose Bullrush Lane was the proximity to the proposed golf course. Since this has yet to materialise, and probably never will, the council now feels this land will be better suited to house travellers. We can't help but feel somewhat annoyed about this decision. Building a site in a residential area such as Bullrush Lane would also mean the area would become an eyesore. The adoption of the proposed gypsy site would destroy Bullrush Lane's cared-for environment and appearance. There are plenty of open spaces to put a Gypsy site why not near the offices you occupy?
28677	Object	I am not generally the type to campaign but on this subject I will most certainly do so and influence as many people as I can to do the same. I have not intention of quietly allowing anyone to impose this gypsy site on Cambourne or indeed any immediate vicinity around it on me. No to the gypsy site in Cambourne.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23554 24874 24989 24999 25009 25651 25668 25975 26754 26769 26797 26856 26877 26880 26889 26899 26939 26995 27019 27052 27063 27290 27292 28559 28563 28567 28571 28574 28580 28725 28779 28898 28910 28961	Object	Although I understand that the council has specific targets for developing traveller sites I believe that a travellers site in Cambourne would undermine other government targets e.g. affordable housing / general housing targets. This is due to the disproportionate amount of land required to meet traveller's needs, which would reduce social capital, and reduce affordable / social housing provision or reduce open space. There is a lack of social housing throughout the south east of the UK. Replacing some settled social housing with a traveller site would not be fair to those in need of social housing. Available sites would have to be taken from the allocation of social homes, which the developers have been forced to provide under government guidelines. This is a gross waste of potential homes that have been identified as being required. Housing need is currently being met by developers providing up to 40% social homes. More affordable housing should be built that will provide more benefits to a large portion of the community. There are so many young people that cannot afford to get on the housing ladder.
28810	Object	Lack of Privacy Cambourne is currently a village where privacy is respected. The inclusion of high density housing in the area would erode this privacy for the new residents of this high density housing and the existing residents of the village.
24985 24995 25005 26854 26874 26890 26901 26936 26990 - Cambourne Parish Council 26997 27018 27053 27064 28557 28561 28565 28570 28576 28836 28933	Object	The proposals do not make any link between demand and supply in respect of Traveller sites. There is no need for a traveller's site - we have gypsies and travellers living here in houses as permanent members of the community so there is no need for a dedicated site for them. A traveller's site in Cambourne would not reduce or alleviate the demand for unauthorised sites, as travellers would not be attracted to Cambourne, as they have no prior history in Cambourne and no stated desire to settle in Cambourne. It has not been a traditional stopping place, as people have no previous links to Cambourne, as it is a new community. Additionally there is not the traditional work in and around Cambourne that travellers seek. It is difficult to see how Travellers could be integrated into the local economy. The way Cambourne has been planned is based on economically active individuals working in very modern offices based business on the local business park, working in the schools and the few shops, or commuting to Cambridge. There would be very few, if any, suitable jobs for Gypsies and Travellers. Furthermore the vision for Cambourne will not meet traveller's needs.
28798	Object	Me and my Partner moved into Cambourne around 3 years ago, Cambourne is a lovely place to live with near by lakes and countryside. Our plans in the next year or two is to start a family, we are already looking forward to walking our child to the park to play on the swings. Please take on board the feelings of Cambourne Community

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24983 24993 25003 26886 27051 27062 28712 28792	Object	My understanding is that the developers (MCA) are not in support of any plans for the development of a traveller's site in Cambourne. Therefore I am mindful that any pursuit of such a development would seem to be a waste of public money, resources and time. Additionally if MCA were to withdraw from any further development of Cambourne in line with the original vision this would further affect the sustainability of Cambourne as a whole.
23991 24881 24894 24977 24990 25000 25010 25199 26206 - MCA Developments Limited 26607 26630 26672 26774 26798 26810 26814 26842 26868 26870 26881 26892 26913 26918 26919 26922 26928 26934 26981 26987 - Cambourne Parish Council 27022 27056 27066 27082 27097 27295 28716 28781 28784 28789 28808 28857 28894 28896 28906 28908 28925 28929 28959 28962 28986	Object	See Paragraph 66 of the Circular 1/2006 relating to highway impacts. It is clear that new traveller sites are best located in areas close to direct access with the major road network, thereby avoiding the need to pass through residential areas. Given the existing development in Lower and Upper Cambourne then future traveller site provision could only be provided in the southern or eastern peripheral areas of Upper Cambourne, which is yet to be fully developed. This would have a significant impact upon the internal highway network in both Upper Cambourne and Great Cambourne given the need for travellers to pass through the village centre en route to the A428. Due to infrequent and expensive public transport, any proposed site will have a high car dependency and so the site must not be accessed via a minor residential road (OPT5). This would therefore rule out any site in Great Cambourne as the available site or sites are not served directly by distributor roads. The roads in Cambourne are minor residential roads; windy and narrow therefore it will make access difficult. The introduction of a Traveller site would lead to an increase in larger (commercial) vehicles and caravans which would put an additional pressure on the road infrastructure. The main roads through Cambourne were not designed to accommodate traffic. The roadways in Cambourne have not been adopted therefore policing and enforcing of speeding will be non-existent. It would also add to the risk of injury to pedestrians, cyclists and playing children. Streets in Cambourne are narrow and often overcrowded with parked cars as many households have insufficient parking space and are forced to park on the roads.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23447 23469 24115 24116 24725 24777 24829 24878 24958 24986 24996 25006 25649 26604 26606 26753 26791 - Cambridgeshire County Council 26801 26817 26853 26878 26893 26980 26986 26994 27021 27043 27057 27067 27149 27154 28568 28715 28726 28802 28889 28901 28964	Object	This consultation is flawed as no proposed site has been put forward for Cambourne which puts residents at a disadvantage to other proposed sites where actual locations have been named. The people of Cambourne cannot comment on material planning matters such as access, traffic, and parking, noise, pollution, landscape impact, wildlife, amenity or Design issues when a specific parcel of land in Cambourne has not been identified for the purposes of this consultation. No specific site has been identified for the proposed development and so it is not possible to assess the impact that the development will have on our community. Cambourne is three separate villages each with its own identity and community. This is what we bought into when we decided to move to Cambourne. Further impacting on the density and/or population of Cambourne risks turning it into a 'new town', and the ensuing problems this brings which was never the intention, or vision for Cambourne. It would be fairer to consult us when a site has been identified. It is the duty of the Council in law to consult fairly, which means letting those who have a potential interest know in clear terms what the proposal is and telling them enough (which may be in great detail) to enable them to make an intelligent response. This proposal fails to give sufficient detail to enable me to intelligently comment as no specific site within or proximate to the red lined area has been identified. Something this important should be put to a vote because it involves drastic and unforeseen change to a community. This really is not about the travelling community so much as the rights of ordinary townsfolk.
26631 28729 29106	Object	Pollution is likely to be a problem as can be witnessed at Chesterton Fen where there is a ditch, which is an environmental hazard due to the way it is used. Pollution will be significant in terms of atmospheric discharges, litter and noise - based upon experience from other travellers sites. The introduction of a traveller site would introduce greater pollution through accommodation and transportation that is not designed with ecological impact as a fundamental consideration.
28804	Object	We would strongly object to the Cambourne Building developers being offered permission for 950 further houses to be built in Cambourne, on provision the traveller's sites are provided by the developers
28739 28793 29149	Object	There must be an impact on the landscape especially on the several conservation areas where wildlife is encouraged and beginning to return. In association with the National Wildlife Trust Cambourne has worked hard to create a landscape to cater for leisure & pleasure. Many trees, bridal paths, and lakes have been introduced to create a village feel to the location. The introduction of a gypsy & travellers site is not in keeping with the designs and vision of the Wildlife Trust or its residents. Cambourne is also a centre for wildlife, which would be adversely effected.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23445 24139 24151 24889 24893 24984 24994 25004 26772 26795 26796 26800 26816 26852 26873 26887 26896 26935 26940 26972 26992 - Cambourne Parish Council 27049 27060 27080 27293 28579 28717 28835 28854 28859 28890 28902	Object	The plan is misleading because of the masterplanning review has changed the existing approved footprint so edge of Cambourne development is not as represented to the public but is the smaller developable areas of Upper Cambourne and Great Cambourne within the wider plan. Therefore the potential site would not necessarily be "within but on the edge of Cambourne" per the red edged plan described but quite possibly well within the confines of the overall development. This has not been explained adequately and is, therefore, unfair. Masterplanning for Cambourne has been done for years. Great Cambourne is virtually finished and is establishing itself well. No provision was made in the original plan for Cambourne to have a traveller's site, and therefore no space was allocated. A Gypsy and Traveller site was not part of the original vision for Cambourne. It is incorrect to say "Many of the effects are unlikely to be significant as the site falls within the wider Camborne Major Development Site, which is currently under construction." Two of three 'villages', are now complete, save for a small number of dwellings that are currently being finished. If Cambourne is to be blighted with a traveller's site, your choice of location is inappropriate. How could it possibly be in keeping with the surrounding area, which is a carefully designed, well-established suburban area? At present finished Lower and Great Cambourne properties are built right up to boundaries making it difficult to find sites on the edges or even in the existing green spaces. The original concept and approved Masterplan for Cambourne is for three villages with open space between, providing a rural village / countryside environment for the inhabitants to enjoy. Any attempt to build on open spaces would clearly reduce this approved facility provided for the enjoyment of all and would remove the wildlife and ecology that occupies these spaces. I believe that the new development of Cambourne already includes provisions for housing for gypsy families, key workers, first time buyers, single parents and other deserving or needy residents. It is a well planned and socially well balanced community, but with very limited resources.
24157 27116 27289 27294 27303 28727 28800 28814 28858 28968	Object	Cambourne has unfortunately already acquired a reputation for being a high-crime environment. Some local politicians even refer to it as "Crimebourne". Unreasonably, the addition of Gypsy and Traveller sites may further detract from its reputation and will make it more difficult to maintain a good mix of households that fairly represent most sections of the population - the population of Cambourne may become less diverse and the community would suffer as a result. Travellers do not generally want to integrate; if some do they are catered for in traditional houses which would ensure their needs are met. Few travellers travel. Cambourne is a family village and should remain so with no fear. In the FAQ it states "Well managed and well run Gypsy and Traveller sites do not generally cause trouble to the local settled community" which I have yet to see one. With an already overburdened government budget could you supply someone who could dedicate the enormous amount of time to maintain a well-run travellers site. There is a mention of 10 pitches, but if more turn up the Council find them hard to move on. Cambourne has a lot of easily accessible open areas, including nature reserves, which would be attractive and easy to set up illegal travellers' sites. Therefore, putting a permanent travellers' site in Cambourne might also attract other, more unscrupulous, travellers allowing them to 'discover' these places.
23956 25662 25663 28796	Object	We strongly disagree with the proposed Travellers Site in Cambourne. We are totally against the idea and it should not be considered at all in Cambourne. It's incredibly difficult to submit "I object" on your website! So I am sending you an e-mail, to let you know that I am not in favour of the idea of a traveller's site in Cambourne. I am registered on your website, so this vote should count.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23532 24257 24379 24822 - Cambridgeshire County Council 25646 25973 25982 26603 26669 26770 26808 26812 26818 26841 26867 26888 26900 27045 28787 28861 28891 28903 28969	Object	<p>Cambourne is much less suitable location for travellers' site than more established communities because of its underdeveloped infrastructure and unusual demographics. The community is still in its fledgling stages and development is ongoing, this will put further pressure on the local infrastructure before a travellers site and all of its additional requirements are added. Cambourne has an extremely high birth rate this means that in a very short time the existing schools including the third temporary school will be oversubscribed and unable to accommodate children who move to the village whilst already in education. This means that the travellers children would most likely not be able to be accommodated locally requiring travel to schools that are further afield. This is before you factor in the additional 950 homes that have recently been given planning permission. There is currently significant pressure in relation to secondary school places as a result of the planned development of the Cambourne new settlement. The County Council, therefore, requests that the District Council should contact the Authority to have further discussions in relation to the proposed inclusion of the new pitches at Cambourne given the lack of existing secondary school capacity and the need for clarity to enable the County Council to assess the impacts on the capacity of existing and future primary school catchments.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23440 23449 23455 23458 23489 23517 23525 23531 23551 23598 23636 23752 23844 23920 23940 23950 23954 23970 23983 23984 24015 24074 24097 24695 24730 24979 24982 24992 25002 25200 25205 25647 25669 25976 25991 26605 26618 26626 26629 26670 26673 26809 26813 26840 26849 26859 26898 26914 26917 26921 26932 26971 26982 26984 26989 - Cambourne Parish Council 26996 27020 27038 27044 27046 27050 27061 27117 27287 27301 28537 28558 28562 28566 28572 28575 28713	Object	<p>Cambourne lacks facilities for its existing residents, this has long been a complaint of local residents. In particular young people in Cambourne lack social and recreational facilities. Cambourne is already suffering due to the lack of the developers holding to promises to build community facilities e.g. sports centre. This is blamed on economic climate; however, problem has been around for much longer. Adding more demand on the current facilities would serve no benefit to the local residents. The sustainability of current services (Doctors, Policing, Schools etc) within Cambourne cannot meet the needs of the current Cambourne population. There are also many outstanding promises still to be met. Until all these services are running efficiently and effectively meeting the needs of the permanent Cambourne community (paid for in house price/rent and local taxes), the traveller/gypsy community should be discouraged from living in an area that cannot meet the needs of current residents let alone meet the needs of this specialist community. Cambourne already provides council assisted housing through the Housing Association and other Agencies. I feel very strongly that Cambourne already 'does its bit' for those in need of government support and, as a long-term employed tax payer, I object most strongly to the additional strain that would be put on the community, services and infrastructure if Gypsy Travellers were accommodated in the Cambourne area. Putting a Traveller site into this growing community, with an expectation that Traveller's needs' will be met above others is totally unrealistic, unfair and will raise significant local tensions. Gypsy & Traveller communities would not be well catered for in this environment. Additional facilities are unlikely to be funded.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
28722		
28782		
28783		
28785		
28788		
28803		
28811		
28813		
28820		
28833		
28852		
28856		
28862		
28893		
28905		
28922		
28934		
28958		
28965		
28987		
23852	Object	Cambourne is significantly different to Northstowe and any of the other "major development sites" in that these sites are not already occupied. Apart from a few patches of land and Upper Cambourne to be completed it cannot be considered a new development.
24627		
25650		
25687 - Cambourne Parish Council		Cambourne is already occupied and, furthermore, has a vision and a plan that enhances the chances of good citizenship and thriving communities. Any site should have been integrated at the start of the original masterplan to allow proper integration of the travelling community. Its design was not based on the inclusion of a travellers site and to now include one would be in conflict with the current planning permission. The testing method for inclusion of Cambourne is therefore at fault. On this analysis, Cambourne should be removed from further consideration by the District Council.
26799		
26848		
28778		
25977	Object	Impact on environment
		Cambourne is a quiet almost rural community, one of the many reasons myself and others like me choose to live here. The site proposed is greenfield and houses a lot of wildlife which is essential to the area.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23457 23461 23462 23463 23466 23474 23511 23518 23523 23524 23533 23580 23981 24334 24336 24754 26850 26851 26857 26872 26876 26897 26920 26952 26983 26985 26993 - Cambourne Parish Council 27023 27039 27081 27084 27150 27155 27288 28675 28740 28757 28777 28791 28794 28797 28799 28801 28812 28831 28834 28846 28855 28860 28926 28932 28945 28960 28970 28981 29103	Object	Due to Cambourne being new the perception of the village is extremely important. Already dubbed "Crimebourne" and recently attacked by the labour government (Cambridge News 29.9.09) Cambourne is fighting for fair representation. A traveller's site would impact the surrounding residential development and could damage the fragile developing character of the village. Through no fault of the "General" traveller and gypsy community the perception of a travellers site is negative. This causes a decrease in the property values of any village containing a site. As Cambourne is a new community a decrease in values would have a negative effect on the future lives of the residents, and would discourage new property owners. New developments are reliant on builders being able to sell market homes. New developments are already contributing to the housing need by enabling up to 40% social housing, including re-homing travellers. They simply will not be able to sell homes that are even threatened by travellers nearby. There is a real risk that targets set for home building will not be achieved. Houses are still being built in Cambourne. Rightly or wrongly, no-one will buy these properties if a travellers' site is permitted in or near Cambourne and people will move away. The overall sustainability of Cambourne is heavily reliant on the developers being able to sell the remainder as market homes. With sales and growth halting there will be no incentive to develop the promised facilities of Sports Centre, Golf Course, High Street etc. In my opinion, this will be a disaster for Cambourne and will lead to many social and other disturbances, and it would destroy wildlife habitat.
23588 24495 25055 28879	Support	All major new development should make provision for traveller. Good principle to put new pitches within development areas, excellent idea but if possible could increase to 15 pitches. Cambourne offers successful site integration with the on-going development. Good principle to put new pitches within development areas, excellent idea but if possible could increase to 15 pitches. Very good opportunity to place site close to good local amenities and excellent transport links. New community therefore more easy inclusion of travellers. New schools being developed. Very good location for site. There would be more resources and better services for the travellers near the large towns and villages that at present have no pitches. Sites such as Cambourne (site 7), Bassingbourn (site 18) and when built Northstowe (site 6) would be better equipped to take more pitches.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
Site 8 - Ida Darwin Hospital Site, Fulbourn		
24826 - Cambridgeshire County Council 25883 - Environment Agency	Comment	A number of these sites are subject to river flooding and/or include areas susceptible to surface water flooding based upon the latest information produced by the Environment Agency (July 2009). It is recommended that South Cambridgeshire District Council obtain further advice from the Agency about how these issues could be addressed if these sites are to be brought forward. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle, subject to satisfactory assessment of identified constraints. Details of surface and foul water drainage also required.
26082 - Fulbourn Parish Council	Comment	The Ida Darwin site is still a working hospital and Fulbourn Parish Council questions whether it is a redundant hospital.
26123	Comment	Cost of development Do you intend to use 106 agreement money to fund major road improvements plus the traveller site. The village will need significant financial support to accommodate this development. Are the existing owners happy that they will be able to maximise their revenue from the whole development or is the traveller site incorporated into the granting of the overall planning permission?
26937	Comment	Integration of traveller and settled community The location is not on the edge of the city, but in an already built up and established area between Cherry Hinton and Fulbourn- Although locally we like to think of these as two villages, they can also be seen as urban commuter-belt suburbs of Cambridge and as such are probably not an ideal location to place 5 traveller families.
25564	Comment	Fulbourn is a community separate from Cambridge. This proposal will erode that distinction and will be the first step to urbanisation meaning further developments are easier to pursue - precedent will be set.
26125	Comment	No specific site Without more firm proposals any real critique is difficult.
26015 26081 - Fulbourn Parish Council	Object	G & Ts and the settled community alike have highlighted their desire for a buffer to be in place between the two types of development. This has not only been highlighted through consultation with G & Ts in South Cambs but has been highlighted as a preference nationally (please see consultation undertaken in Central Bedfordshire and Dacorum). The Ida Darwin site could not provide a G & T site, 250 to 275 dwellings and an adequate buffer between the two on the footprint of the existing buildings.
25030 25749 26010 26864 27351	Object	I do not support that Fulbourn is either an appropriate location or a growth area. The Ida Darwin site is not suitable for residential development of any description. I would like to confirm that I am disappointed to see that in spite of numerous public objections SCDC seems to be considering making land available for Gypsies and Travellers and 250-275 houses on the Ida Darwin Site. To get into Cambridge at present with the amount of cars, buses, lorries etc. is a nightmare without adding more to it. The proposed site already has planning conditions attached which would be breached in allowing a development of such a size to have pitches as part of that development. This proposed development would be far too large to fit on the existing footprint of the Ida Darwin. There are unlive in houses within Cambridge and Cambourne to my knowledge - surely these should be sold or refurbished first. Such a large development on the edge of the village would join it to Cambridge and not become part of the village. The issue of settlement of any sort on this site needs careful scrutiny by the SCDC and Fulbourn Parish Council to ascertain whether Fulbourn amenities can absorb additional pressures.
29011	Object	Cost of development Through the Freedom of Information Act local residents have the right to ask: - The total cost of the site development and ongoing management - What proportion of this cost is met directly by the travelling community through site/pitch taxes and if the whole cost is not met by travelling community, how has the remaining cost been funded - What proportion of the travelling community residents pay the same rate of council tax as local settled residents

