



## **Appendix A**

### **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework**

#### **Pre-Submission Core Strategy DPD Responses to Representations**

**Special Council 15 November 2005**

# *Draft Core Strategy, Development Control Policies, Site Specific Policies DPDs*

## *Public Participation Report*

INTRODUCTION

1.1

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<b><i>INTRODUCTION</i></b>				
<b><i>1.1</i></b>				
9913 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The plan period to 2016 is too short. A period of circa 10 years will not address the long-term development requirements of this major growth sub-region. Whilst the Structure Plan has an end-date of 2016 the new RSS, the East of England Plan has an end date of 2021 and should be taken into account given that it should be approved during 2006.	RSS6 and the Structure Plan 2003 place emphasis on the early delivery of the development strategy for the Cambridge Sub Region. The Council's first tranche of LDDs are therefore being prepared in accordance with the adopted and saved Structure Plan 2003, and the development strategy in the Core Strategy plans for development up to 2016 in order that plans are in place as soon as possible. The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS14) covers a longer period to 2021. However, it carries forward the Structure Plan strategy for South Cambs to 2016 and proposes a similar rate of development up to 2021, which will be largely delivered through the major developments that will continue beyond 2016. The Area Action Plans for the major developments provide a policy framework for the developments as a whole. The Core Strategy will be reviewed once RSS14 is adopted.	
8375 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The LDF should be prepared in association with Cambridge City Council's preparation of its LDF, in order to produce an integrated planning framework that recognises the strong geographical inter-relationship between the two authorities' areas.	The two Councils are working closely on cross-boundary issues, such as the review of the Green Belt boundary and planning the Cambridge East urban extension, through the production of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan, a joint Plan being produced by the two local authorities.	
9227 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	The alterations made to the development plan were aimed at simplifying the process in order to aid implementation and delivery. The LDF should comprise a set of comprehensive, concise documents to be read collectively. The South Cambridgeshire LDF pre submission draft does not appear to comply with advice in PSS12 or the Companion Guide, since the DPD's are generally repetitive, with policies reiterated in different DPD's, and are unnecessarily detailed and complex. It is difficult to understand how the documents will help achieve the aims of implementation and delivery. It is also difficult to see how such confusing, lengthy documents will be more accessible to the local community.	Due to the pressure for growth in the Cambridge Sub-Region it was important the Council move forward as quickly as possible to plan for the new development. As a result, the Council felt there was a need for a comprehensive suite of policies. However, in response to some representations received, the Council is proposing to streamline some parts of the LDF, and in future reviews of the LDF documents the Council will seek to produce a more modular plan and simplify the suite of documents.	
8484 - Hazardous Installations Inspectorate 8367 - Hazardous Installations Inspectorate	Support	Thank you for the comprehensive suite of documents. I am happy to be consulted either on a CD-rom copy, or ideally by reference to documents on your website.	Noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9346 - Willingham Parish Council	Support	The revised LDF document appears to meet all the concerns previously expressed by Willingham Parish Council. I am asked by the Willingham Planning Committee Chairman to convey their appreciation for this.	Support noted.	
<i>1.4</i>				
10949 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	In line 2, add "and Peterborough" after "Cambridgeshire".	Agree.	Amend reference to the "Cambridgeshire Structure Plan" to read "Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan."
<i>1.5</i>				
9881 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	Proposal Maps - draft June 2005 (i.e. both) - What are the highlighted areas using the letters A to D etc - do they relate to the concept diagrams? Cross references / explanatory key needs to be stated.	The areas marked A to D on the Proposals Map relate to the inset maps for the Area Action Plan locations. They are differentiated from the village inset maps, denoted by numbers. The contents page in the Proposals Map lists all of the maps.	Revisit how the inset maps are shown on the Proposals Map to make it clearer.
<i>1.6</i>				
9533 - GO-East	Object	The main proposals map should be clearer and consistent in showing the inset areas to be covered by the Area Action Plans. In some cases, the areas covered are not fully clear or consistent with the actual areas shown for the AAP insets.	Noted.	Revisit how the inset maps are shown on the Proposals Map to make it clearer.