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26078 - Fulbourn Parish Council	Object	<p>This is not a major development</p> <p>Fulbourn Parish Council notes sites are being considered on major new developments. This Council feels this site does not fall within this category. It was obvious from the consultation meeting with parish councillors that incorporating travellers' sites within new developments is a new venture and many questions remained unanswered at that meeting.</p>
23480	Object	<p>why can't I vote without commenting?</p>
24366 24812 29010	Object	<p>With all the planned growth in our area, NHS land will be needed to cope with the huge expansion of the population. Utilising the Ida Darwin site for housing and traveller sites is a short sighted plan and local residents should have a bigger say on what happens to their neighbourhood. No final decision on relocation of the Fulbourn Hospital site has been agreed. Indeed, the site is one which the NHS has not ruled out adding to. With Ida Darwin being adjacent to the Fulbourn Hospital and no definite relocation plan for the hospital, it would not be appropriate to include a gypsy and traveller site a short distance from so many vulnerable people. This is not an appropriate place to establish a travellers' site.</p>
25664 25756 26076 - Fulbourn Parish Council 28619 29001	Object	<p>It states in Fulbourn Newsletter that a pitch will have a day and wash room and 'up to 3 caravans'. One supposes that these three caravans will be the homes of 3 other families? It is likely that they might have children who require school places. Has this been taken into consideration and will any such children be in full time education? Provision on an ad hoc basis will make for difficulties for local schools and the situation must be anticipated and formalised. Surely it would not be unreasonable to make full time school attendance for school aged traveller children a condition of occupancy together with meeting the usual Council and other service charges that house owners have to meet. Whilst the Primary School currently has availability, the demographics of the village (new Swifts estate, Thomas Road, etc.) show that this will not be so in the near future. The schools will be filled to capacity & there is little possibility of expanding. Both Fulbourn Primary School and Bottisham Village College have extended their buildings to their maximum allowance. Both schools would find it hard to cope with an influx of extra children that such a development might bring. Fulbourn Primary School has limited space to expand.</p>
26846	Object	<p>Land ownership</p> <p>The land is currently Crown property. It should continue as such, and be allocated only on a tenancy basis as suggested above. The tenancy should be for named individuals, and only transferrable on the same basis as any other resident on the overall site.</p>
25562 28609	Object	<p>The site would increase in size in the future - refer Fen Road, Chesterton and Smithy Fen, Cottenham. It would be like 'Bees to a honey pot'. It's clear over the decades that minorities migrate to existing communities. This will inevitably lead to travelling travellers increasing the proposed site irrespective of planning rules.</p>
24802 26781 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	<p>Whilst the small number of pitches proposed to be located as Ida Darwin is welcomed if any pitches have to be provided at all, it is argued that having five pitches only within the area will be impracticable if a site manager is to visit the site regularly as set out in Government guidance. It is questioned as to whether a site accommodating only five pitches would be economically viable to manage. It is also questioned whether this issues has been addressed. Have the travelling community input into the suggestion of this site as it seems a little odd in terms of scale and location?</p>
28620	Object	<p>Affordable houses for travellers rather than pitches</p> <p>Need to find how many Travellers would prefer to be in a local authority or private housing.</p> <p>The Fulbourn site an opportunity to offer five families in Fulbourn a permanent home within a residential development</p> <p>It is unclear whether any of the five pitches in Fulbourn are designed for permanent occupation ?</p> <p>The Fulbourn site is not large and the plan suggests that between 250 and 275 homes are proposed with 'a potential to include a small 'Gypsy and Traveller site'. Are any if the 250 homes local authority owned or is it proposed that it will be affordable homes for local people built by a developer? What market is the target group for these properties, could not five be offered to Traveller families who seek to settle? This would be a progressive answer and obviate the need for a pitched site.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23528 23878 24778 25665 25755 26011 26073 - Fulbourn Parish Council 26120 26121 26780 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust 26863 28622 28665	Object	<p>This location would seem to conflict with the adopted Green Belt policies - GB/1; GB/2; GB/3. Even though the Ida Darwin site is a previously developed site within the green belt it is still a green belt site and is not suitable for large-scale development such as that proposed through the LDF. We do not believe that special circumstances have been demonstrated that would justify a significant development taking place within this location. Even if special circumstances were demonstrated by the Council it is questionable how a development the size proposed and a G & T site could be developed on the footprint. Once cleared, this site should return to greenbelt. We would like to see the whole site cleared and returned to open countryside and/or playing fields thereby making it a more clearly recognisable part of Fulbourn's western Green Belt. The purpose of the green belt in this location is to prevent the coalescence of Fulbourn with Cherry Hinton (Cambridge) and needs to be regarded as sacrosanct. The site is part of the masterplan for the Fulbourn Hospital and Ida Darwin Site. This masterplan protects the Green Belt and, therefore, only the current footprint can be used for development although the location of the footprint can be negotiated. There are weaknesses evident in the policy documents which put forward this site as an option. The closure or moving of the Ida Darwin hospital offers an opportunity to reinstate this gap that has been eroded since the hospital was built. Its uses are limited and prescribed and should not be the normal choice for the proposed purpose. For 250-275 houses and a gypsy site to be built on this green belt site previously developed or not would be wholly inappropriate.</p>
23512 25208 25563 25758 25872 26008 26016 26075 - Fulbourn Parish Council 26862 27352 28667	Object	<p>With a possible site for 5 travellers pitches to be developed on the site apparently the consultation would be for 5 pitches with each containing a day room? and wash room? together with a garden and up to 3 caravans, this would be a total of 15 caravans. In addition planning permission would be needed to subdivide each pitch - could be divided into 3 resulting in 45 caravans. 3.5 residents per caravan could mean 157.5 individuals who would put pressure on the facilities in Fulbourn. Impact on existing local residents. Suggest that locals be allowed to have caravans in their gardens to supplement their pensions. The centre of Fulbourn does include a chemist, post office and school. Fulbourn surgery is only a branch surgery. The recreation ground is at the far west end of the village a good distance from the proposed development. The nearest services to this proposal are in Cherry Hinton and Tesco not the centre of Fulbourn. Its location, closer to Cherry Hinton and Tesco's than it is to Fulbourn High Street, means that new residents would shop away from the village. It is unlikely that our village shops and other services would benefit from the development of this site. New residents would therefore be a drain on the village resources without contributing to village economy and community. We are worried about the impact it will have on our quality of life and sense of security. What studies have been undertaken to demonstrate that the local infrastructure, such as schools and doctors, could cope with the need generated by the development of the Ida Darwin site? There will be extra pressure put on the services we offer in Fulbourn. We already have had a massive new development at The Swifts in Haggis Gap. Fulbourn is a friendly village and has already increased in size, which has affected the traffic, the pressure in our school and noise pollution / litter. We do not want Fulbourn to change any further; we are already losing our identity. Additional medical facilities, refuse collections, extra policing, additional school places will be needed if a site for travellers is included in the development of Ida Darwin site. The Health Centre in Fulbourn is not a stand alone practice but a satellite service of a Cambridge based practice and major funding would need to be made available to attract a GP practice to the village. It is extremely hard to obtain appointments now but with increase of numbers from the proposed development this will get worse, putting patients health at risk. If this site is to be developed and the footprint as it stands it to be used, why not develop it as facilities for sport / recreation etc. for the existing large village of Fulbourn. A pleasant park please not more houses. Rubbish generated by the travellers can be perceived problem amongst the general public. Details of the policy on arrangements for and funding of refuse collections or obligations on residents to dispose of it themselves, would help allay villages worries about the visual and health implications. Misguidedly people do associate law breaking with travellers. Thomas Road area of Fulbourn has crime / anti social behaviour, both amongst local youths and between themselves and gangs in Cherry Hinton. It would be unfortunate if wrong judgements about the culprits were made by villagers each time a crime was committed. To protect new residents caught in between them both from wrongful accusations and from being embraced by the misdemeanant fraternity I feel consideration should be given to a much stronger police presence in the form of a local base.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25759 26017 26079 - Fulbourn Parish Council 26124 26865 29000	Object	We would like to comment on the wisdom of placing a traveller's site at the proposed development. We would question whether the location is favoured by the G & T community. There are no other travelling communities near to Fulbourn. Fulbourn does not have any historic links with this section of the community and generally it is recognised that the north of the county has attracted travellers because of the seasonable work undertaken. In addition G & Ts have stated previously that they have a preference for rural locations. A site such as this, sandwiched between the City of Cambridge and a rural centre, is hardly rural. The road links to the site are dangerous which would make it difficult for travellers to come and go from the site with their large vehicles and caravans. We would again reiterate the ability of the Ida Darwin site to provide an adequate buffer. What is your policy for managing the site and managing relations with travellers and local residents, and who will be responsible for these?
28608	Object	Integration within development Site too near houses. Reduction in property values is a valid objection if you live near a travellers site.
23962 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Cambridge City Council objects to the allocation of the Ida Darwin site for permanent pitch provision, favouring instead the provision of a transit site combined with a health facility for Gypsies and Travellers at this site. Such an approach would be more appropriate as it would allow families to move to the site to allow them easy access to health facilities when it is needed.
23464 23919 23928 24640 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust 25666 25754 25757 26013 26074 - Fulbourn Parish Council 26122 28666 28999	Object	The access road to the site is extremely narrow with difficult junctions, and with extra traffic this will become very congested and dangerous. The majority of traffic will use the Cambridge Road via Hinton Road which is an accident blackspot. The road into Cambridge, which this road leads into, is also very congested, particularly in the rush hours. The right hand turn onto the main road is already quite dangerous and with extra traffic this will increase. Part of the road leading to the proposed site for housing / Gypsy pitches has recently been marked with double yellow lines, indicating that traffic is already heavy and parking of any kind unsuitable for safety reasons. With more houses and the occupants of which using this road safety will be compromised. The access roads and junctions are not suitable for increased traffic movements. Such is the nature of the proposed site access arrangements that any G/T site would need to be located immediately adjacent to the main site access point from Fulbourn Old Drift if the access road is to cater for the type and nature of traffic that would be associated with such a use. This is considered to be undesirable and inappropriate on highway grounds. It is also thought to be undesirable on visual grounds and that of failing to provide an integrated community as is detailed elsewhere in the representations submitted. The suggestion by your officer at an earlier meeting that a road could be put through to Cambridge Road, presumably using even more green belt land strikes me as irresponsible. Regarding the comment about easy access to Cambridge etc. Has a profile of the intended groups to inhabit the area been undertaken? For example, you state that there is easy public transport access to Cambridge, but given the nature of the travelling community is this actually needed? The distance from the main high street in Fulbourn will mean people will use cars to get into the village thereby generating more traffic congestion. Footpath access to site is bad again encouraging people to use cars. The public transport provision for Fulbourn would need to be improved.
23522 24775 26782 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust 26866 28599	Object	I am sorry to say that mixing housing with a traveller's site will never work as travellers will always be moving around the area so they will not want to make roots in one place, so I would be interested to know how this would work. What steps has the council taken to promote 'cohesion between settled and travelling communities' apart forcing local communities to accept sites they do not want. In the interests of integration, travellers should be offered sites scattered amongst all other dwellings, not discrete site. Could then use communal areas on same basis as other residents. Travellers should use modern mobile or static trailers with toilet and washing facilities with metered electricity, water, and sewerage facilities. No amenity buildings would then be required. They should be offered, in preference, houses with parking for a touring caravan, no different from those provided for any other potential resident. The reasons for these suggestions are: based on equality of treatment with any other citizen; ensuring current sanitary and public health standards can be maintained by ensuring modern trailers are used; and ensuring sites are easily returned for use by the wider community. It is considered that the possible site for G/Ts, located between the proposed sole vehicular access to the site and the Steiner School to the West and in close proximity to Fulbourn Old Drift to the South, is not an appropriate location as it would not secure any integration with the remainder of the site. Should it be considered appropriate for the G/T sites to be located off a private road serving the Cook/Chill building, then it is similarly thought that this would be an isolated position which would not be truly integrated with the remainder of the site. The access would be separate from that to the residential area but off a private roadway.
28598	Object	The proposed site would be better utilized within the hospital sector i.e. convalescence home, old people's residence with landscaped gardens as there are such a shortage of places for the elderly.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25207 26014 26077 - Fulbourn Parish Council	Object	Given the current economic climate the developer will require the biggest number of houses on the site to pay for the additional schools, access roads, medical facilities etc to make development viable. Questions are raised as to the deliverability of this proposal. Should there be development on the Ida Darwin site, it would have to comply with the masterplan. In addition the redevelopment being mooted is for mixed development to include homes for private sale to enable provision of 40% affordable housing to be built. Adding pitches for travellers may make this unviable. Given the already limited footprint that development can be built on within a Green Belt site, and the significant footprint that a G & T site would use, adding pitches for travellers may make the proposal unviable causing the needed affordable housing to be lost and as such unable to comply with planning policy. Any new development with emphasis on affordable housing should have a system of ensuring occupation by those with need and a link to the parish.
26837	Object	Housing need The council seems to be focussed on providing housing for key workers and the travelling community. Is there a policy that caters for people at the other end of the social spectrum? Specifically, as a Fulbourn resident I am frustrated at the lack of high end housing in the area, with one such development being targeted to exclude people.
28621	Object	Too few pitches to be viable There has to be a question mark about the sustainability of the Fulbourn site, acknowledged in the Consultation Document as being 'smaller than others included as options;
25841 - English Heritage 26009	Object	At the Ida Darwin Hospital site the gypsy and traveller pitches should not be within the 'green wedges' of undeveloped land at the west end of the site and as noted in our letter of 11th December 2008 it will be important to ensure that this wedge remains of sufficient size to achieve the purpose of protecting the setting. Please remember Fulbourn is a village, a large village, and we are close enough to Cambridge as it is. The proposed development will bring us closer and the village will lose its identity.
24791 26783 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust 29002 29005	Object	The provision of a travellers' site will adversely affect the appearance of the local area. The site sits on low ground and will be visible from the direct route between Cherry Hinton and Fulbourn. This contravenes the CLG Good Practice Guide for Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites which states that a site "should also provide visual and acoustic privacy". It is currently a beautiful and tranquil location and any future plans should aim to protect not destroy our local landscape. The location would have a negative impact on the immediate area, especially for residents in Hinton Road and Thomas Road. This is in contravention of CLG Good Practice Guide for Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites which states that "there should not be an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of nearby residents or the appearance or character of the surrounding area." In addition to having a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the Green Belt in this locality, it is considered that the location of five G/T pitches immediately alongside the only access into the Ida Darwin housing development would not be a selling point for the scheme nor is it likely to find favour with the adjacent Steiner School. Also owing to the much larger area of hard standings within G/T sites and correspondingly less vegetation this would have a significant detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.
24819 28880	Support	Support.
23593 24496	Support	I agree with the proposed number of pitches for this site which although small would provide good access to Cambridge and lies just off the main routes of A14 and A11 accessible for travellers who would be towing vehicles. This is a good site with good transport links and close to amenities. School places available in this area of Cambridge. Green belt land already designated for development therefore would avoid developing any new green belt land. Is there not space for 10 pitches?
<i>Sites 9 to 17 - Willingham</i>		
26794 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Flooding A number of these sites are subject to river flooding and/or include areas susceptible to surface water flooding based upon the latest information produced by the Environment Agency. It is suggested that South Cambridgeshire District Council obtain further advice from the Agency about how these issues could be addressed if these sites are to be brought forward.
28882	Comment	Six of these have temporary consent, why? One is unauthorised so where is the enforcement? And two are private land -except it doesn't say if they have planning perm.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24023 - Irish Traveller Movement in Britain	Object	Irish Traveller Movement in Britain believe Willingham is a case for the unfair treatment of Irish Travellers in Cambridge. Many Gypsy families were able to move from houses to sites when this was developed and so we would like to see full provision for Irish Travellers in any further developed areas.
24830 - Cambridgeshire County Council 24856 - Over Parish Council 25347 25348 27152 29099 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	Impact on local services - schools; doctors etc - By increasing the number of sites there will be increased pressure on the existing services in Willingham. Concern that there will need to be appropriate funding to provide for these services. The County Council is currently experiencing pressure on primary school places in Willingham. A scheme to extend the primary school to provide a total of 420 places currently underway in response to the existing pressures arising from house building and population growth. This is the County Council's preferred maximum size for a primary school. Additional sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in Willingham area would add to these pressures and the school might not be able to provide for the numbers of children involved. Given this, the County Council requests that the District Council contact the Authority to have further discussions given the apparent uncertainty about the availability of school places and any future funding
25053 25293 26839 27153	Object	Willingham already has a large settled travelling community and there does not need to be more sites allocated in the village. More sites in Willingham than in the new proposed Northstowe with over 3 times the population. This does not make sense. Concern that there will be an influx of Travellers into the village as happened in Cottenham.
25346	Object	(Sites 10 to 17 Willingham) Infrastructure - generally the roads through Willingham are subject to traffic jams. We have already had to put up with 3 housing estates off the High Street and 1 off Rampton Road. Any further housing developments would make this major problem in our village worse.
28920	Object	Small numbers in Smithey Fen, in relation to the housing in the Fen which was scattered and very low density, work okay. Putting two sites within a few fields distance of each other is asking for trouble, and trouble came to the Fen, so don't do this in Willingham your ideas there are terrible, sorry but they are. They will lead to another Smithey Fen site and more millions of pounds wasted on legal costs.
27151	Object	Impact on environment My concerns are on pollution, landscape impact, conservation and wildlife,
25342	Object	(Sites 10 to 17 Willingham) Planning permission should not be given on Green Belt land.
28881	Object	Size and spacing The piecemeal approach to Schole Road, Priests Lane and Meadow Road will, in my experience, risk ending up like Smithey Fen Travellers end up occupying land that is not theirs and using it, or land that is theirs but has no planning permission. These scattered sites will coalesce with each other and create a big big site without planning permission. I don't think this is going to work at all. The proposal is for too many. Willingham should have some 15 pitches, set near the houses not away from them and with access to good bus links and so on, then it would work.
23442 24497 24820	Support	Support for having sites in Willingham. Adding to an existing site is a much better idea than creating more sites. Additional space for a site is created and the travellers can form a sense of community with those already based there. This area is able to support more pitches better than Fen Road Chesterton with much more space and better transport links and closer to main village.
27396 27397 27398	Support	Support for sites being granted permanent status from people who either live on or have relatives living on these sites in Willingham.

Site 9 - Grange Park, Foxes Meadow, Iram Drove (Off Priest Lane) Willingham

25519 - Waterbeach, Swaffham and Old West Drainage Boards	Comment	The Board would wish to see that there is suitable surface water accommodation works and foul sewerage systems incorporated in any approved site. Ditches that are the responsibility of the riparian landowner adjacent to the proposed sites should be kept clean and free flowing. If any new access is required by culverting any adjacent watercourse, a consent will be required directly from the Board.
---	---------	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25884 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed. Consult IDB.
27408	Support	The respondent and her family have lived in the area for over 40 years and on this particular site for over 5 years. Close family members have lived here historically. The children within the extended family access local schools and are all registered with GP. The children are active in the local community. The family have good relationships with other travellers in the area. The family has already had to be relocated giving up what they considered home when they were forcibly moved from Cottenham. To move again would damage the respondent's health and cause the family severe emotional distress. The family support the issues and options recommendations to grant permanent licences to families living within the Willingham area where they have developed a strong sense of belonging.

Site 10 - Plots 1 & 2 Cadwin Lane, Schole Road, Willingham

25885 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed. Consult DC Engineer re Award Drain.
25343	Object	Infrastructure - Schole Road (Sites 10-12) is not a tarmac road, it is full of pot-holes and further traffic would make this worse.
24060	Object	<p>Schole Road is it Bridleway or Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT) or Road Used as a Public Path (RUPP)? No one can confirm from within SCDC reps at Willingham meetings, local signage suggests Bridleway as does O/S map.</p> <p>Should the proposal be accepted then new speed humps, designated footpaths, tarmac surface end to end and 20 mph speed limit need to be provided</p> <p>Without these basic items an incident is waiting to happen along with rising tension between existing residents and the travellers over their attitude to their neighbours who they have to pass for access.</p> <p>In summary traffic volumes and speeding are not acceptable under this proposed increase in travellers numbers.</p>
23443	Support	I fully support additional sites in Willingham. Adding to a site will serve better than creating a new one.
27404 27406	Support	<p>Support this land as a permanent site - support from Travellers currently living on the site and settled into the community with children at the local school and registered at local medical centre. The site offers a sense of security as extended family live close by. The site is secure, gated and fenced and approached via a no through road - children are safe to play here.</p> <p>The families consider this site to be home and are keen to get the security of a licence to enhance the condition on the site and improve the physical appearance. Elderly family members are also resident on the site.</p> <p>The site is within easy access to the local shops and medical health care, play groups etc and well screened from the local road.</p> <p>They would have nowhere else to move to if asked to leave.</p>

Site 11 - Plots 3 & 4 Cadwin Lane, Schole Road, Willingham

25886 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed. Consult DC Engineer re Award Drain.
25344	Object	Infrastructure - Schole Road (Sites 10-12) is not a tarmac road, it is full of pot-holes and further traffic would make this worse.
24061	Object	<p>Schole Road is it Bridleway-BOAT or RUPP??? no one can confirm from within SCDC reps at Willingham meetings, local signage suggests Bridleway as does O/S map.</p> <p>Should the proposal be accepted then new speed humps, designated footpaths, tarmac surface end to end and 20 mph speed limit need to be provided</p> <p>Without these basic items an incident is waiting to happen along with rising tension between existing residents and the travellers over their attitude to their neighbours who they have to pass for access.</p> <p>In summary traffic volumes and speeding are not acceptable under this proposed increase in travellers numbers.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------

Site 12 - Plots 5 & 6 Cadwin Lane, Schole Road, Willingham

25887 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed. Consult DC Engineer re Award Drain.
24062	Object	The current travellers do impact upon Schole Road surface and users not as stated in your summary. Through their speed and driving activities they destroy the surface and its patched up by certain properties to remove pot holes. Should the number of vehicles increase as proposed then the surface and speed humps need to be improved all along Schole Road especially at the Rampton Road intersection where entry and exit speeds are totally unacceptable and waiting for a serious accident to happen.
25345	Object	Infrastructure - Schole Road (Sites 10-12) is not a tarmac road, it is full of pot-holes and further traffic would make this worse.
23444	Support	Adding to existing sites and areas is a better way of managing travellers.

Site 13 - Land to Rear of Long Acre and Green Acres, Meadow Road, Willingham

25520 - Waterbeach, Swaffham and Old West Drainage Boards	Comment	The Board would wish to see that there is suitable surface water accommodation works and foul sewerage systems incorporated in any approved site. Ditches that are the responsibility of the riparian landowner adjacent to the proposed sites should be kept clean and free flowing. If any new access is required by culverting any adjacent watercourse, a consent will be required directly from the Board.
25888 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed. Consult DC Engineer re Award Drain. Consult IDB.
23932	Object	Too near populated area.

Site 14 - Land to Rear of Long Acre, Meadow Road (1), Willingham

25521 - Waterbeach, Swaffham and Old West Drainage Boards	Comment	The Board would wish to see that there is suitable surface water accommodation works and foul sewerage systems incorporated in any approved site. Ditches that are the responsibility of the riparian landowner adjacent to the proposed sites should be kept clean and free flowing. If any new access is required by culverting any adjacent watercourse, a consent will be required directly from the Board.
25889 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed. Consult DC Engineer re Award Drain. Consult IDB.

Site 15 - Land to Rear of Long Acre, Meadow Road (2), Willingham

25522 - Waterbeach, Swaffham and Old West Drainage Boards	Comment	The Board would wish to see that there is suitable surface water accommodation works and foul sewerage systems incorporated in any approved site. Ditches that are the responsibility of the riparian landowner adjacent to the proposed sites should be kept clean and free flowing. If any new access is required by culverting any adjacent watercourse, a consent will be required directly from the Board.
25890 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed. Consult DC Engineer re Award Drain. Consult IDB.

Site 16 - Site of Storage/Agricultural Buildings East of Long Acre, Meadow Road

25891 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage and potential ground contamination details being agreed. Consult IDB.
----------------------------	---------	---

Site 16 - Site of Storage/Agricultural Buildings East of Long Acre, Meadow Road

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25523 - Waterbeach, Swaffham and Old West Drainage Boards	Comment	<p>The Board would wish to see that there is suitable surface water accommodation works and foul sewerage systems incorporated in any approved site.</p> <p>Ditches that are the responsibility of the riparian landowner adjacent to the proposed sites should be kept clean and free flowing.</p> <p>If any new access is required by culverting any adjacent watercourse, a consent will be required directly from the Board.</p>
25058	Object	My main concern is site 16 Meadow Road Willingham as once one pitch is approved on this large area it could potentially expand as sites rear of Long Acre are looking to do so.