<i>1.8</i>				
10189 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	The University welcomes the intention, at paragraph 2.20 and set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme, to prepare an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the land to be released from the Green Belt, west of the City, between Huntingdon Rd and Madingley Rd. The University is concerned that the AAP for North West Cambridge is not included in the first tranche Development Plan Documents that South Cambridgeshire intend to produce, since the University has demonstrated a clear need for the early release of land in this location. The early release of land at North West Cambridge is important not just for the benefit of the University, but for the wider benefit, in particular in respect of housing for key workers and others. The University wishes to see the AAP for the land between Huntingdon and Madingley Roads brought forward and included in the first tranche of development documents listed in Paragraph 1.8. We understand that the District Council have, since publication of this consultation, agreed to bring forward the AAP. The list should be amended to reflect that decision.	The Council has agreed to amend the Local Development Scheme to bring forward the programme for the Cambridge North West AAP, and for it to be a joint AAP with Cambridge City Council. It is clearly not possible to include it in the first tranche of documents which are well advanced. However, the timetable for the AAP will seek to bring it forward as quickly as practicable.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>1.9</i>				
8750 - The Cambourne Consortium	Object	Paragraph 1.9 should be re-worded to reflect the urban form, scale and character of Cambourne as a small town.	Cambourne, even once it is fully developed, will not be considered of a scale or character to warrant status as a town. The new town of Northstowe will have an ultimate size of around 8,000 dwellings, more than twice the size of Cambourne, and this is considered to be a small town.	
9531 - GO-East	Object	We consider therefore that the submission DPDs will need to say more than they presently do about how regard has been had to other plans and strategies, that will have a bearing on the delivery of the development proposed - including for example other local authority strategies, such as housing strategies or local transport plans; and those of outside agencies, such as utilities bodies and in relation to health and education.	The Council has consulted all key stakeholders at three stages in the preparation of the DPDs and it is for them to advise the Council how their own strategies affect the South Cambs LDF. Where such information has been received, this has been taken into account in preparing the DPDs. Where organisations did not advise the Council of their delivery plans, it will be for Cambridgeshire Horizons, as the delivery vehicle for the Cambridge Sub Region, to draw together the delivery plans for all aspects of the major developments as part of the negotiations on the planning obligations agreements. A statement of this position will be included in the Introduction.	Include new section in Core Strategy to follow paragraph 1.16 as follows:  "RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER PLANS AND STRATEGIES  1.16A The Council has consulted all key stakeholders at three stages in the preparation of the DPDs and it is for them to advise the Council how their own strategies affect the South Cambs LDF. Where such information has been received, this has been taken into account in preparing the DPDs. Where organisations did not advise the Council of their delivery plans, it will be for Cambridgeshire Horizons, as the delivery vehicle for the Cambridge Sub Region, to draw together the delivery plans for all aspects of the major developments as part of the negotiations on the planning obligations agreements."
<i>1.13</i>				
10032 - House Builders Federation	Object	The text refers to the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan requirement for 20,000 dwellings between 1999-2016. It would seem more appropriate to now instead refer to the dwelling requirement between 2001-2021 in the East of England Plan which may be adopted by the time this Development Plan Inquiry ends. Particularly given that other policies in the Council's LDF Documents refer directly to the content of the East of England Plan (RSS14). Furthermore, the Government's proposed changes to PPG3 (July 2005) now advocate provision for 15 years housing land supply in Development Plans.	The plan period to 2016 is too short. A period of circa 10 years will not address the long-term development requirements of this major growth sub-region. Whilst the Structure Plan has an end-date of 2016 the new RSS, the East of England Plan has an end date of 2021 and should be taken into account given that it should be approved during 2006.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10950 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	1st line, also add "and Peterborough".	Agree.	Amend reference to the "Cambridgeshire Structure Plan" to read "Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan."