Site 17 - The Oaks, Meadow Road, Willingham

25524 - Waterbeach, Swaffham and Old West Drainage Boards	Comment	<p>The Board would wish to see that there is suitable surface water accommodation works and foul sewerage systems incorporated in any approved site.</p> <p>Ditches that are the responsibility of the riparian landowner adjacent to the proposed sites should be kept clean and free flowing.</p> <p>If any new access is required by culverting any adjacent watercourse, a consent will be required directly from the Board.</p>
25892 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed. Consult IDB.
27394 27395	Support	<p>Support for this site being made into a permanent site from Traveller who is currently living on this site.</p> <p>The respondent has lived on her plot for many years now, and very much wants to stay. She has well established links to the local area where she enjoys employment with a local foster association as a support care worker. Were she forced to move this might be difficult to pursue. Not only that, but she also runs her own business on the land: breeding dogs. Her life and work is completely based in the area, where she has both friends and family; she feels that she has the full support of the local community. She does her shopping nearby, goes to her local GP and makes use of public transport. She doesn't want to leave her home - she would have nowhere to move to and would have to live on a roadside.</p> <p>As for the respondent's actual plot, it is well kept, well secured, and has proper boundaries. It is large enough for her to have other family members come to visit, without disturbing the community. The plot is also ideally situated, as it is far enough from local residents so as not to disrupt them, but is still within manageable walking distance to the town. The land is not on a flood plain, nor can it be seen from the road.</p>

Site 18 - Land at Spring Lane, Bassingbourn

24832 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	<p>Access to local services</p> <p>As the Bassingbourn Primary School is potentially facing rising school rolls and is at capacity for certain age groups the County Council requests that the District Council contact the Authority to have further discussions in relation to the proposed inclusion of the new pitches at Spring Lane, Bassingbourn given the apparent uncertainty about the availability of school places and any future funding.</p>
28664	Comment	Land Grab - It is disturbing that an owner of an orchard in Cottenham had this destroyed by sewerage pipes laid illegally by Travellers. Will Travellers similarly commandeer land in Bassingbourn?
25893 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed. Consult DC Engineer re local drains.
23637	Comment	<p>I object to site 18 with respect to lack of information. How can Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth villagers respond to an incomplete proposal?</p> <p>Is the site to be permanent or temporary?</p> <p>Is the site to be managed or not?</p> <p>Is the site to be private or council owned?</p> <p>Would the initial site be expanded later?</p> <p>Staff at the Limes presentation event could not answer these questions. No one is sufficiently informed for the proposal to go ahead, neither council nor villagers.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26792 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	Flooding This site is also susceptible to surface water flooding based upon the latest information produced by the Environment Agency (July 2009). It is recommended that South Cambridgeshire District Council obtain further advice from the Agency about the flooding issues affecting this site.
26693 - North Hertfordshire District Council	Comment	Site 18, South of Bassingbourn is the only preferred site proximate to North Hertfordshire, however, as the site is only five pitches and the services and facilities are provided within Bassingbourn any potential impacts from the development are likely to be minor.
25511	Comment	I believe that the farmer would lose his livelihood as a result of the development.
24315 24943 25078 25500 25505 25719 25954	Object	Impact on environment - There will be an increase in noise pollution if the site is developed both from within the site from generators and along Spring Lane with the associated increase in traffic using the lane.
24940 - Whaddon Parish Council	Object	Whaddon PC has been in contact with Bassingbourn PC and the Action Group set up in relation to the proposed Traveller site in Spring Lane. Whaddon PC shares their concerns about this site and fully supports the stance being taken by Bassingbourn on these proposals.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23495	Object	Drainage concerns - Spring Lane is named because of the number of springs in that road. The groundwater level is very high in this area.
23500		
23625		There has been a problem with flooding in the area in the past -particularly in the winter of 2001. Construction of a large area of hard standing could result in increased run-off and further flooding. The current surface water drainage is not adequate for the existing community and would need to be improved if the site was to be developed.
23657		
23664		The site should ideally need to be linked to the main drainage which is not the case at present and to connect to this would be costly and also damaging to the environment.
23672		
23680		If any dangerous chemicals or fuels are kept at the site heavy rainfall could be polluted and either runoff along the lane or go through the chalk to the springs beneath thereby polluting the source of drinking water for the village.
23690		
23706		
23714		
23726		
23730		
23746		
23757		
23769		
23776		
24040		
24048		
24050		
24182		
24202		
24208		
24272		
24282		
24289		
24292		
24296		
24302		
24346		
24408		
24426 - DV and JA Pettitt		
24446		
24458		
24473		
24680		
24862		
24924		
25050		
25073		
25080		
25087		
25093		
25110		
25226		
25269		
25311		
25406		
25434		
25446		
25453		
25464		
25469		
25476		
25517		
25529		
25567		
25721		
25733		
25795		
25815		
25862		
25970		
26041		
26129		
26289		
26590		
26619		
26656		
26659		
26730		
26758		
27007		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
27346 28660 28743		
23651 23668 23676 23687 23703 23711 23724 23738 23750 23762 23765 23784 23801 23802 24353 24401 24413 24431 - DV and JA Pettitt 24432 24439 24451 24467 24688 25477 25766 25871 25967 25984 26766	Object	Road widening - Access to the proposed site in Spring Lane is currently single track, this will have to be enlarged to enable access, the cost of this will be substantial with the associated disruption to the local community as well as the effect on wildlife being environmentally damaging.
25221 25813 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	Not clear if proposed site will enable Travellers to carry on a business from the site. If this is allowed it will have an impact on the surrounding area - traffic generation etc.
24405 24423 - DV and JA Pettitt 24443 24455 25475	Object	Impact on environment - As a partner of the farm on which the site is proposed, we have entered into various environmental schemes, with the support of Cambridgeshire County Council, to improve the area for the people of Bassingbourn and wildlife. This includes a lot of hedge restoration work in Spring Lane and planting a new wood on the edge of the village. This environmental work is having a significant positive effect, proved by a recent Bird Survey. The location of the site along one of these hedges would have an undoubted detrimental impact on the bird and wildlife populations in the area.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23605 23623 23645 23655 23663 23683 23691 23701 23718 23728 23732 23745 23763 23773 23777 23793 23826 23976 24042 24128 24137 24205 24279 24323 24533 24604 24646 24661 24723 24790 24922 24962 25091 25107 25114 25177 25229 25275 25315 25335 25531 25548 25712 25724 25765 25817 25864 25985 26043 26057 26136 26595 26690 26726 26760 26834 26843 26908 27034 27099 27109 28541 28704	Object	Public transport is poor to the village. There is no railway station. The bus service is limited. Only two services to/from Cambridge each day Monday to Friday with a limited two hourly service to/from Royston. No Cambridge service on Saturdays and two hourly service to/from Royston. No services on Sunday. The local bus service does not meet the criteria laid down in the guidelines. Ideally a site should be within 400 metres of a transport node (bus stop) with at least an hourly service. The proposed site is 900 metres away with only a two hourly service.
25231	Object	Area is rich in archaeology . Would need to be carefully surveyed and add to cost of site.
26066	Object	Access to local services The analysis of access to key and other amenities is flawed as it applies no weighting or importance to those listed. The significance of the site achieving 5 out the ten listed appears to have basis for taking decisions. The way in which the section is used is highly misleading in relation to the suitability of the proposed site.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23618 23977 24191 24196 24690 25228 25333 25695 26039 26054 26725 27104	Object	Distributor roads - South Cambs District Council guidance indicates that preference should be given for sites located in close proximity to distributor roads and which do not impact on housing estates. This site completely contradicts those requirements.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23483 23487 23507 23515 23529 23599 23600 23603 23604 23608 23610 23615 23617 23643 23649 23673 23788 23790 23803 23808 23823 23824 23831 23853 23998 24003 24045 24138 24175 24176 24177 24209 24214 24231 24273 24277 24303 24304 24316 24318 24320 24531 24538 24549 24572 24574 24579 24683 24702 24930 24937 24946 24961 25018 25031 25037 25042 25047 25059 25060 25063 25076 25108 25109 25115 25123 25134 25136 25139 25140 25153 25155	Object	<p>Access - Spring Lane is a winding, no through road. It narrows to a single-track lane where the proposed site is planned. There are already difficulties encountered because of the narrowness with parked cars and large agricultural vehicles using the lane. Vehicles speeding down the lane would create problems.</p> <p>SCDC states a preference should be given to sites located on or near distributor roads avoiding housing estates. The lane is lined with residential development and the proposed site and the associated traffic that the site will generate is very likely to have a significant impact on the existing dwellings.</p> <p>The visibility at the end of the lane is bad and it will add to the problems of traffic safety in the High Street.</p> <p>Access to the site from the lane is unacceptable.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------

25168		
25170		
25179		
25222		
25247		
25249		
25251		
25255		
25260		
25264		
25276		
25280		
25289		
25309		
25339		
25341		
25354		
25407		
25438		
25440		
25442		
25461		
25466		
25471		
25488		
25498		
25509		
25513		
25530		
25537		
25540		
25547		
25549		
25634		
25691		
25705		
25710		
25725		
25731		
25737		
25739		
25761		
25930		
25952		
25959		
25961		
25994		
26031		
26046		
26633		
26651		
26682		
26688		
26733		
26746		
26757		
26835		
26998		
27005		
27073		
27146		
27345		
28548		
28653		
28657		
28693		
28731		
28742		
29144		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23612 23860 23972 25025 25144 25474 25507 26589	Object	Concern at the impact on pedestrians of the proposals. With the increase in traffic generated by the site there is an even greater need for a pedestrian crossing on the High Street. There is currently no pavement for pedestrians along Spring Lane to walk safely .
23460 25154 25185 25224 25437 25533	Object	Site location - Proposed location of the site is not ideal being on the edge of the village . Not preferred location for travellers to feel part of community. Must be a more suitable site in Bassingbourn which is not as remote and segregated. Such a site would be easier to manage which is important factor with Traveller sites. Sites are best if closely supervised.
23789	Object	I object to development outside the village framework. I object to it being made an exception, whereas sites which meet the criteria, but are within the Green Belt, are not being considered. Use of Green Belt is permissible under Government guidelines. North and East Hertfordshire's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (June 2006) states: "Council members thought the same planning rules and considerations should apply to gypsy and travellers as they do to other residents." Why is SCDC not following this same "level playing field" philosophy?
25124 25245 - Bassingbourn Affordable Housing Group 25246 - Bassingbourn Affordable Housing Group 25594 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	The selection of this site is flawed because the process for selecting it is different from and less rigorous than that normally adopted for selecting sites on an exception basis for local affordable housing. Government advice indicates that they should be the same.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23505	Object	Impact on the environment - The proposed site will alter the character of the lane and have an impact on this rural landscape.
23508		
23634		
23644		Development of the site will involve damage to, or the destruction of, part of one of the few mature hedges in Bassingbourn especially as the road will have to be widened. In addition it will also involve the felling of number of mature trees with their associated invertebrates.
23674		The hedgerows and verges are full of wild grasses and flowers. Bats and rare birds can be seen along the lane.
23787		
23796		Creating the site will also damage the aquatic life in the pond and springs, which give the lane its name and could result in pollution of these springs and the groundwater.
23817		
23855		
23973		Village people have taken part in clearing the site after the illegal encampment by travellers was removed from the lane and Ashwell Stret. The community has subsequently helped to plant the woods and trees along the lane giving them a sense of ownership and pride in the area and an interest in keeping the environment attractive and cared for. The trees planted are now beginning to mature. Many enjoy walking along the lane to experience a countryside walk and to see its flora and fauna. If the proposed site was to go ahead there is the risk that the community would abandon the areas and that it would again deteriorate.
24054		
24169		
24174		
24183		
24286		
24294		
24297		
24309		
24310		
24701		
24707		
24744		
24864		
24920		
24936		
24960		
25019		
25043		
25064		
25099		
25111		
25116		
25145		
25157		
25180		
25192		
25216		
25241		
25242		
25244		
25250		
25253		
25261		
25262		
25268		
25281		
25291		
25445		
25452		
25470		
25472		
25482		
25487		
25506		
25516		
25566		
25711		
25720		
25728		
25738		
25740		
25763		
25767		
25794		
25867		
25873		
25908		
25951		
25964		
25969		
25979		
26036		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26051		
26132		
26591		
26627		
26637		
26655		
26671		
26674		
26681		
26709		
26729		
26737		
26740		
27028 - Litlington Parish Council		
27163		
27170		
27282		
28649		
28658		
27284 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>In response to South Cambridgeshire District Council 's invitation to participate in local democracy, a petition signed in excess of 1200 people is enclosed, opposing the selection of Spring Lane, Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth as a location for a proposed gypsy and traveller site.</p> <p>Taking into account not only the petition but all the previous activities during the consultation period, a 'listening Council' would have no other option but to remove Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth from the 20 proposed sites.</p>
23504	Object	The locating of a traveller site in this area would have an impact on house prices.
23834		
24326		
24944		
25074		
25213		
25565		
28540		
28613		
28696		
28720		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23497 23502 23602 23622 23660 23662 23682 23692 23707 23717 23727 23737 23744 23756 23770 23778 23829 23835 24041 24063 24187 24192 24198 24200 24227 24278 24350 24779 24787 24925 24938 25089 25095 25194 25314 25436 25443 25450 25457 25478 25490 25496 25532 25557 25814 25860 25909 25910 25986 26044 26058 26128 26762 26844 26912 27074 27347 28542 28611 28651 28697 28703 28721	Object	<p>Impact on local services - Concern at the impact on the local services in Bassingbourn if the proposed site is developed. Pressure on local services from existing population.</p> <p>The food store in the village is only a small convenience store with limited choice of fresh produce and has high prices.</p> <p>The doctor's surgery is a satellite of Ashwell and does not have a full range of services.</p> <p>Class sizes in the school are already high. The local schools do already serve the Whaddon Travellers site and also the Army Barracks where families are often in transit. An additional traveller's site will put even greater pressure on the school community's ability to absorb, integrate and settle-in transient pupils.</p> <p>Cost of additional policing that may be needed.</p>
24404 24406 24422 - DV and JA Pettitt 24424 - DV and JA Pettitt 24442 24444 24454 24456	Object	<p>Impact on amenity - As a partner of the farm on which the site is proposed, we have entered into various environmental schemes with the support of Cambridgeshire County Council to improve the area for the people of Bassingbourn. We have created various permissive paths joining existing footpaths so that people can do a circular walk including Spring Lane. These are in constant use by families, dog walkers, etc. The construction of the proposed site would cause considerable disruption to the area, preventing people being able complete these walks.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25595 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>Loss of Agricultural Land</p> <p>Policy NE/17 Protecting high Quality Agricultural Land states that "The District Council will not grant planning permission for development which would lead to irreversible loss of Grades 1, 2 or 3A agricultural Land unless: a) land is allocated for development in the LDF or b) Sustainability considerations and the need for the development are sufficient to override the need to protect the agricultural value of the land.</p> <p>It is submitted that the proposed development of the Spring Lane site is not in the LDF and as the Issues and Options 2 Report proposes to select 88 sites of 149 consulted there is no grounds for overriding the policy.</p>
24407 24418 24425 - DV and JA Pettitt 24437 24445 24457	Object	<p>The land on which the site is proposed is currently in an environmental stewardship scheme, with Natural England. As a partner of the farm on which the site is proposed, I object to the possibility of taking productive arable land, which is being farmed in an environmentally friendly manner, out of production when potential brown field sites exist. This occurred with the site at Mettle Hill in Meldreth. This site now lies derelict, is an eyesore and is unlikely to ever be returned to production.</p>
23484 23494 24685 25020 25021 25122 25622 25723 27029 - Litlington Parish Council 27100 27341 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>Integrating Travellers into the community - Concern at how the Traveller and settled community will integrate in Bassingbourn. By putting the site at the end of a single-track lane where this residential community contains a number of vulnerable members of society such as the elderly this may cause problems. Also there will be concerns from people who experienced the last illegal encampment in this area.</p> <p>The Traveller community could feel isolated on the edge of the village.</p> <p>If money has to be spent to provide facilities for a new Traveller's site and strain is placed on local village amenities such as the schools and medical facilities the existing settled community may feel resentment creating a 'them and us' situation.</p>
25451 25458 25997	Object	<p>Concern at the number of pitches proposed and the impact of them.</p>
28543	Object	<p>Integration of travellers into community</p> <p>Bassingbourn is a socially mixed community, with a strong sense of community acceptance and tolerance. I accept that different people have different priorities and lifestyles. In Bassingbourn we meet this range of preferences whilst staying within the confines of our laws, and mutually agreed codes of behaviour, that sustain a healthy community. Whilst accepting that some people want to live in caravans I have to ask if they want to be included as part of the community, or whether they would rather be separate. We welcome travelling families who have now chosen to live in houses around the village. I hope as a community we would welcome people who want to become part of our integrated community.</p>
24051 24052 24210 24283 24285 25024 28659	Object	<p>There is a problem with the sewage system in the village. Development of this site will increase these problems.</p> <p>If the site goes ahead then there would be a need for additional sewage tankers going to and from the sewage treatment works in Guise Lane. This already is a problem in the village.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23499 23619 23809 23822 23833 23859 23979 23999 24046 24181 24189 24194 24274 24308 24322 24354 24785 25032 25075 25086 25203 25230 25252 25254 25265 25277 25336 25405 25538 25694 25792 25819 26040 26055 26201 26685 26719 26906	Object	Access for emergency vehicles would be a problem if the site was to be developed. Access down a single track lane is unsuitable and the lane is not wide enough to allow emergency service vehicles access since these vehicles need an access road a minimum of 3.7 metre wide.
23854	Object	I hope the council live up to there name and listen to the people of Bassingbourn

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23496	Object	There are few employment opportunities within Bassingbourn and extremely poor transport links from the village to larger settlements where there may be more jobs available.
23656		
23665		Bassingbourn is essentially a commuter village most "working" occupants travelling more than 2 kilometres to work.
23679		
23689		There is now no requirement for casual agricultural labour - the main reason for travellers in the past.
23698		
23708		
23719		
23733		
23747		
23753		
23768		
23775		
23825		
24043		
24224		
24281		
24391		
24686		
24921		
25085		
25097		
25103		
25120		
25141		
25151		
25189		
25220		
25585 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth	Action Group	
25734		
25818		
25865		
25990		
26126		
26641		
26663		
26734		
28600		
28691		
28705		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23791	Object	Cost of providing infrastructure - Concerns about who will pay for the cost of providing the entire infrastructure needed for the site and for the widening of the road. Concerned that it will have to be met by the local taxpayer and would lead to an increase in the taxes having to be paid or in the reduction of the services available locally?
23792		
23810		
24438		
24872		
24929		
25035		
25049		
25069		
25125		
25150		
25169		
25225		
25240		
25273		
25430		
25473		
25510		
25515		
25527		
25539		
25722		
25906		
25988		
26045		
26059		
26312		
26683		
26723		
26735		
26751		
27004		
27008		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23654 23666 23678 23688 23705 23713 23725 23734 23741 23758 23767 23781 24172 24234 24271 24291 24300 24351 24923 25051 25070 25084 25092 25131 25149 25193 25202 25239 25431 25481 25526 25707 25762 25816 25863 25874 25907 26038 26053 26130 26640 26662 26704 26732 26979 27071	Object	Loss of prime agricultural land - The proposed site is prime, productive agricultural land and is currently in an environmental stewardship scheme, with Natural England. Objections to taking productive arable land out of use. Bassingbourn is a transition village and as such committed to sustainable development. This is not a sustainable development on the grounds that it is using valuable good agricultural land (which is currently used for agriculture)
24047 24284 25223 25993 27072	Object	Impact on environment - There is no lighting further down Spring Lane and if this site was added this would change. This would add more light pollution to the village.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23506	Object	Lack of services to site - The site does not have any connection to the main utilities such as water, electric and drainage. To connect would be costly and cause even more damage to the character of the existing lane.
23624		
23804		
23816		
24001		
24053		
24170		
24171		
24203		
24298		
24299		
24411		
24420		
24430 - DV and JA Pettitt		
24449		
24461		
24682		
24692		
24867		
25039		
25044		
25066		
25079		
25188		
25248		
25283		
25310		
25433		
25439		
25449		
25456		
25462		
25467		
25483		
25501		
25504		
25528		
25541		
25546		
25635		
25696		
25700		
25706		
25709		
25771		
25963		
26638		
26657		
26660		
26687		
26736		
26759		
26910		
27006		
27075		
27106		
27168		
27348		
28652		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23486	Object	Safety of road to vulnerable users - The safety of Spring Lane for use by vulnerable members of the community will decline if the proposed travellers site is located here. Spring Lane and Knutsford Road are a retirement community along with the Papworth Trust residential care home. The doctor's surgery is located on the other side of Spring Lane. These units are on a blind bend. Local children are encouraged to walk and cycle to schools, which are at the other end of the village. They would have to cross a busier road. Some residents use the lane in their mobility scooters and a busier road will be unsafe.
23498		
23513		
23597		
23648		
23659		
23661		
23684		
23693		
23699		
23716		
23722		
23735		
23742		
23754		
23772		
23780		
23800		
23830		
23857		
24044		
24178		
24179		
24280		
24305		
24306		
24307		
24347		
24388		
24389		
24403		
24415		
24434		
24671		
24916		
24919		
25013		
25048		
25061		
25068		
25088		
25098		
25112		
25113		
25117		
25187		
25191		
25219		
25263		
25274		
25316		
25338		
25423		
25447		
25454		
25484		
25489		
25493		
25512		
25698		
25726		
25760		
25821		
25866		
25955		
25980		
25981		
25996		
26042		
26056		
26127		
26258		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26280 26588 26652 26684 26702 26703 26710 26731 26764 26931 27162 27166 28545 28656 28745		
25102	Object	<p>Poor transport</p> <p>From your own document 'Travellers' Needs Assessment' June 2006 one of the key findings states that 'work and travel are major reasons why Cambridgeshire is attractive to gypsies and travellers.</p> <p>Surveys have been undertaken (eg East Cambs who surveyed every gypsy family) and these conclude that 'for them being on a major route to transport and jobs and families is crucial'</p> <p>Spring Lane has poor transport connections and no employment opportunities and therefore cannot be considered to be meeting gypsy and travellers needs.</p>
28612	Object	<p>I strongly object to the site in Bassingbourn. Nor enough local housing for local people. These travellers are not local.</p>
27027 - Litlington Parish Council	Object	<p>Access</p> <p>Spring Lane is a metalled road which runs past the proposed gypsy and traveller site and provides the only road access to the site.</p> <p>In the past Travellers / gypsies have made illegal encampments in Spring Lane and extended this along Ashwell Stret and past Litlington towards Ashwell. There is evidence within living memory of Litlington residents of gypsies / travellers accessing the former illegal encampment in Spring Lane / Ashwell through the village of Litlington and residents are concerned that were the proposed site to go ahead it would again open up this route.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23805 23813 24059 24213 24225 24288 24314 24470 25065 25072 25142 25146 25195 25312 25444 25479 25555 25556 25631 25693 25770 25956 25957 25971 26260 26639 26661 26713 26724 26752 26885 27107 27171 28544 28654	Object	Need for Travellers site in area? - SCDC has not demonstrated the need for a traveller /gypsy site in Bassingbourn. The regional predict and provide mentality is not based on real evidence is essentially guesswork. SCDC is not following its own policy of demonstrating local need. There already exist a number of sites within the area - the site at Whaddon and the Travelling Showpeople site ; the currently unoccupied site at Mettle Hill. There is no evidence stating that Travellers wish to come to this area.
24963 25034 25036 25040 25138 25459 25736 27148 28883	Object	Objecting to the proposed site because it will have an impact on the surrounding area and is in an inappropriate location.
26063	Object	Site infrastructure The precise location of the site is not sufficiently well located with the result that inconsistent differences exist in the distances used to calculate notional costs. Upon review it is clear that the overall notional cost is underestimated. No provision has been made for the construction of a pedestrian footpath or cycle route. This is a further example of how the notional costing is understated. The approach reasoned in this representation indicated the notional cost is 50% higher than stated in the report.
23856 26767	Object	Cycling - Spring Lane is part of the proposed route for cycleway to Royston. Concern that the development of the proposed site will make this a more dangerous cycling route.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24441 24453 25038 25278 25284 25448 25455 25492 25499 25699 25903 - Litlington Parish Council 26694 26701 27161 27165 28695 28707 28719	Object	The road access into the site is not suitable for large lorries- the sort of vehicle favoured by travellers. The lane is already used by large agricultural vehicles due to there being a farm located at the end of the lane.
23514 23811 23812	Object	Rejected sites - other sites have been rejected. This proposed site could be rejected for similar reasons.
25232	Object	This is a high risk site and there is a requirement on the Council to carry out a proper risk assessment on all major decisions. Examples of risk are - damage to local environment; risk that development would harm amenity value of area; risk of flooding; risk of tension between settled and traveller communities; risk of accident on road; risk of fire; risk of Council having to take enforcement action if unauthorised business use on the site.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23493	Object	Impact on amenity - Villagers currently use Spring Lane as a route to the High Street, jogger, dog walkers, parents with young children etc currently all use this quiet country lane, this development will severely affect these activities.
23501		
23534		
23611		The proposed site is located adjacent to two recently planted woodlands on a no through road leading to a conservation area. This is a highly valued area to the community and used by many for walking, jogging, cyclists, horse riding etc. It forms part of a circular walk from the village going along Ashwell Stret.
23620		
23633		
23647		If the proposed site were to go ahead this would severely impact the safety and tranquillity of this much loved part of the village.
23653		
23669		
23685		
23696		
23700		
23715		
23721		
23731		
23743		
23755		
23764		
23779		
23786		
23794		
23797		
23798		
23799		
23821		
23828		
23843		
23861		
23996		
24000		
24056		
24159		
24184		
24207		
24311		
24324		
24348		
24402		
24414		
24416		
24417		
24433		
24435		
24436		
24440		
24452		
24462		
24542		
24659		
24687		
24742		
24871		
24918		
24928		
24945		
25015		
25017		
25052		
25062		
25071		
25083		
25100		
25126		
25135		
25156		
25178		
25186		
25201		
25217		
25259		
25266		
25272		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------

25279		
25282		
25286		
25290		
25432		
25441		
25465		
25486		
25494		
25508		
25514		
25535		
25544		
25550		
25632		
25692		
25701		
25732		
25741		
25764		
25768		
25793		
25868		
25953		
25962		
25968		
25995		
26003		
26032		
26047		
26065		
26134		
26203		
26634		
26653		
26680		
26686		
26720		
26738		
26739		
26747		
26761		
26763		
26836		
26907		
26930		
26975		
27076		
27105		
27164		
27169		
27173 - Litlington Parish Council		
27349		
28546		
28577		
28583		
28601		
28643		
28644		
28694		
28708		
28718		

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23820 23975 23982 24002 24146 24168 24267 24270 24295 24349 24465 24679 24681 24931 25033 25132 25143 25166 25190 25215 25218 25227 25237 25267 25270 25422 25435 25460 25485 25534 25583 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25633 25708 25729 25769 25806 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25836 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council 25901 - Litlington Parish Council 25978 26033 26048 26259 26635 26654 26711 26721 26748 26911 26976 27035 27070 28547 28582 28650 28692 28744	Object	<p>Outside village framework - This site is to be located well outside the village framework previously regarded as sacrosanct in the 2004 LDF plan.</p> <p>Development would be contrary to Policy DP/7</p> <p>The current village development plan goes further than simply drawing a boundary beyond which development would be prohibited. In its core it states that "the framework for the village has been tightly drawn to preclude any further peripheral development, particularly at South End and Spring Lane where the character is of a country lane" Other local residents have had planning applications refused because they are outside and not consistent with developments outside the village framework.</p> <p>Should not make an exception for traveller sites.</p>
24409 24410 24428 - DV and JA Pettitt 24429 - DV and JA Pettitt 24447 24448 24459 24460 25480	Object	<p>The development of the site will impact on local businesses. As a partner of the farm on which the site is proposed and due to the nature of the farm (the main farm is in Fen Road with the majority of land to the south of the village, accessed via Spring Lane) I am constantly using this single-track lane. As there are currently only 2 properties beyond the village boundary, the proposed 5 pitches (potentially 10-15 caravans) would mean a vast increase in the amount of traffic using Spring Lane. The resulting disruption of access would have a negative impact on my business, particularly during busy periods. Also during the construction of the site the significant increase in traffic and potential obstructions caused would have a negative impact on my business, particularly during busy periods throughout the year.</p>
25987	Object	Reasons for objection to proposed site in Spring Lane Bassingbourn - volume and weight of opposition to this site.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23646 23652 23658 23670 23671 23675 23681 23694 23697 23702 23709 23710 23720 23723 23739 23740 23748 23749 23760 23761 23766 23771 23782 23783 23795 23818 23974 24049 24173 24186 24275 24276 24301 24312 24387 24621 24917 24926 25081 25082 25096 25101 25119 25271 25428 25429 25545 25820 25859 25869 25989 26034 26035 26049 26050 26133 26135 26636 26658 26749 26750 26909 27167 28709 29141	Object	<p>Safety of site - The proposed site is adjacent to working farmland and therefore would not be a safe environment for the Travellers as those with a poor health record would be further disadvantaged by the effects of crop spraying, harvesting, and the possible risks of cereal fires.</p> <p>If there is a LPG (Propane) fire then the fire brigade would require a 200 metre exclusion zone. This would not be possible for this proposed site. They would also require a high pressure water supply which is not available in this area.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23832 23858 24057 24064 25045 25133 25204 25551 25713 25875 28610	Object	The development of the proposed site will generate more traffic and Bassingbourn as a village is already experiencing problems. The high street becomes particularly congested when the school traffic begins and ends.
25067 25902 - Litlington Parish Council 26689 26765 28539	Object	Impact on environment - concern at the visual impact of the proposed site on the surrounding landscape. The report mentions that visual impact could be minimized due to the presence of a bend in the road and of hedging and trees from the viewpoint of the passing motorist. However many people would see the site who walk along the road and nearby footpaths. Additional planting would not screen the site.
23650 23667 23677 23686 23704 23712 23729 23736 23751 23759 23774 23785 24352 24927 25077 25090 25094 25861 26131 28581 28595 28602	Object	Access to the site is from a no-through road and could be blocked off and therefore should not be considered for this type of development.
23516 24866 29142	Object	Just because the County Council owns the land is not a good reason to propose this site. Selected because it is the easy option.
25353 25870	Object	Tier 2 underplays the cost of providing services. The site is at least 180m away from existing water and sewerage services and it is unclear that they could be extended 'as is' to support both the safe operation of the site and emergency fire service requirements
24058 24293 24397 25495 27103 27147 27283 27344 28645 29143 - Litlington Parish Council	Object	Impact on amenity - There may be concerns about safety when people are passing the proposed Traveller site especially if it is not well managed. This is especially true if people remember the illegal encampment in the past. Dogs that live there may not be kept on leads and may approach walkers with their dogs. Loose dogs running from the site could be a problem to the local sheep farmer.
25243	Object	The use of gas cylinders would increase the amount of pollutants and increase greenhouse gases.
25960	Support	Flooding The flooding of this field can be rectified and overcome.
25056	Support	There would be more resources and better services for the travellers near the large towns and villages that at present have no pitches. Sites such as Cambourne (site 7), Bassingbourn (site 18) and when built Northstowe (site 6) would be better equipped to take more pitches
25127 25212	Support	This site is close to the village and local services and will be safer for children since it is not located on a major road.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
27101	Support	Impact on environment The area of Spring Lane is an area important to conservation and wildlife and I am concerned about the impact of the traveller community on this. I have no objections provided that adequate ongoing measures need to be put in place to protect wildlife from the impact of any site.
23537	Support	Design of site / Scale I have no objections provided that no more than 5 pitches no later increase in pitches to be allowed.
23535	Support	I have concern about the development of gypsy sites but I agree we cannot just ignore the problem and hope they do not set up illegal sites far away from Bassingbourn. Legal well controlled sites are a better alternative. I do worry that although an initial 5 pitches are proposed at Bassingbourn this will increase as a thin end of the wedge syndrome. Support the proposal on understanding that no more than 5 pitches will be allowed in Bassingbourn, policing of the sites will be adequate and that public transport links to Cambridge will be improved. Persuade Stagecoach to reinstate full time service or pay the current private operator in Bassingbourn to do a direct bus service to Cambridge every hour with a final bus back from Cambridge at midnight.
25958	Support	Access to local services. Having seen the detailed map of the site it seems to fulfil all the criteria required by SCDC (shops, schools , doctors are all within the required maximum distances). Why the travelling community should always be located on the edges of the village baffles me. They are entitled to all the amenities the rest of us enjoy.
27102	Support	Impact on amenity The area of Spring Lane is near the Stret and already suffers from young people riding motor bikes and quads in a dangerous fashion. This is likely to get worse if a travellers' site is put in place. I have no objections to the site provided that sufficient policing needs to put in place.
24823	Support	This is the only site proposed in the Southern part of South cambridgeshire, others having been previously rejected. I support this proposed site as I believe Gypsy and traveller sites should be spread across the whole of South Cambridgeshire
24498	Support	Good location, close to amenities and very close to village (100m). Can be sympathetically designed. Fairly good transport links. Likely to be able to incorporate more than just 5 pitches.

Site 19 - Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey

24835 - Cambridgeshire County Council 25895 - Environment Agency	Comment	A number of these sites are subject to river flooding and/or include areas susceptible to surface water flooding based upon the latest information produced by the Environment Agency. It is suggested that South Cambridgeshire District Council obtain further advice from the Agency about how these issues could be addressed if these sites are to be brought forward. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed.
24858 - Over Parish Council	Comment	Over Parish Council is concerned, given the high proportion of proposed pitches in Willingham and Swavesey, that unsustainable pressure maybe placed on local schools and surgeries given the acknowledged extra needs of the travelling community. Over Parish Council would like to see appropriate funding in place to alleviate this.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23459 24028 - Swavesey Parish Council 24029 - Swavesey Parish Council	Object	I believe this site is privately owned and has had planning permission rejected in the past. SCDC originally refused permission on the grounds that the site had not been shown to be essential and would be contrary to criteria listed in policies SP12/1, H5, SE13 and HG29. In particular that the concentration of caravans severely detracts from the rural character of the area. I objected via my local council several years ago to the site on the grounds of it being converted to accommodation use without planning permission. The proposal to make the site legal is, I believe giving the wrong message to those who wish to flout the planning regulations that normal law abiding residents cannot flout these regulations. If I were to build an extension to my home without planning permission I am sure the authorities would take appropriate action against me. Is not local government meant to operate on a level playing field! Concern is raised over density. Temporary permission allows for up to 5 caravans/pitch, potentially 40/site. The Council considers the site unsuitable for that density and would not be permitted for permanent development. Visual impact is high. The site sits on a rise and can be seen from all around. Large dwellings on site are of high visual impact. The development has an adverse impact on the surrounding countryside.
24032 - Swavesey Parish Council 24967	Object	The site lacks sewage facilities required as it is not connected to the mains sewers. The current dwellings use individual sewerage systems, which Swavesey Parish Council considers are unsuitable for the location. Drainage ditches surrounding the site are agricultural land ditches and are not suitable for foul water or excess run-off from the site.
27031 - Fen Drayton Parish Council	Object	<p>Planning permission</p> <p>Fen Drayton Parish Council disapproves of the way the illegal site at Rose and Crown Road; Swavesey has been handled. No planning permission was sought and none given and if this situation is allowed to continue then the Parish Council feels that it gives the Gypsy and Traveller community the green light to do this again whenever they wish to do so. A precedent has been set and this we object to.</p> <p>The site should be made a legal site with the proviso that no further planning permission is given for expansion and that any attempt at expansion will be dealt with immediately via regular enforcement procedures.</p>
27032 - Fen Drayton Parish Council	Object	<p>Pitch size</p> <p>The Parish Council notes that nobody seems to know what a 'pitch' consists of. We were told that the Rose and Crown site would consist of 8 pitches but this has grown to mean a minimum of five caravans on each pitch ie a minimum of 40 dwellings. These are very large dwellings, not caravans and cannot be moved without assistance of substantial engineering and structural work. What checks have been made to ascertain if these occupants are 'family' or not? Need for a definition of the word 'family'.</p>
24030 - Swavesey Parish Council 24965 24966	Object	The site is accessed via Scotland Drove, an unmade byway maintained by local landowners and of a standard that Swavesey Parish Council considers unsuitable for the amount of traffic that would be generated by the development (potentially up to 40 dwellings). The visibility splay at the junction with Rose & Crown Road is not sufficient or safe for the potential amount of traffic which would use it, particularly looking to the east. Increases in pitches would bring with it a significant increase in traffic and would increase the risk of accidents at Rose and Crown Road. The lack of pedestrian access would necessitate walkers using the Rose and Crown Road and increase the likelihood of further accidents.
24964	Object	This site is located in a predominantly rural area and the resulting caravan density would have an impact on the surrounding environment.
24499 24824	Support	Good location, minimal impact on local communities. Close to local amenities. Already granted temporary permission therefore little additional impact in making permanent. Good location.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
27373 27378 27380 27382	Support	<p>The respondent considers this site his permanent family home. They have lived on this pitch for the past 7 years and have visibly improved the area and are continuing to do so by erecting solid and attractive boundary fences and hard standing for access. They have invested money in their home and think that this is an ideal place to bring up children. If they were moved off the site they wouldn't have anywhere to go but to live on the roadside. Significant investment has been made in improving the visible appearance of the site, with improvements made to reduce proximity to the main road and in improving the look of the general area and the individual living conditions including attending to all previous recommendations made regarding planning considerations i.e. they have increased the space away from the road, put up boundary fences and paid to ensure the pitch is secure. The site is not visible from a main road and the respondent is willing to invest in further landscaping to increase privacy. The land is not on a flood plain.</p> <p>The family has improved site conditions. There is a 'community feel'. Each family has improved their own pitch and the general appearance of the site. The site does not attract unwanted attention and is being developed as a 'model sites'. The 'community action' is likely to generate a strong sense of safety and security for families living here. Families work together to ensure that everyone living on the site maintains standards. This is likely to eradicate most problems associated with site management as families have some control over who can pull on and off. Families have received support from the settled community for the site who can see that it is being developed in a positive way that enhances the local landscape. There is Parish Council support for the site and a local petition to support the Travellers.</p>
27375 27399 27402	Support	<p>The plot has been made private. It is currently being fenced and screened from neighbours. However there is a degree of uniformity to the fencing, which makes the site look attractive. She has improved the landscape by planting and is willing to undertake necessary changes to meet planning recommendations with improvements made to reduce proximity to the main road and in improving the look of the general area and the individual living conditions.</p> <p>Over time the residents have been active as a community to improve the landscape and surrounding area. Fencing has recently been erected to mark the individual plots and this has given the appearance of a well-kept and orderly site. Visibility on the site is good and the respondent relies on extended family members and residents to co-parent children - including making children responsible for their surroundings and elderly residents. Because of this the site feels a very safe space for children to play and for residents to monitor who comes on and off site. She intends to continue investing in and improving her plot in order to create a pleasant and hospitable home for her young children.</p>
27374 27376 27377 27379 27381 27400 27401 27403 28884	Support	<p>The family have lived here on site for 7 years and has longstanding connections to south Cambridgeshire, having lived locally all their life. The extended family also live here and rely on them for support. The elderly relatives are cared for nearby and can use local facilities to shop. The elderly relatives have poor health that reflects historic lifestyle and travelling, but feel well supported on this small site. They wish to be granted permanent residence and for the site to be given permanent residence so that they can relax and feel that they not have to worry about being moved on and have the security of family members nearby. It is essential there is access to medical health care since there is a specific medical issue that need a deeper level of understanding by the local healthcare team for her cultural needs. They benefit from a strong sense of cultural heritage and security amongst other travelling families who value their way of live and ensure that young people grow up to respect elders and their surroundings. The family has developed good relationships with others on site and in the local community. Hence there is a strong sense of security on site and community feel. The family have their own transport and regularly access the local shops in the village, work in the local area and are registered with the local GP. The children attend local schools and are developing a particularly good relationship with the TES team where discussions between families on the site and the local schools is developing to consider options for secondary schooling. The children attend local dance classes. The family utilise all the local amenities, public transport, participate in local social events at the pub and have friends of their own in the surrounding areas. They feel very much a part of the area and would have no other option but to live on the roadside if he was forced to leave this pitch. The site has the full support of the community, proven by the petition that was signed in favour of the site being permitted and also the support of some local parish councillors.</p>

Site 20 - New Farm, Old North Road, Whaddon

24837 - Cambridgeshire County Council 25896 - Environment Agency	Comment	<p>The site at New Farm, Old North Road, Whaddon is within an area susceptible to surface water flooding based upon the latest information produced by the Environment Agency (July 2009). It is recommended that South Cambridgeshire District Council obtain further advice from the Agency about how this issue could be addressed if this site is to be brought forward. The Environment Agency has no objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed. Consult DC engineer re Award Drain.</p>
---	---------	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23538	Comment	The section of the A1198 carries high traffic volumes and is an area of fairly frequent motor vehicle accidents with the army barracks and associated housing close by. Any additional travellers in Whaddon could be adversely affected by this busy and dangerous road.
25703 26977	Object	This site could be further expanded at less cost as it has good access and infrastructure. I suggest making that 4. It is a very good site with necessary amenities.
24792 - Foxton Parish Council	Object	Should not have passed the 3 tier test, as there are no essential facilities within 2000 metres. RECOMMEND REJECTION.
23594 24939 - Whaddon Parish Council	Object	A majority of Whaddon PC does not oppose the addition of two pitches to the Old North Road Site. We have consulted with the residents there and we understand that they too are content with the proposal alongside an improvement in facilities. We understand that SCDC has agreed in the past to upgrade the facilities for residents at this site but this has not happened. We would strongly encourage you to improve these facilities whether or not the additional pitches are eventually added. I would support this site on the basis that this provides additional traveller plots within the overall geographic coverage of SCDC. On the basis that it is currently in use with 14 rented pitches additional pitch provision should be explored with improvements to the site.
24500 24825 25697 28885	Support	Support.
25288 26000	Support	Other sites than Spring Lane more suitable. There is the possibility of increasing the orderly established site opposite Bassingbourn Barracks. The success of the Whaddon Gap site has much to commend it with a position that is more favourable for vehicle access to a major road and without the associated risks that narrow lanes with lorries present to pedestrians.

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue
-----------------	--------	-----------------------

8. TRANSIT PITCH PROVISION**8. TRANSIT PITCH PROVISION**

26187 - Windsor Road Residents	Comment	There should be no transit plots in Castle Ward or in regions of S. Cambs near the Ward.
--------------------------------	---------	--

8.2

23539 23540 23542	Object	Object to temporary transit sites because they are usually not in suitable areas e.g. Trumpington Park and Ride. Also they have a habit of becoming permanent without adequate sanitation or infrastructure or policing. I do not think transit sites would work. I think they would become permanent sites by default and would not be adequately supported or policed by the Local Authority. More and more travellers seem to want to stay put nowadays.
-------------------------	--------	---

8.3

29006	Object	Cambridge City Council has recommended use as a transit site. This suggestion is objected to in particular, given the evidence that in general more problems are experienced with transit sites than those whose occupants are more firmly established and embedded in the community. And many gypsy and travellers themselves do not support transit sites, citing the transient nature of sites as potential disaster zones
-------	--------	---

26080 - Fulbourn Parish Council	Object	Transit pitches Fulbourn Parish Council objects to the proposal by Cambridge City Council to allocate transit pitches to Fulbourn.
---------------------------------	--------	---

26602 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Cambridge City Council supports the allocation of the Ida Darwin Site for pitch provision for Gypsy and Travellers, but considers the site is more suited to transit provision than the proposed permanent provision. The City Council considers that this site would be ideal for the provision of a transit site combined with a health facility for Gypsies and Travellers.
--------------------------------	--------	---

23541	Object	~Reasons as in Para 6.2
-------	--------	-------------------------

28554	Object	It was mentioned to me at the same consultation that some members of the community do travel. Therefore, special parking areas should be allocated to them for the limited period of time they require at the different Park and Ride car parks located at the main entrances to Cambridge.
-------	--------	---

29003	Object	Cambridge City Council has recommended that Site 8 - Ida Darwin Hospital Site, Fulbourn is used as a transit site. This particular suggestion is objected to strongly, especially in terms of the negative impact a transit traveller community may bring. In addition, some travellers themselves do not support transit sites. As reported in local newspaper (The East Riding Mail) on November 2nd 2007, a travellers' spokesman described these short stay sites as potential 'disaster-zones' with people drifting in and out.
-------	--------	--

29009	Object	Cambridge City Council has also recommended this site be used for travellers in transit. This is particularly worrying. People in transit are less likely to feel ownership or responsibility towards the land on which they are temporarily staying or the area in which they temporarily live. Even people from the traveller community are opposed to transit sites and the potential problems they pose.
-------	--------	--

Site 21 - Blackwell Site, Cambridge

24838 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The County Council has no objection to the change in use of the Blackwell site, near Milton, from residential to transit provision and no objection is raised from a property perspective by Strategy and Estates. However, redevelopment for transit provision would need to be carefully managed with the existing residents so that suitable alternative accommodation is agreed and made available before work is progressed further.
---------------------------------------	---------	---

23543	Comment	No comment
-------	---------	------------

25897 - Environment Agency	Comment	No objection in principle subject to satisfactory surface and foul water drainage details being agreed. Consult DC Engineer re Award Drain.
----------------------------	---------	---

28886	Comment	I would suggest that the experience of the past whereby transit camps got trashed on a regular basis, would require the presence of a manager on site, preferably a traveller.
-------	---------	--

25028 - Huntingdonshire District Council 25349 28769 - Fen Ditton Parish Council 28921	Object	Retain 15 pitches on the Blackwell site as this makes better use of the land and accords with Government guidance. The site scores and works well with good access to local services and facilities, and the major road network. It is not within the flood zone or Green Belt. There is the opportunity to turn it into a model site and possibly expand it.
---	--------	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
26176 - Cambridge Regional College	Object	The Site is adjacent to our Kings Hedges Road property and it is proposed that it reverts to a Transit Site from its current residential use. We object to this as it has taken a long time for the College to develop a working relationship with the residents of the Blackwell Site - it is felt that this relationship currently works for both parties. If the site reverted to being a Transit Site, there would be no opportunity for any sort of relationship and it is felt that this would have a very negative effect on both parties.
26083 - FFT Planning	Object	The Blackwell site should be used as a transit site only if the environmental problems can be ameliorated to give a similar living environment to that expected from a residential site. The fact that a family may travel for long periods should not condemn them to living in substandard environments.
28738	Object	<p>Why they are not all put on existing site adjacent to Milton A14? This site was obviously a suitable choice in the first instance by the fact it was chosen previously. Its proximity to Cambridge means they would be capable of walking to essential facilities or utilising a brief public transport service. It has been stated that this site is too near to the A14 and therefore too noisy. If this were true then firstly the pitches already in place would lie vacant.</p> <p>The other side of the road are private residencies that people are paying in excess of £200,000 to live in. If noise was such as issue this would never have been granted planning permission.</p>
23613 24024 - Irish Traveller Movement in Britain 24827 25559 26149 26159 26169 26969 27003 27121 27128 27135 27142 27184 27197 27208 27220 27232 27244 27257 27268 27280 27315 27327 27339	Object	The families on the Blackwell site are settled and would like to remain. The site has good access to local facilities and services and families are registered at local doctors and dentists. They object to the site being returned to use as a transit site and seek to retain the site as a permanent site.
27353 - Girton Parish Council	Object	<p>Girton Parish Council wishes to comment on the Transit site option</p> <p>It is unacceptable that the Transit Site option has been chosen only because the site is deemed unsuitable for permanent occupation, and with no reference to the needs of the travelling communities for suitably-sited transit. This is a failure of duty of care.</p>
24501	Object	No need to use this precious area within Cambridge city for this purpose. Multiple other options around the county could fulfill this. Little argument for situating such a site within Cambridge - will only add to traffic in and out of Cambridge. Perhaps more appropriate to consider an area outside of the park and ride sites?
24952	Support	Developing site 21 as a permanent site is more appropriate than sites 1 and 2.
23963 - Cambridge City Council 24017 - Gamlingay Parish Council 24903 25027 - Huntingdonshire District Council	Support	Support the approach for the conversion of the Blackwell into a Transit site due to potential long term health effects associated with A14, including from noise and air quality. It has proved less than suitable for permanent residents due to its location.

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****9. TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE PROVISION****9. TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE PROVISION**

26189 - Windsor Road Residents	Comment	There should be no Travelling Showpeople plots in Castle Ward or in regions of S. Cambs near the Ward.
25848 - GO East	Comment	We are pleased to note that the Authority is already engaging with other local authorities in addressing needs of Travelling Showpeople and that it is included in DPD.

9.2

26327	Comment	Meldreth Parish Council has the following points in response to the consultation, which should be taken into consideration - the Showmen's Guild of Great Britain has identified a need for only three new Travelling Showpeople's plots in South Cambridgeshire in the next five years.
26829 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	It is considered that more guidance should be given in the DPD on the required dimensions for G/T sites, for Travelling Showpeople sites and for those where stables will be supported, so as to provide an indication as to the land-take anticipated.

Site 22 - Bidalls Boulevard, Kneesworth Road, Meldreth

28989	Comment	Impact on environment I have no objections provided that adequate ongoing measures need to be put in place to protect wildlife from the impact of any site.
24840 - Cambridgeshire County Council 25898 - Environment Agency	Comment	The site is within an area susceptible to flooding. The Council should seek further advice from the Environment Agency and ensure there is satisfactory surface and foul water drainage in place before the site is brought forward.
28990	Comment	Public Transport Better and more regular public transport links to Cambridge and Royston are essential.
28991	Comment	Integration of travellers into the community Unfortunately in my own village of Bassingbourn I have not heard one word of rational criticism against the site. They have all been racist in nature so adequate protection of the travellers from the results of such prejudice will be required.
25913 - Meldreth Parish Council	Object	We are concerned at the proposal to add 6 plots to this site. On appeal this was given consent as a Travelling showpeoples site providing a maximum of 11 plots. Recently the owner applied to SCDC to increase the plots to 17 by sub-dividing and using spare land at rear. This was refused. The parish council understands that the owner wishes to reserve the undeveloped land for his own retirement home. If 6 additional plots are added there is potential for overcrowding. Government guidelines say sites between 6-12 are popular with travellers and easier to manage. Adjacent site is well managed. Why is GTDPD proposing further 6 plots when Showmans Guild has only identified need for 3 in S Cambs in next 5 years?
26062	Object	Transport and access issues must be considered. The Showpeople's sites constitute a large community, but safe access to village schools and services do not exist. Walking or cycling into the village along Kneesworth Road with no path and fast traffic is dangerous. There is a strong local view that a 30MPH speed limit should be imposed here and footways should be created. This is important for children and elderly residents and others who do not drive. The families of Travelling Showpeople increasingly are settling year round for access to schools and other services.
26061	Object	There are two Showpeople's sites in the village, which together form a large development. Five Acres consists of 10 plots and is well integrated with Meldreth's settled community. The Boulevard, is the newest site and has unresolved planning issues. It has potential to evolve into a cohesive community, having planning consent for 11 plots but has been subdivided, creating a complex layout. Permission to increase the site to 17 plots was rejected in August 2009, with concerns about overcrowding. This view was shared by Meldreth Parish Council and myself. The additional of six plots on 'The Boulevard' would not contribute to successful community building. I object to the additional plots.
24793 - Foxton Parish Council	Object	The proposed site is separately owned but adjacent to an existing travelling show people site. It is therefore contrary to S.C.D.C. policy and unsuitable for use by general travellers. RECOMMEND REJECTION. Recent planning application for this site has been rejected by S.C.D.C

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23582 24502 24828	Support	Support allocation of this site for further 6 plots. There will be minimal impact on the local population and services. This site will enable the travelling showpeople to continue to visit Cambridgeshire and be located closely together.
23544	Support	All my comments in relation to the proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites in Bassingbourn and Whaddon apply to the Showpeople site in Meldreth. In particular the poor public transport links and the impact on the environment and wildlife which does not seem to be addressed anywhere in the report.

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****10. GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES IN THE GREEN BELT****10. GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES IN THE GREEN BELT**

24075 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners 24076 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners 24077 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Through National Planning Policy it is accepted that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development within Green Belts. In terms of Gypsy & Traveller sites, however, there are a significant number of decisions across the country where special circumstances have dictated that Green Belt sites are appropriate to accommodate Gypsy & Travellers. Indeed, as acknowledged by South Cambridgeshire "there are a number of existing Gypsy & Traveller sites that benefit from temporary planning permission in the Green Belt". Such sites are being proposed for allocation through this DPD.
25587 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25591 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 26093 - FFT Planning	Object	Do not automatically dismiss sites because they are in the Green Belt. This would be contrary to Government guidance in Circular 01/2006 which recognises that allocation in Green Belt area could well be a necessity. To ignore Green Belt sites could result in less appropriate sites coming forward which do not meet the criteria.

10.1

24507	Support	Agree that use of green belt land should be a last resort.
-------	---------	--

10.3

23545	Comment	Any sites proposed in the green belt must be implemented in such a way as to not damage the green belt or wildlife in the area.
23879 23880 24624	Object	There should be no sites in Green Belt. The purpose of the Green Belt should not be ignored. It has been designated to stop the City converging with surrounding villages. There have been no exceptional circumstances demonstrated to justify the use of these sites.

10.4

25588 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 26094 - FFT Planning 26095 - FFT Planning	Object	Allocated sites in the Green Belt should be removed from the Green Belt, as long as they are specifically allocated a such. Boundaries for sites will be clearly defined. The affordable housing exceptions policy has not weakened local planning authority position in terms of development within the Green Belt and is not regarded as setting a precedent. There is no reason why the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites for the specific purpose of meeting special housing need, should do so either.
---	--------	--

Option OPT1

24078 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners 24079 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners 24080 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners 24508 24713	Object	Where sites are deemed appropriate for Gypsy & Traveller provision within the Green Belt, it is considered appropriate that the site should remain in the Green Belt given the exceptional circumstances which will have needed to have been demonstrated for development in the Green Belt.
25589 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	OPTION OPT 1 The option would appear to go against Circular 01/2006 which indicates that when land within the Green Belt is to be allocated as a gypsy and traveller site then it should be removed from Green Belt designation and specifically allocated within a DPD as such.
24841 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Cambridgeshire County Council supports the view of the District Council that there is not sufficient justification as required by Circular 01/06 to release land in the Cambridge Green Belt should sites in Chesterton Fen or elsewhere in the District be used for Gypsy and Traveller provision. Retaining these sites within the Green Belt would help to prevent pressure for their redevelopment for alternative uses.
25658 - Jesus College (Cambridge)	Support	Support

Rejected Option OPT2

24509	Support	I agree that this option should be rejected. The important position that green belt land has is eroded by building upon it.
-------	---------	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25590 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Support	REJECTED OPTION OPT2 This is in keeping with Circular 01/2006 advice.
<i>10.5</i>		
24510	Object	These sites should NOT have been identified as they are on green belt land.
<i>10.6</i>		
24511	Object	Far too many pitches already - no further development should even be considered.
<i>10.7</i>		
24512	Comment	The land should remain part of the green belt. It should not have any development on it. If development needs to occur then there are far better ways to use the land to contribute to better housing stock or facilitate the new railway station.
<i>Option OPT3</i>		
24714	Object	I would object to option 3
24513	Support	I support keeping the area part of the green belt. However I do not support any further traveller pitches on this area.
24842 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Cambridgeshire County Council supports the view of the District Council that there is not sufficient justification as required by Circular 01/06 to release land in the Cambridge Green Belt should sites in Chesterton Fen or elsewhere in the District be used for Gypsy and Traveller provision. Retaining these sites within the Green Belt would help to prevent pressure for their redevelopment for alternative uses.
24831 25655 - Jesus College (Cambridge)	Support	Support.

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****11. GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES AT MAJOR DEVELOPMENT SITES****11.1**

23875	Comment	South Cambs state that sites are being considered on major new developments, but it seems not all major developments in the area are being considered. Why not? The Ida Darwin site, if it were to be taken forward, would only be considered small in comparison to some of the major developments proposed in and around Cambridge and therefore not an appropriate site for a G and T site. Other larger major developments should be looked at more closely for the siting of new G & T sites within the district.
25840 - English Heritage	Comment	<p>It should be noted that those options where the allocation is part of a major development site do not have a discrete location specified. An inappropriate location might result in harm. These larger sites include:</p> <p>Cambridge East North West Cambridge Northstowe Ida Darwin Hospital Site, Fulbourn</p> <p>In all these cases it will be important to ensure the specific sites are not located within land set aside as 'green separation' which has been designated to protect the character and appearance of existing adjacent communities and which in many instances includes conservation areas.</p>
26205 - MCA Developments Limited	Object	<p>The 10 traveller pitches proposed at Cambourne are disproportionate to the typical scale of provision proposed at other major development sites. For example Cambridge East where for 10,000 - 12,000 new homes are planned, only 20 pitches are proposed in this strategic city location, which equates to less than 2 pitches per 1000 dwelling provision; Northstowe (Site 6) is allocated only 20 pitches, which equates to less than 2 pitches per 1000 dwellings</p> <p>In contrast, the land allocated for further development at Cambourne comprises only 950 dwellings which, in proportion, equates to over 10 pitches per 1000 new dwellings.</p> <p>Where the requirement for traveller pitches is numerically disproportionate in relation to that levied on other similar major developments, the viability of the proposed development will be compromised.</p>
24514 24515 26096 - FFT Planning	Support	Support the integration of sites into new developments in the same way that social housing and key worker housing is included. This will allow the sites to be more integrated and aim to provide better amenities.
24069 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	<p>Whilst there is acceptance in principle that there is a need to provide further Gypsy & Traveller sites during the plan period based on the RSS, this objection comprises three specific elements.</p> <p>One of which is South Cambridgeshire's proposed strategy for the location of Gypsy & Traveller sites as part of major developments</p>
28628 - Caldecote Parish Council	Object	<p>It would not be an efficient use of land compared with providing traditional social homes, which are already being used by travellers.</p> <p>It may be a worry for re-homed travellers to have what could be a problem site in the same area.</p>
28816 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	<p>Whilst there is acceptance in principle that there is a need to provide further Gypsy & Traveller sites during the plan period based on the RSS, this objection comprises three specific elements.</p> <p>One of which is concern at the deliverability of Gypsy & Traveller sites as part of major developments.</p>
23881	Object	We would question how the provision of G & T sites as part of major housing developments would work in practice? Recent consultation with G & Ts has clearly indicated that whilst G & Ts and the settled community thought, in theory, it could be a good idea. How it would work in practice is entirely different. See Central Bedfordshire consultation and Dacorum consultation.
24553 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Only healthy, safe and socially supportive sites should be delivered.

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****11.4**

28951 28957	Object	I think that the use of privately owned pitches rented out to the council is the only way forward for an initiative like this.
----------------	--------	--

Question Q4

24516	Comment	Travellers' sites should only be public sites if they are cost-effective i.e. they are cost neutral or profitable. This requires charging a high enough pitch rent so that this is comparable to rent paid for normal housing in Cambridge. If the public set to lose money then they should be privately managed.
26097 - FFT Planning	Comment	<p>There is a need for more public sites and major developments provide opportunities to develop these. However there needs to be equitable opportunities for both private and public provision on major developments. Hence a mix, the proportion to be determined during master planning. Costs may exclude private sites from being a realistic consideration, unless cheaper land is made available through section 106 agreements.</p> <p>The options presented only consider public versus private sites reflecting patterns of tenure of the past. We believe there are other opportunities between traditional private and public provision. Travellers are able to develop their own sites. The key issue for many families is access to land, which is capable of gaining planning permission.</p> <p>Other options include leasehold of land with families developing their own sites and let to buy schemes.</p> <p>There may be some Travellers who prefer public sites.</p>
23547	Comment	I have a philosophical objection to privately owned sites as I suspect they will not have adequate protection for the local communities or fair their gypsy residents.
23882 24580	Comment	In reality whether a site would be publicly or privately run is misleading as it is surely more likely public sites will be run by a management company or a housing association as opposed to the Council. Sites should be privately owned or family run, with Council Tax, water rates, and any connected services paid for by the owner.
23969 24131	Comment	Travellers do not want to be located within large development areas due to their urban nature. More effort should be put into finding alternative sites. They should be private sites that would be better monitored and maintained than public sites.
24243 - Longstanton Parish Council 24398 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	Private sites should be preferred, since there will be likely to be a stronger sense of ownership, leading to a better-maintained site that will be better-integrated with the existing population.
24641 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	<p>Clarification is needed as to whether the G/T sites will be considered as part of affordable provision.</p> <p>It is considered that they should be operated by either the Council or RLS.</p> <p>The feasibility of managing small sites of five pitches only is queried.</p>
25301 27091 - Gallagher Estates	Object	Sites, particularly at major developments, should be delivered as public sites and also managed and maintained in the long term by the public sector. Registered Social Landlords are likely to be best placed to manage sites as they already provide homes and services for vulnerable and disadvantaged groups including Gypsies and Travellers. This will ensure they are included in the overall consideration of affordable housing.
23840 24025 - Irish Traveller Movement in Britain	Support	A mixture of public and private sites is likely to be best for Travellers. This should be accompanied by a fair and comprehensive allocations policy. Historical issues for segregation should be looked at carefully and provision made for these issues.

Option OPT5

23883	Comment	The Ida Darwin site would not be deliverable for a G & T site. Development would have to take place within the site boundary which assuming there would be a buffer between the G & T and housing site would eat into the already limited footprint available restricting the ability to provide the 40% affordable housing required by planning policy. It would not be appropriate to not provide a buffer.
24399 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	In principle site options should not be within Green Belt, should meet all sustainability criteria and should not exceed 10 pitches per site. We strongly support the proportionality aspects of this document in relation to existing communities.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23864 23902 23904 23911 23912 23922 24099 24132 24142 24158 24222 24244 - Longstanton Parish Council 24246 24256 24329 24338 24360 24369 24517 24554 - Girton Parish Council 24628 24645 24672 24715 24726 24727 24759 24781 24855 24911 - Oakington and Westwick Parish Council 24914 - Oakington and Westwick Parish Council 25300 25639 25742 28679	Object	Sites should be within or on edge of new developments and not outside in close proximity. In close proximity means within 1,000m from the edge of the development and therefore pushes sites towards or within nearby villages. In the case of Northstowe, this includes the whole of Longstanton, which does not have the infrastructure and it would marginalise Travellers from the new development. Careful planning has been undertaken so as to determine where the boundary of a major development site lies and it is important that villages retain their individual identity and the green separation and conservation area are protected.
24649	Object	GTDPD Report 1 (4.31) reports that 'sites should be no more than 1000m from the service centre in any of the types of settlement identified, rather than from the edge of the settlement', and this approach should be adopted when selecting sites for Gypsy and Traveller pitches' because The needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community are no different from those of the settled community ... initial consultations have identified the need to be close to these amenities as a priority (4.29). Tier 1 6.4 determination, excluding pitches from Northstowe, rejects this inclusive guidance upon which it should be based.
26098 - FFT Planning	Object	Sites on the edge of developments but in Green Belt should be given consideration and not rejected outright as this option demands. There may be problems experienced with mixing in Traveller sites with conventional housing because of reluctance of developers. If such sites cannot be found then must go outside of the development boundary, which may mean Green Belt- an exceptional circumstance. If the major development has been removed from the Green Belt then in the same way boundary alterations can be made, or the Green Belt wash over such small developments. Hence we would prefer option 5 to include a caveat that Green Belt can be used in exceptional circumstances
24865	Object	I object to the proposal for a site to be included 'within' Cambourne, but I do not object to a site 'on the edge' of Cambourne providing this is beyond the edge of the current masterplan area. Please see my representation 24684 for my suggested location, which complies with para 2b criteria of having 5 or more amenities within 1000m of the location. If secondary/primary schools are also built nearby as currently intended then this would enhance these criteria.
24642 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	With regard to Ida Darwin, aims of Option 5 cannot be met. The site would of necessity be in a visually prominent location in the Green Belt and at an entrance to a Major Development Site. The G/T sites could not be accommodated elsewhere as the road hierarchy would be inappropriate. The location next to the private Steiner School, the established residential area to the East or the large area of public open space to be provided to the West is considered to be inappropriate.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25686 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	OPTION OPT5 Sites delivered through major developments should be outside but in close proximity except in the Green Belt OPTION OPT5 should read as above.
23933 24758	Object	This statement is ambiguous, giving two alternative locations within one proposal.
<i>11.8</i>		
24106 24843 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The Council should identify the sites in close proximity to Northstowe and Cambourne. They should be defined in the consultation document for comment. Not identifying sites will lead to uncertainty and have the potential to hinder delivery of these sites. The Council should re-consult on this issue with more site specific proposals to give people the chance to comment on this matter.
24245 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	The final sentence must be modified to strengthen the goal of leading through Master Plans: "Gypsy and Travellers site provision will be determined through masterplanning and site design so that it is integrated effectively with a major development." Words such as "could" and "should" provide no clarity.
23546 23587	Support	Gypsy and Traveller sites at major developments must be effectively integrated into the development through the masterplanning and site design process and not simply added on.
24370	Support	The creation of any gypsy or traveller sites should be undertaken as part of a major development. Any gypsy or traveller sites that are therefore to be located at a major development should not be constructed prior to the construction of the major development. This is so that the infrastructure for the gypsy and traveller sites is provided by the major development and so that steps can be taken so as to ensure the gypsy and traveller site is appropriately integrated with the major development (before the gypsy and traveller site is occupied).
<i>11.9</i>		
24107	Object	What does this mean "the GTDPD could include a policy to guide the location and design which covers issues specific to major developments which are additional to the more general criteria based policy applying to all Gypsy and Traveller sites". Does this mean that it is left open for planners to do as they please? The word "could include" is deceptive. It leaves the whole issue open to hidden extras. The whole paragraph is unintelligible and requires some detailed clarification
24657	Support	The site location, design and layout of any travellers site should provide no better safety, security and privacy for it's residents than that considered adequate for all other residents of the entire development.
<i>Option OPT6</i>		
28625 - Caldecote Parish Council	Comment	The Council is consulting on criteria which will be used to identify sites at the major developments. The fifth criteria being consulted on are that sites should NOT be located where they would rely on minor residential roads - and villages do not appear to perform well against this criteria.
26101 - FFT Planning	Comment	OPT6 Part 2) Replace 'good' with 'reasonable'.
24584 24586 28680	Comment	Sites must not be provided until infrastructure, facilities and services are available. This should ensure the site is appropriately integrated with the major development before it is occupied.
26102 - FFT Planning	Comment	OPT6 Part 3) This is unclear and seems to be a catch all written in such a way as to enable almost any site to be rejected on the grounds of incompatibility. The criterion as written is quite ambiguous and should be more tightly, but reasonably, defined.
23913	Object	In order to be plan-led, and to ensure infrastructure provision, sites must be located *within* the developments, not "near" them. 3. extend "occupants of the Major Development" to include " and occupants of existing surrounding villages." Northstowe is not being developed in a vacuum; GT site provision will have a profound impact upon existing communities. add 6. Provision must be Master Plan-led, and be delivered contingent upon provision of infrastructure (including shops).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23923 23934 24118 24133 24143 24160 24163 24220 24247 24248 - Longstanton Parish Council 24330 24339 24362 24555 - Girton Parish Council 24630 24666 24673 24728 24731 24748 24760 24762 24857 25743	Object	Subsection 1 must make it clear that sites should be within the major development, particularly in the case of Northstowe, and not on the edge. The provision of a site can only be planned through the masterplan if it is located within the development area specified in the associated AAP. The new development is the reason for the new site so it should accommodate it. During the planning process residents adjacent to the site should have the right to participate so the boundaries of the development are set to reduce the effects of the new development on them and this should include the placement of the Traveller site.
24632	Object	I object to any site being 'within' a development, it should only be outside, and it could be in the green belt if no other land is available.
23869 24100 24108 24259	Object	The wording of this option is confusing and ambiguous. What does "or close to" the major development mean? There needs to be clarity of the amount of separation from the rest of Northstowe. Sites outside the major developments should be planned with regards available infrastructure and facilities. This wording should be deleted and the wording in subsection 1 amended to read "...located within and closely..." Also request clarification of "privacy" in subsection 4.
27086 - Gallagher Estates	Object	The 'Option OPT6' policy does not reflect the intent of OPT5 or the tiered assessment process. New sites may be within 1000m metres of settlements with the appropriate facilities. The text of the first issue on OPT6 should therefore be amended to read: "1) The site should be located within, or on the edge of, or closely related to, the Major Development. Sites in the Green Belt..."
26100 - FFT Planning	Object	OPT 6 part 1) If the proscription on using Green Belt is to be applied then it must be made clear that not being able to deliver sites within the Major Development constitutes exceptional circumstances.
23884 24647 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	The Green Belt Ida Darwin site is not appropriate for development: No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for the development. The only site feasible is off the main access into the MDS, in the most visually prominent part of the allocation. A location elsewhere is not feasible on highway grounds and undesirable in close proximity to existing residential development to the West, and the Steiner School. A location adjacent to the proposed open area in the Green Belt is also considered inappropriate. The location does not provide good access to services and facilities. It is unlikely that any significant new services will be provided within the development, therefore, residents would use the school and doctors in the village but due to its close proximity to Cherry Hinton would spend all its money there. The site location, close to the railway line would have a detrimental impact on the environment for future residents. The site location means that safe access cannot be provided for all modes of transport. In addition to a reliance on minor residential roads the Ida Darwin site is located close to the dangerous junction of Cambridge Road and Hinton Road.
24660	Object	The wording of this needs to be specific.
24363 24674 26103 - FFT Planning 26625 26628 27298 28585 28586 28590 28591 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	Subsection 5 should make it clear that access should be via major roads specifically designed for access purpose and should not rely on residential village roads which cannot take any increase in traffic. It should clarify what "appropriately located and safe access" means.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
28587 28588	Support	Support parts 3 and 4 of OPT6.
24518 24844 - Cambridgeshire County Council 25685 - Cambourne Parish Council	Support	Support the policy approach that pitch provision should be provided as part of new major developments. This will be the most efficient and less provocative way of setting up new sites.
26099 - FFT Planning	Support	We agree that there does need to be a policy relating to issues relating to design and location of sites within or close to major developments.
28584	Support	Parts 2; 3; and 4 of OPT6. Agree with these.
28589 28592 28593	Support	Support the proposals in subsection 5 for the use of major roads rather than existing roads in villages.
<i>11.10</i>		
28865	Object	Size and spacing of sites From my experience if you have a site of around 15 pitches, not isolated, and it is the only site in the surrounding area ; not overwhelming local housing numbers - where the proportion of travellers to settled community is right, a large number of difficulties will be resolved. The main criterion is that the numbers of the travellers in the site should not exceed the numbers of settled people in the land around, and that sites should be placed well apart from each other.
28915	Object	The Gypsy and Traveller community will grow just like the settled community and this needs to be taken into account when considering site provision. Two, Three and four pitch sites are too small for growing families.
24519	Object	This seems a ridiculously small number. It is better to have 20 pitches in a large development such as Northstowe and could push this to 30.
23849 23850	Object	There are too many pitches proposed on sites. The impact of large sites is underestimated. Each pitch is likely to be home to 3 families, and on a 10 pitch site this will equal 30 families. Planning must account for this and a maximum of 3-4 pitches is more viable.
28919	Object	My preferred option is to allow for small sites, a maximum of 15 pitches and it gels with the experience in Cottenham where a 12 pitch site was reasonable, but once an 18 pitch site was placed very close to it problems in general and my problems in particular escalated. My land was in between the sites and my trees began to be cut down - mature fruit trees - an orchard; sewer was laid illegally across my land, etc. It was the forerunner of all sorts of problems, which escalated, with the size of the site. Much of the occupation became unauthorised and law was not enforced. Don't put them in isolated places. This will increase the chances of integration between settled and traveller community.
24109	Object	This may be the Councils preferred approach, which seems to have been arrived at in consultation with the Gypsy and Traveller communities but NOT in consultation with those that may be affected by the proposals.
23548	Support	Sites of no more than 10 pitches or less is my preference
<i>Option OPT7</i>		
24767	Object	We feel you cannot undertake appropriate planning for the GT pitches at Northstowe until all matters relating to Northstowe are finalised.
23865 23905 23924 24134 24164 24249 - Longstanton Parish Council	Object	The masterplanning for Northstowe has already taken place without making any provision for Gypsy and Traveller sites. Either the materplanning process would need to be repeated, sites will be retrofitted into the existing masterplans, or sites will be located "near" Northstowe. Any decisions on the location of sites within Northstowe or the number and split of pitches should wait until the people who are going to live there are able to be consulted. If the sites could impact on people outside the major development, such as Longstanton, then local residents should have a say.
24650 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	Details should be given as to the width of access, the need and extent of maneuvering within the site and other space requirements for the various utility building/drives/garden areas to be provided. Without this clarification, it is difficult to plan for the provision of these various categories of sites.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23951	Object	Ownership of site Requiring 'Major Developments' to provide a specific number of pitches through the GTDPD raises the obvious question of, "Who will pay?". Is it South Cambs District Council's intention to buy the required amount of land and invest the required sum of money to design and construct a Traveller site at each Major Development or is the developer expected to foot the bill? If the latter, then SCDC will be providing another disincentive to the house building trade. Alternatively, the cost will be unfairly passed down to those private buyers who choose to live in any new Major Development.
25684 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	The Parish Council supports this policy in relation to new sites coming forward but it should not be retrospectively applied to major developments where construction has commenced. The wording of the option should be adjusted to reflect this.
23914	Object	While the wording as it stands is sound, it is in conflict with other wording that permits site provision outside the area affected by the Master Plan. Again, this points to the requirement that sites associated with major developments must be *in* rather than *near* them.
24560 - Girton Parish Council	Object	This is an evasion of responsibility. (It also contradicts the "two typical sites of 10 pitches" on p43.) Masterplanners should either be given the sizes of individual sites (agreed with the local travelling population) or required to consult potential users on appropriate sizes.
24620	Support	This must include all major developments that have yet to start on site, regardless of current planning approvals
26104 - FFT Planning	Support	We agree with this option which does impart flexibility and an ability of master planning to meet the varying needs which present.
24520 24588	Support	Support.
23935	Support	My support applies only if this means the site(s) will be within Northstowe, as the paragraph above implies that it should be.

Timing of Delivery of New Sites at Major Developments

26105 - FFT Planning	Comment	Options 8 and 9 Clearly the need for sites is urgent and in a general sense they should be established as soon as possible. However as para 11.14 outlines such early establishment does carry some penalties for the inhabitants. We are unable to comment further - this question can only be answered by potential inhabitants and we suggest that outreach consultation be undertaken with the local Gypsy and Traveller community to gain their views on what they may find acceptable and liveable with.
----------------------	---------	--

11.13

24592	Comment	This will depend on the major development showing concrete evidence of sustainability: a master plan would have to be at least approved, infrastructures and services funded, contracted and deliverable within a specific time scale before any planning applications for plan-led and designed-led G&T accommodation may be accordingly facilitated and approved. SCDC vision 'To ensure that G&T communities enjoy equality of service and are part of cohesive communities within which people from different backgrounds participate together and share equal rights and responsibilities' cannot be met in the Northstowe context without their housing needs being established in a plan-led/design-led development.
-------	---------	---

11.14

24605 24607	Support	In any new development gypsies and travellers should be treated no differently in their provision of essential services such as schools, medical facilities etc. to any other new community residents.
----------------	---------	--

11.15

24677	Object	The reverse could be argued: housing Gypsy and Traveller families in a larger scaled and better serviced Northstowe community that was plan-led/design-led in preparation from the outset seems to be a more sensible option aligned with Government policies, than relegating such families in areas where the lack of facilities could be an unfortunate cause for friction.
-------	--------	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23841 23916 24613	Object	If sites are provided later this would cause disruption to all residents of the development. This will cause great integration difficulties when communities are at an advanced stage of being established. Providing sites in larger scaled plan-led / design-led developments from the outset seems to be a more sensible option aligned with Government policies, rather than relegating such families in areas where the lack of facilities could be an unfortunate cause for friction. A development without full facilities is more likely to result in problems than one when facilities are properly developed.
<i>Option OPT8</i>		
23886	Comment	We do not agree that there should be any housing or G & T development on the Ida Darwin site.
23906 23915 24251 - Longstanton Parish Council 27299	Object	Sites should not be provided until it can be shown the whole development is sustainable in terms of adequate services and facilities. This has not always been the case even for settled communities. In particular the lack of school places. The reason for locating sites at major developments is to ensure adequate infrastructure is available. Early provision leaves such infrastructure aspirational.
24561 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Replace "should" with "must" or "shall". There can be no exception to this requirement.
24774	Object	<p>"Delivery of sites should be phased so that key services and facilities are available before Gypsy and Traveller pitches are completed."</p> <p>We feel the above should read</p> <p>"Delivery of sites should be phased so that key services and facilities are available before Gypsy and Traveller pitches are OCCUPIED."</p> <p>This should hopefully prevent occupation of the GT pitches prior to the provision and commissioning of vital services i.e. sewage disposal and refuse collection together schools etc.</p>
23568 23867 23917 23925 23936 24110 24135 24165 24218 24250 24252 - Longstanton Parish Council 24260 24331 24340 24364 24372 24376 24585 24623 24633 24663 24667 24675 24729 24734 24745 24761 24765 24784 24801 24833 24859 25176 25181 25211 25302 25682 - Cambourne Parish Council 27087 - Gallagher Estates 28678	Object	Support Option 8, the delivery of sites must be phased so that key services and facilities are readily available before pitches are permitted. Allowing sites before infrastructure is in place is likely to lead to dissatisfaction amongst all residents and affect integration. It is also crucial that those who become resident have the opportunity to have their say or at least know of the proposals for the inclusion of Gypsy and Traveller pitches within their neighbourhood.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24144 24400 - Rampton Parish Council 24521	Object	The delivery of pitches should be phased in line with available services and facilities. Many sites are close to existing major developments, such as Cambridge city, which have infrastructure in place in the early stages. Further services and facilities can be created in parallel with establishing the sites thus providing integration from the outset.
25675	Object	There must not be any consideration of building new GT sites dependent on Northstowe facilities until they are thoroughly established and functional, even if current economic conditions mean Northstowe is not developed for many years. If further GT sites are to be forced on this region then proposals for established communities such as Cambourne should be enacted first and monitored to assess their impact on the settled community. Lessons may be learned from this which could be applied to new communities still in the building. Option 8 should read: "Delivery of sites should be phased so that key services and facilities are available within the new development before GT pitches are completed".
24119 28630 - Caldecote Parish Council	Support	Sites on any new developments should not be agreed until it can be shown that the whole development is sustainable in terms of facilities and services. Until the infrastructure of the new development exists any sites within that development should be assessed based on the existing infrastructure. To do otherwise would place pressure on existing local facilities and create unnecessary tension between communities. Sites on any new developments should not be agreed until it can be shown that the whole development is sustainable in terms of facilities and services.
23866	Support	I support this option, but with one minor modification. it should read: "Delivery of sites should be phased so that key services and facilities are available within the new development before GT pitches are completed".

Option OPT9

23885	Comment	We do not agree that there should be any housing or G & T development on the Ida Darwin site.
24652 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust 24653 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	Depending in financial provision made and the developer / owner of the site, there are obviously problems of providing the pitches before other development on the site commences. It would be unreasonable and impracticable to expect land owners to make the land available and develop the sites before obtaining any revenue from other development on the site.
24776	Object	As worded this is surely a catastrophe in the making with respect to health and safety.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23907 23918 23926 23937 24122 24136 24145 24166 24219 24253 - Longstanton Parish Council 24254 24261 24332 24341 24365 24373 24377 24506 24618 24635 24664 24669 24676 24732 24736 24746 24764 24769 24780 24803 24834 24860 25303 25676 25683 - Cambourne Parish Council 25744 28681	Object	Object to Option 9, infrastructure must be available before sites are delivered. If not, it may be some time before the required infrastructure is provided and residents will have to rely on inadequate infrastructure in the surrounding villages and place undue burden on them. If a site is to be occupied beforehand then it should be assessed on the basis of the existing infrastructure, and should only be occupied if it is found to be sufficient. There is no basis for treating Gypsies and Travellers any differently to the settled community. A site requires infrastructure prior to habitation otherwise it risks creating unnecessary tension with neighbouring communities.
24562 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Insert "not" between "but" and "before".
24522	Support	This will allow better integration for the communities by being part of the development from the start.

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****12. EXISTING GYPSY AND TRAVELLER POLICIES IN SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE****12. EXISTING GYPSY AND TRAVELLER POLICIES IN SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

25846 - GO East	Comment	Replacing saved policies It is a regulatory requirement for the Council to identify which extant saved local plan policies will be replaced/ superseded by the Gypsy and Traveller DPD upon its adoption. We would suggest that any early consultation documents should give a broad indication of the extant policy areas likely to be replaced and the submission Gypsy and Traveller DPD to include this information in detail, ideally as an appendix.
23549	Support	No further comment
12.2		
24836	Support	This policy is supported
Option OPT10		
26106 - FFT Planning	Object	Option 10 Since para 12.3 does indicate that a limited area of land could deliver pitches then in our view this option of keeping the existing policy in place should be retained to help the process of delivering windfall sites. To follow option 10 would exclude such possibility, even though the number of sites might be limited.
24523 24839 25656 - Jesus College (Cambridge)	Support	Support the non-inclusion of Policy CNF6 from Local Plan 2004.

*Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue***13. POLICIES FOR CONSIDERING PLANNING APPLICATIONS****13.1**

28749 28973 - Cottenham Parish Council 29093 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	Need for robust policies to rebut attempts to bring forward unsuitable windfall sites. Suggest amending objectives of GTDPD to include one for windfall sites. Provide robust criteria based policies for assessing windfall sites so that those that are unsuitable may be refused and defended at appeal. Make it clear that windfall sites will be deducted from the overall assessment of need and if granted planning permission will lead to a reduction in allocated sites over the plan period.
--	--------	---

13.4

26028 - East of England Regional Assembly	Comment	The proposed policies for considering planning applications do not raise any specific conformity issues. The Council should ensure that measures which promote the use of renewable energy sources, and those which seek reductions in other resource uses (e.g. water) are included as part of any site development proposals.
---	---------	---

Option OPT12

24167	Support	I feel that all of these points have to be met as completely as possible otherwise the proposed sites are likely not to be effective.
23938	Support	In particular, sites should not alter the nature and use of the existing area nor affect in any way the peace and safety of the settled community.
23887	Support	A clear need should be demonstrated before a site is considered on a windfall site.
23908 23909 25679 - Cambourne Parish Council	Support	Support the policy.
24847	Support	See Representation 24684 which suggested additional site for consideration for use by travellers to be located at Cambourne and Caxton border.

Draft Policy GT1: Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople on Unallocated Land Outside Development Frameworks

26112 - FFT Planning	Comment	Criterion 3 - this criterion seems to go beyond Circular 1/2006 and does seem to set site size limits, something which Circular 12/006 considers arbitrary. In our view this criterion could most usefully and sensibly be restricted to 'The number and nature of pitches provided on the site is appropriate to the site size and location. Further elaboration in our view is unnecessary as each application will be judged on its merits.
26111 - FFT Planning	Comment	<p>Criterion 2 - although generally unobjectionable this criterion does not take account of the statement in Circular 1/2006 (para 54) that</p> <p>"Sites on the outskirts of built-up areas may be appropriate. Sites may also be found in rural or semi-rural settings. Rural settings, where not subject to special planning constraints, are acceptable in principle. In assessing the suitability of such sites, local authorities should be realistic about the availability, or likely availability, of alternatives to the car in accessing local services."</p> <p>Hence the words following 'healthcare facilities' should be deleted.</p>
24852	Comment	In general terms I support draft policy. In the case of Northstowe, this "development" does not exist. It is only at master plan stage, with planning applications being considered. Whatever happens in that, GT sites MUST not be plonked in Longstanton village boundary, nor in the green belt separation area, nor in the Conservation Areas.
23939	Comment	The sites should be within development, not "adjoining".
23888	Comment	15 pitches is too large a number for rural centres. The number of occupants on a site this size would equate to a reasonable size housing development and as such put undue pressure on local services and facilities.
24524	Comment	I agree that green belt land should be specially excluded. It is very important that such applications are treated exactly the same as planning permission by anyone else. For example, if someone has bought land that is not considered part of the green belt, and wants to build a number of dwellings on it then this should be as easy/difficult to do whether these are travellers' or brick buildings.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24563 - Girton Parish Council	Object	<p>Paragraph (2): After "primary school" add "with adequate class space and resources to provide proper schooling for the expected children without any disruption to the existing settled community".</p> <p>Paragraph (4): Add "and without any disruption to the existing settled community". "Services" must be understood to include policing.</p>
26109 - FFT Planning	Object	<p>The policy contains 9 criteria. Circular 1/2006 (p 21) states "The list of criteria adopted by a local planning authority should not be over-long as the more criteria there arethe greater the likelihood of authorities refusing planning permission. The Government wishes to see a more positive approach being taken to making adequate provision for gypsies and travellers in appropriate locations -"</p> <p>Hence in our view the list of criteria in Policy GT1 should be reduced, simplified and made more positive.</p>
26110 - FFT Planning	Object	<p>Criterion 1- the effect of this could be that no application succeeds if there were available sites elsewhere. It should be deleted as superfluous and potentially discriminatory.</p> <p>In the same way that, as the Cambridge sub-region is a growth area attracting people from elsewhere and for whom conventional housing provision is made, Travellers may move in search of work and the sub-region will be attractive to them. Allowance must be made for this movement and generated need. Recognised need in Circular 1/2006.</p>
26114 - FFT Planning	Object	<p>Criterion 7 is in our view too tightly and unreasonably drawn. Any development could be held to harm the character and or appearance of an area and as such is too tightly and restrictively drawn. A more reasonable alternative could be that:</p> <p>"The site does not have an unacceptable impact on the local area".</p>
26113 - FFT Planning	Object	<p>Criteria 4-6 could be usefully rolled together to state:</p> <p>"The site is capable of providing a safe environment and is appropriate in scale in relation to local facilities and services and size of the nearest settled community."</p>
26107 - FFT Planning	Object	<p>Option 12 Draft Policy GT1</p> <p>Firstly Circular 12/006 states that criteria based policies should be included in core strategies to help guide the allocation of land and also be used to judge applications arising from unexpected demand. This policy restricts itself to sites on unallocated sites. Hence the use of such a policy does seem to be contrary to the requirements of Circular 1/2006.</p>
23550 24845 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Support the inclusion of a policy to assess planning applications for windfall sites. However safeguards need to include provisions to protect the environment and local wildlife as well as considering landscape impacts. Sites should not be located in Air Quality Management areas. It would also be helpful to include reference to Development Control Policy NE/11 on Flood Risk.</p>
24849	Support	<p>See Representation 24684 which suggested additional site for consideration for use by travellers to be located at Cambourne and Caxton border.</p>
23490 - Anglian Water Services Limited	Support	<p>Anglian Water supports the principles outlined in Section 5 of Policy GT1 with regards to locating development away from areas that may have an adverse impact on residents. Anglian Water's guiding principles are to ensure that there are policies in place to ensure that developments are not located close to wastewater treatment works or pumping stations and a 'cordon sanitaire' is maintained to prevent impact from odours.</p>
<i>Draft Policy Regarding Design of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Sites</i>		
26020 - Natural England	Comment	<p>Natural England would expect that most of these proposals for traveller sites would be able to make at least some contribution towards enhancing local biodiversity, such as through the introduction of native landscaping schemes, incorporation of bat and bird boxes and through appropriate design of green infrastructure and, where feasible, through the implementation of multi-functional SUDS. We would expect biodiversity and green infrastructure mitigation and enhancement details to be identified at the planning application stage.</p>
<i>Option OPT13</i>		
24654 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust 25680 - Cambourne Parish Council	Support	<p>Support the policy.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24180	Support	I agree with all the issues and especially point 6. which means any proposed site avoids any unacceptable adverse or detrimental impact on neighbouring uses, including as a result of excessive noise, dust, fumes, lighting, traffic generation or activity - hence any site close to Longstanton would effect the residents in this way, by it's very nature.
<i>Draft Policy GT2: Design of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Sites</i>		
24525	Comment	Again, all planning should be exactly the same as that applied to any other development. The infrastructure design should mimic that of brick dwelling areas. Any deviation should be seen as discrimination.
24846 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council supports the inclusion of a policy to secure the highest standard of design in new developments. To enable this it is suggested that additional criteria be added to Policy GT2 to cover energy and water conservation measures, as well as consideration of potential ecological impacts as part of planning applications e.g. preparation of an Ecological Assessment. Similarly the requirement to provide safe access for new sites should be amended to included equestrians (where appropriate) as well as pedestrians.
24081 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Suggested point 8 of the Policy provides no certainty as to what the Local Authority will require in terms of recreation provision. This issue should be clarified to avoid ambiguity.
27085 - Gallagher Estates	Object	<p>The draft policy should be seeking to establish the highest quality of site provision and does not take into account all matters of good practice and advice. In particular long term site management of gypsy and Traveller sites is recognized as an important aspect of good practice. An additional criterion should therefore be included.</p> <p>The issue of non-commercial vehicles is not adequately addressed in the draft Policy. South Cambridgeshire District Council has already confirmed that vehicle size would be controlled through the lease arrangements or by condition. This matter needs to be referred to in the draft policy and supporting text.</p>
24564 - Girton Parish Council	Object	Paragraph (5): Add "Land previously used for experimental agricultural purposes shall be regarded as contaminated until duty of care has been exercised in the form of a full and thorough risk assessment."
26115 - FFT Planning	Object	<p>The policy reflects Government Guidance on site design. This is aimed at publicly provided sites but does have some application to site design for private sites. It would be onerous for small private sites to have to meet all the criteria. It ignores reality.</p> <p>The policy is complex and negative and difficult to apply in practice. The policy should be rephrased:</p> <p>" Proposals for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople sites will be granted permission provided they pay due regard to Government Guidance on Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites according to the scale and tenure of proposed development."</p> <p>This would allow a degree of flexibility and allow sites to be fairly judged on an individual basis.</p>
24656 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	<p>Guidance should be included as to the relative size of sites to be provided. There should be clear differentiation between those for Gypsy/Travellers, Travelling Show People and site incorporating stables.</p> <p>In allocating sites, the suitability for various types of sites suitable needs to be clarified.</p>

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****14. MONITORING****14.2**

26117 - FFT Planning	Comment	<p>In our view the official statistics as shown in caravan counts have problems and these of course will be reflected in the indicators which will be drawn from the same source.</p> <p>The indicators of unauthorised sites should be based on rolling information, not simply on snapshot counting of caravans on two days in the year in January and July. The information on unauthorised camping should include information about evictions carried out by Police and local authorities. It should be made clear in the monitoring section of the DPD that information from these multiple sources will be used in compiling details of unauthorised caravans and sites.</p>
<hr/>		
Option OPT14		
24853	Comment	<p>My concern about these wordy and no doubt worthy proposals is whether SCDC have the political will to enforce whatever proposals are finally decided. From past experience I have great doubts that the officers will actually enforce the rules.</p>
26116 - FFT Planning	Object	<p>We agree with the range of monitoring indicators but they are not sufficient. .</p> <p>We ask whether temporary permissions are to be included within indicator CO-H4 as pitches completed. Total numbers could imply that the council had met its needs as laid out in the RSS when in fact temporary permissions cannot contribute to this requirement. They should therefore be dealt with separately.</p> <p>The use of the term illegal encampments is factually wrong. Such encampments are unauthorised encampments and should be recorded as such in line with the style of reporting in the centrally organised Caravan Counts.</p> <p>The relevant indicators require revision in line with the above comments.</p>
23952	Object	<p>The chosen monitoring indicators are considered to be insufficient to monitor the performance of the GTDPD and determine whether the objectives have been met.</p> <p>The objectives stated at Section 3.4 and throughout the GTDPD cover more than just the numbers of approved and unauthorised pitches/caravans in South Cambs. Additional measurements need to be monitored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Sustainability aims * Supply v Demand * Use of the provided services, transport links, etc (to assist future planning and strategy) * Community Integration and related issues * Other requirements that emerge from the yet to be published South Cambridgeshire Gypsy and Traveller Community Strategy.
24848 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>For consistency with the requirements for monitoring set out in the East of England Plan, it is considered that there is a need for an additional indicator relating to the net changes in plots for Travelling Showpeople.</p>
24851	Support	Support the policy.
25681 - Cambourne Parish Council		

Table 3: Rejected Options

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------

APPENDIX A. REJECTED OPTIONS*Table 3: Rejected Options*

24850 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the rejection of sites R1 - R22 through the District Council's tiered assessment process. The rejection of those sites on County Council property is supported by the Council as landowner.
---------------------------------------	---------	---

Rejected Options

24082 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.
28979 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Supports no further sites in Cottenham

Site R1 - Land at Bassingbourn Road, Bassingbourn / Litlington

24083 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.
24794 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	This site has access problems. RECOMMEND REJECTION.

Site R2 - Land on the Causeway, Bassingbourn

24084 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.
24795 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	This site has potential flooding and landscape / environment issue. RECOMMEND REJECTION.
24327	Support	The site is not appropriate as it has only one entry and exit.

Site R3 - Land at South End, Bassingbourn

24085 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.
24796 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	This site should not be developed it is part of the village archaeological heritage. RECOMMEND REJECTION.

Site R4 - Land fronting Long Drove, Cottenham

24412 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	Rejection of sites 4 - 9. We fully agree with the rejection of these sites. We also feel strongly that the additional sites put pressure on an already large primary school which children from Rampton attend. Working at or near the limits of proportionality puts pressure on many other local facilities.
24086 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.

Site R5 - Land fronting Rampton Road, north of Ramphill Farm, Cottenham

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------

Site R5 - Land fronting Rampton Road, north of Ramphill Farm, Cottenham

26695 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	Rejection of sites 4 - 9. We fully agree with the rejection of these sites. We also feel strongly that the additional sites put pressure on an already large primary school which children from Rampton attend. Working at or near the limits of proportionality puts pressure on many other local facilities.
24419 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	Sites 5 and 6 specifically are close to Rampton which already has three sites. We find it surprising that sites could be contemplated in view of the traffic hazard of a busy road where fatal accidents have occurred. We fully support the other reasons given
24087 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.
23583	Support	This road is not suitable to any potential additional development with a traveller site
23584	Support	Location of this site would have a high impact on the landscape and screening would be out of character with the existing landscape. Surely this would also be too far for amenities?

Site R6 - Land fronting Rampton Road, south of Ramphill Farm, Cottenham

26696 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	Rejection of sites 4 - 9. We fully agree with the rejection of these sites. We also feel strongly that the additional sites put pressure on an already large primary school which children from Rampton attend. Working at or near the limits of proportionality puts pressure on many other local facilities.
26700 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	Sites 5 and 6 specifically are close to Rampton which already has three sites. We find it surprising that sites could be contemplated in view of the traffic hazard of a busy road where fatal accidents have occurred. We fully support the other reasons given
24088 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.

Site R7 - Land fronting Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham (Eastern Part)

26697 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	Rejection of sites 4 - 9. We fully agree with the rejection of these sites. We also feel strongly that the additional sites put pressure on an already large primary school which children from Rampton attend. Working at or near the limits of proportionality puts pressure on many other local facilities.
24089 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.
23585	Support	I am in complete support of this decision. The site would be a distance out of the village with limited potential to public transport. In addition I have concerns with regards to the Twenty Pence Road along which traffic travels fast and is already of a significant concern. This additional development would be too close to that already in existence at Smithy Fen and would cause an overconcentration of travellers in a relatively small area. An additional site within Cottenham may cause a significant impact on facilities such a GP surgeries and school provision.

Site R8 - Land fronting Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham (Western Part)

26698 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	Rejection of sites 4 - 9. We fully agree with the rejection of these sites. We also feel strongly that the additional sites put pressure on an already large primary school which children from Rampton attend. Working at or near the limits of proportionality puts pressure on many other local facilities.
--------------------------------	---------	--

Site R8 - Land fronting Twenty Pence Road, Cottenham (Western Part)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24090 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.

Site R9 - Smithy Fen, Cottenham

26699 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	Rejection of sites 4 - 9. We fully agree with the rejection of these sites. We also feel strongly that the additional sites put pressure on an already large primary school which children from Rampton attend. Working at or near the limits of proportionality puts pressure on many other local facilities.
28888	Comment	Concern about future of Smithey Fen and Council's plans for the site. No further development at all should occur on the Smithey Fen site, - it is still far too big - nor on the land off Twenty pence road, nor any land in Cottenham. I have plans for my land but I can't implement them until my boundaries are secure and that won't happen until the unlawfully occupying travellers on my boundary are removed.
28887	Comment	The Cottenham map of sites appears to show my land as being in theory deliverable. There is not demarcations between the land I own and fight for, and the land on either side, owned mostly by travellers. WILL YOU KINDLY MAKE AMENDS FOR THIS AND PUT OUT AN ERRATUM, EVEN THO IT IS LATE., FOR THESE MAPS WILL BE RE-USED.
28918	Object	I reject the idea that Smithy Fen is now a flood plain. The last flood there was 1947.
24026 - Irish Traveller Movement in Britain 25206 27354 27357 27360 27363 27366 27409 27411 27413 27415 27417 27419 27421 27423 28917 28992 28997	Object	Object to the rejection of this site as a permanent site. It is one of the few Irish Traveller sites and homes several very happy families who are settled and established in the wider community. The families provide a close network of support for each other. Most families do not have resources to locate elsewhere. There are derelict plots that could be used by homeless Travellers. If the site were made permanent the Travellers are willing to invest in improvements to the site. There would be no need to identify any further sites.
23586	Support	This site is already one of great concern, and additional increase in plots has been demonstrated as inappropriate through various planning enquiries. There are already problems with unauthorised plots on this site. The current authorised plots should remain with no additions.

Site R10 - Button End, Harston

24797 - Foxton Parish Council	Object	Although the site is within the Green Belt it is situated between 2 of the ribbon development dwellings outside of Harston village. It meets the criteria for proximity to local services. There is no valid planning justification for rejection. RECOMMEND ADOPTION.
-------------------------------	--------	--

Site R11 - Land south of Manor Park, Histon

23616 - Histon and Impington Parish Councils 25660 - Histon Parish Council	Support	Histon Parish Council reviewed this matter last week and wish to confirm their support to the decision to reject a site at the rear of Manor Park Histon on the basis of access and the need locally for open space provision.
---	---------	--

Site R12 - Former Local Authority Site, Meldreth

25966	Comment	You are aware of the disgraceful condition of the Mettle Hill site. As a regular user of the road over many years between Meldreth and Kneesworth I can unhappily claim to have been a witness to the rise and fall of that council-run enterprise. It is a monument to the inability of a past council to impose its proper regulatory control over the everyday welfare of its residents.
-------	---------	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
24226 25171 25554 25929	Object	The Council run Mettle Hill site has previously been built and then trashed at great expense to the Council Tax payer. This money has been wasted as the site now remains empty and is an eyesore. However, the nearby privately owned sites have been relatively trouble free.
23638 24321 24694 25016 25023 25041 25257 25258 25292 25313 25463 25468 25503 25542 25630 25704 25730 25777 25999 26970 26978 27077 27108 27172 28661 28733 28746	Object	The Council should reuse the Mettle Hill site at Meldreth instead of creating a new site at Bassingbourn. This is well served by a distributor road and has the utilities infrastructure required. This will be more cost effective than creating a new site with associated infrastructure costs. Its reinvigoration, with appropriate management and oversight, would tidy up the site and provide cost effective, custom-built facility.
25912 - Meldreth Parish Council 26060	Support	Support the rejection of the former local authority site at Mettle Hill. It is not a viable site option. This is the overwhelming view locally.

Site R13 - Camside Farm, Chesterton Fen Road, Milton

24091 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.
24526	Support	I agree that this area should be rejected. It is green belt land and therefore should not be used for any development. The question remains as to why caravans exist here when it is not an authorised site - surely the council should prevent illegal trespass?

Site R14 - Land west of Chesterton Fen Road, Milton

24193	Comment	A potential site at Chesterton Fen Road was the only site proposed at the Issues and Options Report 1. Deliverability is a key issue for the Plan & it is important to recognise that this site can definitely be delivered.
24211	Object	It is illogical to consider the adjacent site at Sandy Park to be appropriate & the proposed site as inappropriate. There are no physical or locational differences between these adjacent sites. Development of the site would not impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The sustainable location & opportunity to contribute towards meeting identified need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches outweighs Green Belt & flood risk issues, as does Sandy Park. The site is deliverable immediately & could be allocated for permanent, transit or travelling show people as required.
24527	Support	Agreed that this should be rejected. It is green belt land and therefore development on it is wholly unacceptable. Transport facilities (Fen Road Chesterton) are very limited and would not be able to cope with further development on this site.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------

Site R15 - Land at Willingham Road, Over

24092 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.
24861 - Over Parish Council	Support	Over Parish Council supports the rejection of this site. The site is relatively isolated, too far outside the village centre, poor pedestrian access.

Site R16 - Land south of Willingham Road and west of Mill Road, Over

24094 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. It is interesting to note that the site "would impact the surrounding residential development". All of the sites being proposed by South Cambridgeshire for allocation through this DPD adjoin existing or proposed residential uses. Why then is this site being treated differently?
24863 - Over Parish Council	Support	Over Parish Council supports rejection of this site as it is too close to existing dwellings and will have too great an impact.

Site R17 - Cuckoo Lane, Rampton (1)

24421 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	We agree fully with the remarks made comprising the basis of the rejection.
27369 27370 27371 27372	Object	This site should be made a permanent place for Travellers since other plots have permanent residence. The site is well established and the families living on site are well settled and have a support network and good relationships with the wider community. The family use the local services and facilities. The site is not visible, being well screened from the main road and the family is willing to make improvements.

Site R18 - Cuckoo Lane, Rampton (2)

24427 - Rampton Parish Council	Comment	We fully agree with the remarks made comprising the basis of the rejection
--------------------------------	---------	--

Site R19 - Former Local Authority Site, Meadow Road, Willingham

24093 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	Without a detailed plan of the site it is difficult to be precise as to the land concerned. However, each site is owned by Cambridgeshire County Council and from the commentary provided under the Reason for Rejection, this would appear to be somewhat subjective and not therefore preclude totally development of the site for Gypsy & Traveller purposes. The issues identified can be mitigated and given that delivery needs to be demonstrated for any allocation, it is considered that the site is worthy of further consideration.
---	--------	---

Site R22 - North of The Stables, Schole Road, Willingham

25899	Object	Object to the rejection of this site as a potential permanent site. The site comprises part of a larger brownfield site and is adjacent an existing gypsy site. Development of the site for example 2 pitches together with suitable planting would not have a negative impact. Long distance views would only result in glimpse of the site. The planning history of the site pre-dates circular 01/2006 and should not be a consideration, it would appear that the concern regarding visual impact (inspectors) in 2004 and should be re-evaluated.
-------	--------	---

APPENDIX C. GYPSY AND TRAVELLER COMPLETIONS AND COMMITMENTS*Table 5: Commitments at March 2009*

24528	Object	Further development on this green belt land should not occur.
-------	--------	---

APPENDIX 1

SUMMARY OF THE REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED FOR THE TECHNICAL ANNEX

Technical Annex - Gypsy and Traveller DPD Issues and Options

Report 2: Site Options and Policies

Public Participation Report

A. THE SITE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

A1

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue
-----------------	--------	-----------------------

A. THE SITE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

A1

26029	Support	Support
-------	---------	---------

A.9

24188	Support	According to this high level sieving process and the standard pro-forma, the 'location gives the nearest settlement to the site'. The location of site 6 is Northstowe, thus 'the town of Northstowe' itself will be the settlement nearest to the proposed site 6.
-------	---------	---

Stage 1: Relationship to Settlements

24190	Object	It is necessary to comment here that locating Gypsy and Traveller Site/sites further away from Northstowe town (south, east and west of it within 1000 metres of its edges) contradicts the pro format requirements and is defaulting on Northstowe approved AAP requirements. Northstowe's July 2007 approved AAP (proposal map including the conservation areas of Longstanton after the Government Inspector's report) specifies in C2 NS4 that 'Green separation between the frameworks of Longstanton and Oakington and the built up area of Northstowe..... will contain only open land uses.... which will contribute towards the effective separation between these communities'.
-------	--------	---

24263	Object	The proposed criterion of 1000 metres from a community centre within Northstowe, although ill-conceived in the context of the Northstowe July 07 approved AAP, was initially intended to facilitate G&T residents' integration and their easy access to community services within (and not WITHOUT) a major development. This 'refinement' is disingenuous in deliberately relegating G&T sites out of the town of Northstowe by stating distances from the edge and out of the future urbanisation rather than the other way round. This would deny G&T the full equality of access to services that all future residents of Northstowe should have by right.
-------	--------	--

A.13

24265	Object	ODPM circular Para 65 above also states 'In deciding where to provide for gypsy and traveller sites all sites considered as options for a site allocations DPD must have their social, environmental and economic impacts assessed in accordance with the requirements of sustainability appraisal.' A settlement that is non existent cannot be assessed for its existing sustainability. A13 is contrary to the Government guidance requiring assessment of existing amenities within the named location, in this case Northstowe.
-------	--------	--

A.15

25677 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	Reference should be made to secondary education provision being within a prescribed distance as part of the Site Assessment Criteria and this should be reflected in Table A1 Tier 1 2a.
----------------------------------	--------	--

A.25

24195	Object	Site 18, Spring Lane, Bassingbourn. The lane opposite the site would be well below the minimum width of 3.7m that is required for emergency vehicles.
-------	--------	--

A.30

28980 - Cottenham Parish Council	Object	Note the Technical Annex, page 8 Stage 3 A.30; the Parish Council feel that, in the context of South Cambridgeshire, the "cap" recommended of 30 pitches, at for example Northstowe, suggests that villages with a "quota" of pitches already in excess of the recommended ratios should be excluded from further allocation, and to suggest otherwise would undermine the legitimacy of the Technical Annex; the exception would be Chesterton, which in reality relates to Cambridge City.
----------------------------------	--------	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
<i>Stage 2: Access to Other Facilities</i>		
26071	Object	<p>Tier 3 2 Access to Other Facilities</p> <p>The amenities are not given any weighting and it is clear from the list that this is a weakness in the qualification criteria since, for example, the distance to a school or health facility must be more important than the distance to a public house.</p> <p>It is notable that neither employment opportunity nor access to public transport to a town centre and improved job opportunities is considered sufficiently important to be included in the list.</p>
<i>A.48</i>		
25592 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>The application of notional costs with no scaling for potential actual costs provides an inadequate assessment of the likely costs of developing a site. Deliverability is a key element of the decision making process which without a more comprehensive test is likely to produce severely flawed results. as well as The difficulties associated with doing this within Issues and Options 2 are understood but given the long elapsed period between this and Issues and Options 1 it should have been possible to obtain more comprehensive and accurate costs for the purpose of identifying the most potentially deliverable sites.</p>

*Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue***B. SITE ASSESSMENTS - SITE OPTIONS FOR CONSULTATION***Site 6 - Northstowe*

24287	Object	What has become of your vision "To ensure that Gypsy and Traveller communities enjoy equality of service and are part of cohesive communities within which people from different backgrounds participate together and share equal rights and responsibilities" in respect of Northstowe/site 6 'development opportunities' when amenities for G&T new sites are listed as those already existing some km away from the very edge of the future free standing Northstowe settlement? What are your real objectives at every stage of this flawed 3 tiers methodology? Referencing existing village amenities makes no sense for Northstowe/site 6.
24913 - Oakington and Westwick Parish Council	Object	We note that in principle Green Belt land is judged unsuitable for Gypsy/Traveller pitches but we have a problem with this, because when Northstowe was first being considered a senior civil servant made a declaration at a public meeting that the existing Green Belt would be extended right up to the boundary of Northstowe. He assured us there would be no coalescence within adjoining villages. This was key to persuading the electorate and the powers that be to go ahead with Northstowe. Subsequently a Planning Inspector ruled out both of these very important features. The Inspector did not rule out completely any extension of the Green Belt and we expect that there will some extension towards Northstowe.
24269	Object	Stage 3 The proposed 'Northstowe' site(s) warrants further assessment/appraisal informed by a master plan that could include, within the town but not outside it, the suggestion of the AAP as mentioned in D3.7: "The District Council will prepare a Travellers' Policy Development Plan Document which will include policies and proposals for the needs of travellers, including site requirements, which may include provision at Northstowe." Tier 1 location and key constraints table make no sense whatsoever against the approved AAP policies NS2,3,7, ODPM Circular 1/06 para.65, and this for as long as Northstowe and its infrastructures are not comprehensively realised.
23847 24912 - Oakington and Westwick Parish Council	Object	The assertion that the land at, and within 1 km of Northstowe is not within or close proximity to a hazardous area is incorrect, because munitions have already been unearthed and exploded on parts of the site, and we have now been informed that further exploratory work has been deemed essential on the basis that there is a high probability that further munitions are to be found on most of the land bordering our village. I would submit that all of the Northstowe site is a hazardous area at the moment. I doubt whether all the ordnance left there by wartime activities and latterly by army occupation will ever be cleared. If the are plans to rotoavate the entire site to a depth of 1.5 metres are not successful in clearing the site, non-one will want to live there.
24268	Support	Stage 3 - Relationship to valued and hazardous areas In the case of Northstowe ,the AAP proposes to use the Conservation areas as part of the Green Separation free of habitat: it "will be provided between the village frameworks of Longstanton and Oakington and the built-up area of Northstowe. having particular regard to the character of conservation areas, it will contain only open land uses ... It is required in AAP C2.5 that 'Proposals for Northstowe will be expected to demonstrate a comprehensive landscape framework to reinforce the quality of the existing landscapeas well as the retention of the historic landscape'
24121 24258 24622	Support	This site assessment assumes that all of the infrastructure is in place. As such its vital that the site(s) are not constructed until this is the case. It is completely unrealistic to expect that the infrastructure of Northstowe will be ready for any GT sites before 2016 and therefore if Northstowe is not ready to accommodate it, it should be placed elsewhere in the county. The amenities in the surrounding area of Longstanton are not sufficient to accommodate extra population of a GT site in terms of e.g. primary school, which is already oversubscribed and is not predicted to cope with the increased birth rate in the village generated by the Home Farm development. The high sieving pro forma excludes as nearest settlements the villages of Longstanton and Oakington while A9 Tier 1 emphasises the need for sound principle for a sustainable development. This underscores the need to clarify that there will be no Gypsy and Traveller sites at Northstowe until the town exists and has the adequate infrastructure to support them.
25949 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	All dwellings in Cambourne have covenants and conditions attached restricting owners from storing caravans or parking commercial vehicles on their property. Similar conditions would have to be attached to the gypsy site if all residents of the community are to be treated the same in the interest of social cohesion.

Site 7 - Cambourne

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25945 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	In Tier 2 and Tier 3 sites assessment there is too many unknowns for a fair consideration of Cambourne to be made without a specific site being identified.
25947 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	Facilities in Cambourne The existing facilities such as doctor's surgery, primary schools, and children being bussed to secondary school are already under pressure. With high birth rate this will mean increased pressure in future. Plus 950 additional houses planned will increase pressure. The Traveller site would add additional strain in the facilities.
25944 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	The site assessment relies too heavily on what can be achieved by master planning, while this has largely been successful there have been areas where it has fallen short which gives the Parish Council little faith in ensuring that such an important issue is correctly integrated into the community to meet all needs.
25948 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	No tradition of Gypsy and Traveller pitches in Cambourne or stopping over places and no unlawful sites have been set up in Cambourne. Cambourne through the development of a high proportion of affordable housing has already provided accommodation for a growing number of Gypsy and Travellers who wish to settle and have already settled here.
23953	Object	The number of pitches is stated as 10, however I am concerned that there is a hidden growth expectation within the figures. Tier 2 Sect 3c states that Cambourne is a Rural Centre and can accommodate up to 30 pitches. Is it South Cams District Council's intention to increase the number of approved pitches towards the maximum once a Traveller site has been established?

Site 18 - Land At Spring Lane, Bassingbourn

25824 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council	Comment	Tier 1 - Footpaths Technical Annex paragraph A.19 identifies public footpaths as a valued area. In the site assessment for site 18, the response to question 3c identifies three public footpaths that are rights of way but has ignored a permissive public footpath that runs eastwards from Spring Lane approximately 250 metres to the north of the site.
24204 25774 25811 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25854 - Fourways 4 Business Limited	Object	Transport infrastructure 1e The frequency of the public transport service within a suitable distance is clearly inadequate by any of the option criteria set out on the Option 1 exercise. The site is poorly served by public transport. The nearest bus stop is 900m away. - There is only one daily service to Cambridge which does not include evening, Saturday or Sundays. - There is only a two hourly service to Royston which does not include a Sunday or an evening service. - The poor public transport infrastructure would restrict employment opportunities and curtail social activities and journeys will inevitably be made by car. Public Transport (bus only) to and from Bassingbourn is poor and falls far short of the stated criteria and should therefore be rejected. On the basis of the above the site would fail an objective Tier 2 assessment of Infrastructure.
25809 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25827 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council	Object	Tier 2 Emergency vehicles Technical Annex paragraph A.25 states 'Emergency vehicles (such as fire engines) require sufficient road widths in order to reach sites'. This is particular importance given the use of bottled fuel gas by gypsies and travellers, the high risk of fire associated with such use and the proximity of cereal crops on adjacent land. Access for emergency vehicles has not been specifically considered in the Site Assessment and the access improvements required would impact on delivery costs. DCLG Good Practice Guide 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites' paragraph 4.29 recommends more than one access point for emergency vehicles and site 18 does not have more than one access point. In considering access for emergency vehicles, Spring Lane is unsuitable for a gypsy and traveller site because: - Average width of Spring Lane adjacent to the proposed site is 2.6m, whereas a minimum width of 3.7m is required. - More than one access point is recommended. Spring Lane is a no-through road. - Congestion in Spring Lane due to parked vehicles may make access difficult. - Fire hydrant is at least 120m away off a 75mm main. - Spring Lane is a single track road. Ideally site roads should allow two vehicles to pass each other.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
23806 24981 25772	Object	I object to the selection of this site on the grounds that the lane is too narrow to accommodate Traveller and Gypsy caravans and associated vehicles; emergency services would also have difficulty in responding to an 'incident'. I understand that some of Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Services initial observations are - Access widths are inadequate; Access for fire appliances and the implementation of safety cordons may also prove difficult due to parked cars; The water main may prove insufficient. Failure to take notice of these safety issues could be seen as negligence on the part of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
25773 25826 - Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council 25851 - Fourways 4 Business Limited 25852 - Fourways 4 Business Limited 25853 - Fourways 4 Business Limited	Object	Transport Infrastructure 1a Technical Annex paragraph A.24 states 'The council determined that preference should be given to sites located on or near distributor roads,...This is to minimise any impact on local amenity resulting from vehicle traffic.' Spring Lane is a narrow winding residential road. The nearest distributor road is approximately 850 metres from proposed site. A survey undertaken by the Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Action Group indicates that there is already a high traffic flow for this type of minor residential road. Spring Lane is a residential development which turns into a narrow rural lane with significant local walker use and very limited traffic use. Thus even a 5 pitch site (which could feasibly cater for more than 10 vehicles) would have a significant impact on the local amenity resulting from the increase in vehicle traffic through the area. The access road is generally 2.5m wide. Designing Gypsy and Traveller sites - Good Practice Guidance 2008 states that 'roads must be not less than 3.7m wide or if they form part of a one-way traffic system 3m wide.' The verge to the East of the lane is not flat but is interrupted by a significant ditch. The lack of visibility offered by the nature of the lane that makes the position of the new site dangerous without a significant visibility splay the creation of which would inevitably compromise the character of the area. The answer to question 1a of Tier 1 is 'yes' and appears inappropriate.
25904 - Litlington Parish Council	Object	The criteria used to justify the inclusion of Spring Lane , Bassingbourn in the consultation exercise is flawed when subjected to close scrutiny.
25603 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25832 - Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council 25905 - Litlington Parish Council 26072	Object	Tier 3 - Access to other facilities The distances used to test accessibility to facilities and services is questioned. ' Better place by Design: Companion Guide to PPG3(2007) and Manual for Streets (2007) ' both state that 800m is a comfortable walking distance to facilities. The first thing to note is the exclusion of two key criteria contained in Circular 1/06. These refer to employment opportunities for travellers and the access of the site to public transport. This site fails on both these. In assessing sustainable development in accordance paragraph Technical Annex A.41, 5 of a list of 12 amenities should be within 1000 metres of the site. The response to question 2.a indicates that a Medical Centre, a children's play area, a community centre, a public house and an outdoor open access public area are within 1000 metres. However, 'community centre' is actually a facility for The Limes sheltered housing and with very limited exceptions (e.g. the library access point) is not made available for public use as a community centre. Accordingly we consider that in response to question 2b, the site does not have 5 or more of the local amenities within 1000 metres. The amenities are not given any weighting and this is a weakness. By applying a common-sense weighting a different picture emerges for the proposed site in Bassingbourn with it meeting broad criteria it fails at a more detailed level. The basic approach requiring 5 of the amenities to be within 1000m is too simplistic, not providing a good indication as to how the residents of the site would be served.
25850 - Fourways 4 Business Limited 25855 - Fourways 4 Business Limited	Object	Not only is the site surrounded by public footpaths, as identified in the analysis, but the narrow rural lane on which the site is to be located is also effectively used as a public footpath itself, linking the village to the surrounding footpaths and extensively used by walkers and dog-walkers. The existing use of the surrounding area is that of a single track rural lane, used primarily as a footpath for dog-walkers and walkers but also providing vehicular access to and from the village for walkers , the farmer , and the two houses beyond the lane on Ashwell St. My concern is that implementing appropriate site design, landscaping and access is likely to have a high impact on the current use of the area by the villagers and in accordance with GT28 ' it would be unreasonable to permit any development where it would have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the locality.'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25600 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25602 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>3c The site is immediately adjacent to a public footpath a locally recognised designation and valued area. The surrounding land has also been the subject of extensive investment in time and resources to enhance the natural environment. This has significantly increased its amenity value. The Site Assessment Criteria states that such valued areas should be avoided in the search for sites unless appropriate mitigation could be provided. It is not clear what mitigation could be implemented which would offset the impact of development in this location.</p> <p>Although the report states N/A to 1a, there is a clear statement that there is a potential impact on the historic environment requiring that this would require consideration as part of the planning application. The report recognises that the proposed site is adjacent to a "valued area" as a public footpath (see 3c under Environmental Constraints above). The impact on this valued area should therefore be assessed.</p> <p>The introduction of this development within this countryside location would have high impact - both visual and noise.</p>
25796 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25825 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council	Object	<p>Technical Annex paragraph A.19 identifies poor drainage as a hazard. Spring Lane has a history of poor drainage with parts of the lane being subject to flooding as a result. Sections of the lane are shown on the Environment Agency flood risk maps. Paragraph A.20 states 'At the initial stage of identifying any new sites, sites within hazardous areas were to be avoided in order to avoid the implementation costs associated with site mitigation.' The development would also appear to be contrary to South Cambridgeshire District Council Development Control Policy NE/9 unless significant expense is incurred to provide the infrastructure. In the site assessment for site 18, the response to question 3d has ignored the hazard of poor drainage.</p> <p>The proposed gypsy and traveller site will increase the risk of flooding not only in Spring Lane but elsewhere in the village. Unless elaborate measures are taken, allowing other than a residential site would run the risk of polluting the aquifer.</p> <p>To assess the actual risk posed by the proposed gypsy and traveller site a full Hydrological, Environmental and Drainage Impact Assessment Report has been prepared by Stephanie Wright MSc, BSc (Water Management) BTEC (Business Management) and this together with a condensed summary is enclosed. The conclusions have far reaching implications.</p>
25856 - Fourways 4 Business Limited	Object	<p>Tier 3 Impact, Access and Deliverability</p> <p>Design and Impact 1d</p> <p>Widening the lane would inevitably result in a high impact on the local character of the lane, which currently homes wildlife such as deer, foxes and badgers and is an environmentally sensitive wildlife habitat.</p>
25828 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council	Object	<p>Tier 2 - Visibility splays</p> <p>Response to question 1b indicates standard visibility splays could be reduced in order to enable the access to be made. DCLG Good Practice Guide 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites' paragraph 4.18 states 'Access roads and the site design itself should be capable of providing sufficient space for the manoeuvrability of average size trailers of up to 15 metres in length, with capacity for larger mobile homes on a limited number of pitches where accessibility can be properly addressed in the light of the land available.'</p> <p>Regardless of the visibility splay, a wider access will nevertheless be required in order to accommodate the turning of long vehicles. This will result in additional costs which have not been considered.</p>
25849 - Fourways 4 Business Limited	Object	<p>Tier 1 Location and Key Constraints</p> <p>Environmental Constraints- 3b</p> <p>The site location on greenfield land is contrary to the council's preferred approach and the aims of national planning policy where sustainable alternatives are available, as is clearly the case in this situation.</p>
25525 25593 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25775 25857 - Fourways 4 Business Limited 25938	Object	<p>Tier 3 Deliverability 3c Notional Costings.</p> <p>The site does not have any connections to utilities (sewerage, electricity, water etc.) and provision of these together with the widening of the existing lane sufficiently to cater for walkers, dog-walkers and increased vehicular access alongside parked cars is likely to be extremely costly and would damage the character of the lane.</p> <p>The costs of constructing a site from scratch means it is unlikely to provide value for money to the taxpayer on a per-pitch basis compared to other sites.</p> <p>We believe the 'weighting' given to the costings of providing this site grossly under-estimates the real costs involved.</p> <p>The proposed site in Bassingbourn is the 6th most costly one of 20 consulted. It is the most costly site on a notional basis except for those proposed as part of major developments. On the notional cost basis the deliverability of the site is a serious doubt and should be rejected now.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25598 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>Key Social Infrastructure.</p> <p>The use of a test that the site should be within 2,000m of primary school, doctors surgery and food shop as the crow flies is totally irrelevant. It has no value in measuring accessibility to key services and amenities if the walk or cycle route is not measured. (ref. A14 of Site Assessment Criteria).</p>
25950	Object	<p>The site appears to be in conflict with much of the criteria which must be complied with . For example the approach road is too narrow, is near a housing estate, and is a substantial distance from public transport. , that is , 900metres.</p>
25597 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 26068	Object	<p>Tier 1. Site description and context The site is located around 100m from the Bassingbourn village edge. It next states at 1c that the distance to the edge of the nearest settlement is 240m. The development framework for the village is hard against the last property in Spring Lane and therefore the village edge and nearest settlement are co-incident. One must be incorrect. The precise entrance to the site is unclear and accurate assessment of distances is therefore not possible with the consequence that cost factors cannot be properly judged. Relevance of this measurement since it does not relate to sustainability criteria.</p>
24199	Object	<p>Although the doctors surgery is within the 2000m criteria it does not carry out the full range of treatments and you have to travel to Ashwell to access these.</p>
25835 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council	Object	<p>Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth PC recognizes the need for Gypsy and Traveller sites but considers that neither the Spring Lane site nor any of the other sites considered in Bassingbourn are suitable.</p> <p>The proposed Spring Lane site would be an obtrusive development in an undeveloped country lane. The caravans and associated infrastructure would compromise the character of Spring Lane.</p>
23626 25810 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>Under tier 2 - Transport Infrastructure it is stated that: "Spring lane is lined by residential development but the impact of a small site would be limited due to the low number of trips generated by a site of this scale". However how many vehicles and what type is not known and so the statement is conjecture. In the assessment of Spring Lane in section Tier 2 1c reference is made to the lane being 'lightly trafficked route'. This of course depends upon your definition of 'lightly trafficked'. In order to obtain more meaningful data a traffic survey of the lane was undertaken on Monday 14th September 2009 which was randomly selected. Over a 12 hour period a total of 712 vehicle movements was recorded entering and exiting Spring Lane. Averages as vehicle every minute so not lightly trafficked particularly as rural village lane.</p>
25830 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council 25831 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council	Object	<p>Tier 3 Impact on designations listed in Tier 1 In question 1a of the Site Assessment, 'Impact on designations listed section 3 of Tier 1' is answered N/A despite the site having been identified as a valued area in the Tier 1 assessment. This appears to be incorrect. We also represent that the site is a hazard area in accordance with paragraph A.19. In the Site Assessment, question 1b 'Impact on amenity of surrounding existing uses' is answered 'Low impact'. Spring Lane is very extensively used for recreational walking and running and the proposed gypsy and traveller site would have a significant impact on this activity. We represent therefore that the impact should be classified as High Impact in accordance with Technical Annex paragraph A.37 and rejected in accordance with paragraph A.38.</p>
25599 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25823 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council	Object	<p>Environmental Constraints At 3c the report states: "Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeology Service state that crop marks indicate the location of Bronze Age barrow to the South West and archaeological investigations to the west have identified significant landscape boundary dating from the Iron Age. No information is given as to the impact of this and what, if any, additional investigations would be necessary. Other sites R4; R5; R6; R7; R8; R15 and R20 have been rejected on the grounds of identified archaeology and the impact on the historic environment. This selection criterion does not appear to have been consistently applied. No justification is given for the failure to reject site 18 for its impact on the historic environment and additional cost would be incurred for archaeological investigation of the site.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25601 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25808 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group 25937 26069	Object	<p>Tier 2 - Transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Answers to questions in this section are questioned -</p> <p>Answer to 1a should be NO. There is no distributor road available without passing through a housing area and it is too far from the site. Does not take into account nature of Spring Lane, such as parked cars and use by a high proportion of elderly and vulnerable pedestrians due to the location of the sheltered housing, Papworth Trust and doctors surgery. The lane is also used for exercise and access to the Icknield Way.</p> <p>1b should be NO. Access for emergency vehicles - preference for sites to be near large settlements and if away from main highway then require sufficient road widths. Spring Lane does not meet these requirements.</p> <p>1c Answer to this is not qualified. There is no footpath or cycle route within 240m of site. The lane is narrow and becomes single track with blind bends. This grossly misrepresents the impact on the existing use of Spring Lane and the size and capacity of the lane on the approach to the proposed site.</p> <p>Little employment opportunities available in Bassingbourn. Residents of the proposed site might expect to carry on home business activities, which in turn would result in the use of commercial vans. These would have a greater impact than is indicated in the report.</p>
23621 23978 24206 25833 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council	Object	<p>Technical Annex paragraph A.48 lays out the criteria for notional costings and these are provided in the site assessment under question 3.c. The cost of utility connection is scored as 1 but in accordance with the criteria in should be scored as 2 since the nearest utility connection is more than 100 metres from the site. The combined sewer is stated to be 180m away from the site which itself varies in distance from 100m to 240m depending on which boundary is chosen. Total site scoring should be a 5. In addition, since we have identified poor drainage as a hazard in accordance with paragraph A.19, the cost of mitigation should be 1. Accordingly the total notional cost associated with site 18 should be at least 6.</p>
25829 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council 26070	Object	<p>Technical Annex paragraph A.26 states 'Safe pedestrian or cycle access/routes should be provided to the nearest local centre, or where one does not exist it should be feasible to provide such a link.' No footpath currently exists and vehicles using the lane to reach farm properties constitute some danger to pedestrians. Whilst it may be feasible to provide a footpath, this would involve an additional cost.</p> <p>The answer yes to 1c is not strictly accurate. Using the distances stated in the report, the site is 240 m from the boundary of the village framework. There is no existing pedestrian footpath or cycle route over the route, therefore this would need to be provided at further cost.</p>
<i>Site 19 - Rose And Crown Road, Swavesey</i>		
24031 - Swavesey Parish Council	Object	<p>Swavesey Parish Council would dispute the comments made regarding the site at TIER 2, 1c. There are no footpaths from the site to the village for pedestrians. Rose & Crown Road is a heavily used road. It takes all of the school buses twice a day to/from the large Village College, it is a main bus route to/from St Ives-Cambridge, it is a main route to/from the A14 for residents of Fen Drayton. The Road is suffering from serious damage through over-use, with road edges crumbling and major repair work required.</p>

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****D. LOCATION AND CONSTRAINTS MAPS FOR SITE OPTIONS AND REJECTED SITES BY VILLAGE****D4a Northstowe Location Map**

24532	Object	Objection to technical annexe glossary: there should be an added definition of Northstowe that makes it very clear that the mapping of the broad geographical site of the future settlement corresponds to the AAP NS3 determination but that the jurisdictional boundaries for Northstowe have yet to be agreed in a forthcoming boundary review.
-------	--------	--

D4b Northstowe Constraints Map

24325	Comment	The Conservation areas, delineated in pink between Longstanton and the Northstowe site, are subsumed into the AAP Northstowe site delineation and green separation. These areas should be indicated as valued and protected rather than areas within the site options, as per AAP NS3
24266	Object	There are no local services within the Northstowe settlement, e.g. shops, doctors and schools, in annexed map D2 but the legend refers to NS3 of the Northstowe AAP: there is no indication in NS3 that any Northstowe educational provision for Gypsy and Travellers accommodation are to be applied within 1 km of the development framework. Furthermore AAP NS7 defines Northstowe as a free standing settlement: a free standing settlement will provide all the required services for its future all inclusive community of residents. It is fundamentally wrong to map out Longstanton Primary School as a Northstowe educational facility.

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****E. REVIEW OF PUBLICLY OWNED LAND****E.2**

27096 - Gallagher Estates	Object	Objection is made to the veracity of the analysis of the public sector land. The approach set out in the Annex appears to be the absolute minimum. If the expectation is that utilising public land may lead to reduced capital costs for gypsy and traveller sites and a more efficient and effective delivery of these sites then a more rigorous approach to the analysis is needed and justified. The conclusions of the analysis of available public land are not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The analysis is incomplete and therefore the DPD fails Test (vii) of the Tests of Soundness.
---------------------------	--------	---

Land owned by Cambridgeshire County Council

24096 - Barratt Strategic & the NW Cambridge Consortium of Landowners	Object	It is noted that the Council reviewed the availability/suitability of publicly owned land as a source of land on which to deliver G&T sites; of concern is the thoroughness of that review. Cambridgeshire County Council is a key organisation involved in the delivery of G&T sites/services and its ability to provide land within the district to accommodate this use should be explored. Entirely dismissing Cambridgeshire County Council's land holdings discounts a deliverable variety of site options. The Council commented regarding land owned by other public bodies. Have the land holdings of each organisation been properly assessed?
---	--------	---

Table E1 - Review of County Council land within search areas by South Cambridgeshire District Council

24891 - Oakington and Westwick Parish Council	Object	On page 296 Site 60, land to North of Dry Drayton Road mistakenly identifies that this land as being Green Belt, whereas it is not at this point in time. We take this as confirming that SCDC is minded to upgrade it to this status as part of the Northstowe development.
28702	Object	The GTDPD Tech Annexe seems to indicate on page 295 table E1 Site no 56 that the council is considering that the Old and Striplan land northwest of Longstanton will be suitable for a Gypsy and Traveller site as this public land is reserved for future development of Northstowe. Objecting to site 56 and 57 because they are misleading from the proposed site 6.

Map D2m Northstowe

24317	Object	There are no local services within the Northstowe settlement, e.g. shops, doctors and schools, in annexed map D2 but the legend refers to NS3 of the Northstowe AAP: there is no indication in NS3 that any Northstowe educational provision for Gypsy and Travellers accommodation are to be applied within 1 km of the development framework. Furthermore AAP NS7 defines Northstowe as a free standing settlement: a free standing settlement will provide all the required services for its future all inclusive community of residents. It is fundamentally wrong to map out Longstanton Primary School as a Northstowe educational facility.
24319	Object	Of all the maps showing 1000 and 2000 metres search area, this one is the only one that fails to show any key amenities within the site area and as from the centre of the search area. This map is premature and misleading: there is not an agreed master plan, there is no physical and jurisdictional agreed boundaries for the town of Northstowe, only the site as a whole has been delineated in the AAP that stands here in yellow as if an exclusion zone at the centre of the search area. What exactly is the point of it?

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------

F. IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR DEVELOPMENT SITE OPTIONS

Major Sites not identified as Site Options

24873	Object	I object to the omission of potential sites in South Cambridgeshire such as Sawston, The Shelfords, Stapleford and other rejected sites being omitted from any consideration at this stage on the grounds that the means of acquiring and developing sites in locations now positively identified may need to be such that if applied to those ignored/rejected sites then these sites would also satisfy the requirements criteria.
-------	--------	--

Cambridge Southern Fringe (Trumpington Meadows)

27095 - Gallagher Estates	Object	The relative timetables for the various parts of the development plan (the adopted Structure Plan, Gypsy and Traveller DPD and the Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP) since 2006 and the evolution of the Trumpington Meadows planning applications do not support the statement that "it would be difficult to secure a (gypsy and traveller) site or to integrate it into the development at this very late stage."
---------------------------	--------	---

If gypsy and traveller sites are to be delivered as part of the overall provision of affordable housing then sites at Trumpington Meadows, Clay Farm (and other parts of the Southern Fringe) should still be assessed.

24870	Object	I object to this site not being included as the criteria for securing a Gypsy and traveller site would be no different to those applied to other major development areas. Even though planning permission has been granted there is nothing to stop a Housing Association/ Social/ Affordable housing site within the development being devoted to provide a traveller site. Cambourne is to be subjected to further masterplanning on the grounds that it should meet revised government densities. On this precedent further masterplanning should be applied to the Trumpington site to meet government requirements for traveller provisions
-------	--------	---

Table F1 - Site Options at Major Developments

25946 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	The major development sites and Cambourne in particular are disadvantaged because the proposal is for the whole village and not site specific. This means it is difficult to object using the specific design criteria. This process potentially means that an allocation of pitches is made when there is not suitable land available for the pitches. This means the process is flawed.
----------------------------------	--------	---

APPENDIX 1

SUMMARY OF THE REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED FOR THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

Sustainability Appraisal of the Gypsy and Traveller DPD Issues and Options 2 Report: Site Options and Policies

Public Participation Report

Non-Technical Summary

Non-Technical Summary

Representations

Nature Summary of Main Issue

Non-Technical Summary

Non-Technical Summary

24095 - Barratt Strategic & the NW
Cambridge Consortium of Landowners

Object

The Options Appraisal Summary Table contains a significant amount of uncertainty in terms of the assessment scoring. With so much ambiguity in relation to the impact of each objective and sub-objective, consideration should be given to including a number of clear indicators against which each site can then be scored. This would avoid the inconsistency in terms of the conclusions reached for each site.

1. Introduction

1.2. This SA Report

24565 - Girton Parish Council

Object

Girton Parish Council regards the Sustainability Report prepared by consultants Scott Wilson as not fit for purpose in its present form, and dependence upon it shall be regarded as a failure to exercise due diligence.

Representations**Nature Summary of Main Issue****2. Stage A****2.5. SA Objectives (A4)**

24355 25803 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>1.1 Minimise the irreversible loss of underdeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings</p> <p>The proposed site will take out of production at least 0.5 hectares (5,000 sq.metres) of prime agricultural land recently growing cereals. Britain is no longer self-sufficient in food production and has to import the majority of its food including substantial amounts of grain. At a time when environmental organisations are urging that reduce carbon emissions arising from unnecessary food imports, using Grade 1 agricultural land for a gypsy and traveller site seems perverse and wasteful</p> <p>The site proposed in Spring Lane, Bassingbourn is to be built on Grade 1 agricultural land. This is a waste of resources particularly when great Britain has to import the majority of its food. It is also counter productive to the Government's objective of reducing carbon omissions.</p>
27093 - Gallagher Estates	Object	<p>One of the SA Objectives is '7.1' Help people gain access to satisfying work.' The associated comment in the SA is that "There may be potential for business activities to be undertaken at authorised sites, although the degree to which this will be the case and the success of such schemes is somewhat uncertain."</p> <p>In fact paragraph 7.2 of the DPD clearly states that all the Gypsy and Traveller sites in the district will be residential rather than mixed uses incorporating employment. At Northstowe, on this basis the impact of the allocation on achieving the SA Objective should be identified as negative.</p>
25799 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>Site 18 Spring Lane Table 2.7 The SA Framework Climate Change and Light Pollution 4.1 Reduce Emissions of Greenhouse Gasses and Other Pollutants.</p> <p>The proposed gypsy and traveller site would have a negative effect on emissions of greenhouse gasses and other pollutants (including air, water, soil, noise, vibration and light) owing to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased traffic flow by cars and commercial vehicles - Caravans, mobile homes, motor vehicles and outside lighting will create additional noise, vibration and light pollution. - A 0.5 hectare site will increase the risk of surface water flooding and risk pollution of the water supply.
25536	Object	<p>The proposed site in Spring Lane does not achieve several of the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives namely it does not -</p> <p>1.1 Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land and productive agricultural holdings.</p> <p>2.2 Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species.</p> <p>2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and wild places.</p> <p>4.3 Limit or reduce vulnerability to the effects of climate change (including flooding)</p> <p>5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space.</p>
25797 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>Site 18 Spring Lane Table 2.7 The SA Framework Healthy Communities 5.1 Maintain and Enhance Human Health</p> <p>It is well documented that the traveller community have a poor health record compared to the settled population</p> <p>Locating a gypsy and traveller site in an arable field would put at risk two vulnerable groups - the elderly and the children.</p> <p>At various times of the year they would be exposed to the effects of chemicals used in fertilisers and other crop spraying. Any existing asthmatic, bronchial or heart conditions would be exacerbated by dust clouds created by combine harvesting. The many types of farm machinery used in these operations pose an acute danger to young children.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
27159 - Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council 28706 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>5.2 Reduce and Prevent Crime and Reduce the Fear of Crime</p> <p>The Parish Council has been extremely careful to avoid any discussion that might be considered racist and to avoid generalisations, stereotypes or negative perceptions of race, ethnicity or culture. Whilst the PC is obviously aware the general public often make generalisations associating crime with travellers, it has not evidence to support such generalisations. However fear of crime is quite different from the actual experience of crime since it depends on the attitudes, perceptions and past experiences of the people. Reducing the fear of crime is the second part of this Healthy Communities objective. The Sustainability Appraisal has not adequately considered the fear of crime.</p> <p>Written evidence from several sources to the office of Deputy Prime Minister details instances of criminality and anti social behaviour associated with gypsy and traveller sites thereby contributing to the fear of crime as perceived by the settled community. A survey conducted by Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council indicated that the majority of residents who responded would not use Spring Lane if it contained a traveller site. The perception of crime has been identified by the Council as a significant issue to address and alleviate but evidence shows that a gypsy and travellers site would have the opposite effect.</p>
25800 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>Site 18 Spring Lane Table 2.7 The SA Framework Landscape, Townscape and Archaeology 3.3 Create places etc</p> <p>The Council's objective to 'create places spaces and buildings that work well, wear well and look good' cannot be achieved by the creation of a gypsy and traveller site because -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A traveller site containing mobile homes, caravans , sheds, commercial vehicles and amenity buildings with their out of character appearance would be harmful in the countryside. - Screening of a site cannot be effective due to the open aspect of the countryside with footpaths transversing all four sides of the location.
24356 25802 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>2.2 Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species. This objective would be seriously compromised by the creation of a Gypsy and Traveller site. A recent study (August 2009) by the Bassingbourn Conservation Group (BCG) has identified in Spring Lane and its environs a diverse range of plants, bird species and flourishing groups of animals and insects. In May 2007 a bird survey identified 47 different species including 8 which are on the Government Red List. The proposed Gypsy and Traveller Site in Spring Lane, Bassingbourn, will adversely impact upon the range and viability of species and their characteristic habitats particularly in the construction stage. The Bassingbourn Conservation Group is greatly concerned at the potential loss of verges, hedges and trees together with the ongoing disturbance arising from the activities at the site.</p>
24358 25801 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>3.2 Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character.</p> <p>One of the main objections to the proposed gypsy and Traveller Site in Spring Lane, Bassingbourn is its rural setting. The concept that it could enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of the landscape is plainly risible. The lane is barely 2m wide and in consequence will need considerable widening both for travellers vehicles but also emergency vehicles. With the loss of verges, hedges and probably some trees the character of the lane will be destroyed for a considerable portion of its length. Screening will take many years to establish and will require maintenance which may not be enforced. The construction of a traveller and gypsy site will require extensive and intrusive construction work which will irreparable damage the visual aspect and rural characteristics of the lane. Planting effective screening of the site will take years to mature and bring inherent problems of its own.</p>
24357	Object	<p>Building a gypsy and Traveller Site in Spring Lane will have the following detrimental effects:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Use of the lane as an access point to the wider countryside will cease or be greatly deterred. 2) Access to wildlife and wild places will be curtailed. 3) Work done by conservation groups and the wider community will be undone giving rise to dismay and resentment.
25798 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>Site 18 , Spring Lane Table 2.7 The SA Framework Healthy Communities 5.3 Improve the Quantity and Quality of publicly accessible open space.</p> <p>The proposed gypsy and traveller site in Spring Lane will reduce the quantity and diminish the quality of publicly accessible open space contrary to the Council's objectives.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
------------------------	---------------	------------------------------

Representations	Nature	Summary of Main Issue
-----------------	--------	-----------------------

Annex III: Site Assessment Tables

Annex III: Site Assessment Tables

26311	Comment	Re Site 18 Spring Lane
		Using 0.5 hectare is contrary to several sustainability objectives - namely (Sustainability Appraisal Objectives) 1.1 Minimise irreversible loss of undeveloped land and agricultural holdings 2.2 Maintain and enhance the range and viability of characteristic habitats and species 2.3 Improve opportunities for people to access and appreciate wildlife and wild places 4.3 Limit of reduce vulnerability to the effects of climate change (including flooding) 5.3 Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space
29090 - Girton Parish Council	Object	A separate enquiry made on behalf of the Parish Council to Cambridgeshire Constabulary under the Freedom of Information Act revealed that no information was held regarding any formal risk assessment of crime regarding either caravanners' sites or of the community of Girton. Therefore no proper assessment of this issue has been conducted of the sustainability of utilising sites 4 or 5 for caravanners.
25238	Object	The Spring Lane site would seem to have many of the features which would justify exclusion of the site by the sustainability appraisal objectives, which is a key component of the site selection. It illustrates that there was very little local knowledge or understanding of the nature of the site, the history of the area or the surrounding land.
27160 - Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council	Object	Site 18 Healthy Communities 5.2 - Reduce fear of crime There is already a significant fear of crime among the sheltered community in Knutsford Rd and Spring Lane. Many Neighbourhood Watch signs. Fear of crime evidenced by responses to Parish Plan questionnaire and attendance of community at Neighbourhood Policing Panel meetings. Older residents relate stories of crimes that occurred when travellers illegally settled in Spring Lane in past. Given this background any development other than settled housing in Spring Lane will almost certainly increase this fear of crime. We consider that the response to Q.5.2 in SA that there is unlikely to be an effect is incorrect and that the response should be scored (-).
25834 - Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council	Object	Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth PC recognizes the need for Gypsy and Traveller sites but considers that insufficient weight has been given to the sustainability appraisal and that neither site 18 Spring Lane nor any of the other sites considered in Bassingbourn are suitable. In particular, the loss of agricultural land appears to be contrary to South Cambridgeshire Development Control Policy NE/17. Site 18 is only one of three sites scoring [-] on this matter in the Sustainability Appraisal and Site 18 should be rejected because the requirement for Gypsy & Traveller sites can be met elsewhere without such loss.
26950 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	Site 18 Spring Lane, Bassingbourn Inclusive Communities Objective 6.4 Illegal encampments by travellers in Bassingbourn led to intense periods of community activity in 1990's - removing accumulated rubbish and debris resulting from occupation of Spring Lane, Ashwell Street and South End ; setting up of conservation group to improve access paths to Icknield Way . Over period of 17 years various village groups have improved rural character of land creating major village recreational and leisure amenity. Establishment of Traveller site would either inhibit , deter or prevent such activities.
25776	Object	The proposed site is a greenfield site in open countryside many hundreds of meters from water and electricity supplies and mains drainage. The road is too narrow to serve the needs/ requirements of emergency or traveller vehicles and so will have to be widened and the pavement extended. There is considerable amenity value enjoyed by the general public in terms of the roads leisure benefits and by the site location in general in terms of the open countryside.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Summary of Main Issue</i>
25408	Object	<p>Spring Lane Site 18</p> <p>The proposed site will serve to increase emissions of green house gasses including air, noise, vibration and light arising from -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in traffic flow by cars and commercial vehicles - The poor public transport infrastructure will dictate that travellers will use their own transport to access services in Royston and Cambridge. - Additional noise will be created by mobile homes, caravans, motor vehicles and any outside lighting will add to light pollution.
24980	Object	<p>Site 18 - Bassingbourn, Spring Lane</p> <p>Taking our of use 0.5 hectares of prime agricultural land, destroying the character of the quiet country lane etc is contrary to several of the sustainability objectives (SA objectives) namely - 1.1; 2.2; 2.3; 4.3; 5.3.</p>
26951 - Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group	Object	<p>Site 18 Spring Lane, Bassingbourn Biodiversity Objective 2.3</p> <p>The establishment of a traveller site in Spring Lane will impact adversely on the following -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce or eliminate conservation work done by the community Inhibit use of the lane as a route to the wider countryside Deny or restrict access to wildlife and wild places.
25409	Object	<p>Spring Lane Site 18</p> <p>By no stretch of the imagination will the Council's objective to 'Create places , spaces and buildings that work well , wear well and look good' be achieved by the creation of a Gypsy and Traveller site in Spring Lane because -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A traveller site containing mobile homes, caravans , sheds, amenity buildings, cars and commercial vehicles with their out of character appearance would be harmful to the countryside. - Screening of the site cannot be effective due to the open aspect and timescale needed to mature.
27026	Object	<p>Site 18 Spring Lane</p> <p>SA Objectives Inclusive Communities 6.4</p> <p>Spring Lane and its environs has seen much local activity over the past two decades primarily to restore the lane after illegal incursions by travellers in the sixties and eighties.</p> <p>After removing rubbish left by travellers, Spring Lane was the subject of conservation work involving seeding, planting and maintenance, some funded by the Council.</p> <p>As a result the lane is now a major leisure area forming part of an integral circular walk taking in the conservation area (Ashwell Stret) South End and Ford Wood. The local conservation group use the lane for an ongoing study of flora and fauna.</p> <p>A gypsy and traveller site would destroy much of the conservation work eroding both community involvement and goodwill.</p>

APPENDIX 1

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED FOR THE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Supporting Documents

Public Participation Report

Equality Impact Assessment

Equality Impact Assessment

Representations

Nature Summary of Main Issue

Equality Impact Assessment

Equality Impact Assessment

28594 - Equalities Consultative Forum	Comment	<p>In DPD's aims panel wanted mention of the wider remit to promote community cohesion. In A3, the panel felt that there would be a direct benefit to Travellers and the settled community.</p> <p>The panel did not like the term "shelf-life" in section A4. Change.</p> <p>The panel not happy with much of section B2 - "emotive, inflammatory and political". Did not reflect local context, and portrayed fact mixed with fiction. Questioned need for this section.</p> <p>- Also on B2, the panel asked for definition of the terms "transient" and "housed".</p> <p>- Discussion sentence in C3 "Travelling and living in a caravan is part of the heritage of a Gypsy and Traveller and not a lifestyle choice". Compromise was reached, to amend this sentence to read "not always a lifestyle choice".</p> <p>- The panel keen to include sections for the other equality strands - ie. Travellers who might be disabled, or young or old.</p>
23955	Object	<p>In the draft Gypsy and Traveller Community Strategy Paper (21 July 2009) Minute Item 11, Point 8 Implications Equal Opportunities the wording says "ensure that gypsy and traveller communities enjoy equality of service ... and share EQUAL rights and responsibilities". If a site (site 18 - Bassingbourn) is developed outside the village framework, when non travellers have had planning applications within the village framework refused (e.g. a single caravan behind the glasshouses on 1198) then travellers are not being given equal rights to non-travellers, but ENHANCED rights.</p> <p>This is also stated in SCDC's Environment/Traveller Issues lobbying document 10. The draft guidance still seems weighted against the equally legitimate interests of householders.</p>

Habitat Regulations Assessment

Habitat Regulations Assessment

26024 - Natural England	Comment	Habitats Regulations Assessment
		<p>We have reviewed the Gypsy and Traveller DPD Habitats Regulations Assessment and consider that this screening exercise has been well prepared and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. Natural England supports the conclusion of the HRA that this DPD is unlikely to have a significant effect on any Natura 2000 or Ramsar sites and there is no need for the plan to progress to the Appropriate Assessment stage.</p>