---

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*Councils' Assessment*

*Change to Draft DPD*

---

1.14

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9532 - GO-East	Object	Again as noted previously, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act requires local planning authorities to have regard to the relevant Community Strategy or Strategies in preparing DPDs. We note that the Introduction to the LDF does refer to the Community Strategy and makes some broad connections between this and the spatial strategy. However, we think that each of the submission DPD(s) will need to make more explicit links with the Community Strategy, wherever possible, throughout the document(s). We acknowledge that this may only be possible in respect of some of the strategic objectives rather than detailed or site-specific matters but whatever the implications of the connections are between the two strategies we think that it is important to be clear about these (even if it is to state clearly that the relationship is limited).	It is agreed to amplify the text in the Introduction relating to the Community Strategy to highlight the vision and key objectives contained in the Community Strategy. However, it is not considered necessary or appropriate to insert references throughout the documents in the interests of a succinct plan. This is also more appropriate in the context of the first Community Strategy in which planning related issues very much respond to and reflect the agreed development strategy contained in the Structure Plan rather than guiding it. Whilst the Community Strategy contains actions to deliver its objectives and some of these are relevant to the LDF, they are identified for a specific 3 year period it is not appropriate to highlight these in the LDF which covers a longer timespan.	<p>Insert the following after paragraph 1.16:</p> <p>1.16A The Community Strategy's vision is split into 6 aims as set out below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ACTIVE, SAFE AND HEALTHY COMMUNITIES where residents can play a full part in community life, with a structure of thriving voluntary and community organisations.</li> <li>2. BUILDING SUCCESSFUL NEW COMMUNITIES where large scale developments have created attractive places with their own identity, supported by a range of quality services.</li> <li>3. A PROSPEROUS DISTRICT where jobs, skills and learning are developed and sustained to benefit everyone.</li> <li>4. GOOD ACCESS TO SERVICES for all sections of the community, including older people, children and families, through better transport links and improved local services.</li> <li>5. QUALITY HOMES FOR ALL with new affordable homes developed to meet local needs and assistance provided for those needing help.</li> <li>6. A HIGH QUALITY ENVIRONMENT with better access to a more bio-diverse countryside, which is protected and improved, and sustainable measures implemented, minimising waste and tackling climate change.</li> </ol> <p>1.16B The Community Strategy is reviewed regularly and includes actions for the following 3 year period</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>1.17</i>				
8376 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The overall quality of life of residents in South Cambridgeshire is intimately entwined with the quality of life of those residents of the City of Cambridge, given the proximity of the two administrative areas. In taking a sustainable approach to development, SCDC and CCC should jointly plan for the future of both administrative areas to ensure that the sustainable objectives of the Plan are met over both administrative areas.	The two Councils are working closely on cross-boundary issues, such as the review of the Green Belt boundary and planning the Cambridge East urban extension, through the production of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan, a joint Plan being produced by the two local authorities.	which focus on meeting key aspects of the vision taking priority at the time and reflecting potential opportunities. Some of these will relate to district wide policies contained in the LDF, including issues such as affordable housing. Others will relate to the major developments in the district, which are addressed in planning terms in Area Action Plans, and which are a key priority for many of the stakeholders and service providers involved in the Local Strategic Partnership.
<i>1.21</i>				
10952 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Presume the intention to start a Statement of Community Involvement in mid 2006 is acceptable, although the following statement, that it will set out how the Council intends to involve the community in preparation of the Local Development Documents, appears to indicate it should be prepared at the outset.	The intention is to start preparation of the Statement of Community involvement (SCI) once the first batch of LDF documents are completed. The Local Development Scheme which was amended following the revised LDF timetable, programmes work to now start in early 2007. This programme has been agreed with GO-East as an appropriate approach given the priority to bring forward plans early for the major developments in the district. The plan makes clear that until the SCI is completed the test will be the minimum requirements set out in regulations, but that the Council has already gone beyond those requirements. Indeed the Council has carried out significantly more public consultation than is required.	Revise 2nd sentence of paragraph 1.21 to read: "Production is proposed to begin in early 2007."



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9534 - GO-East	Object	In terms of procedure, I should remind you again that because you undertook early work on your LDF before commencement of Part 2 of the new Act, you will be bound by the requirements of Regulation 6 of The Town and Country Planning (Transitional Arrangements)(England) Regulations 2004. This means that you will need to comply with the requirements of Regulation 28 in submitting your DPDs, to demonstrate broadly speaking what work you have undertaken at pre-submission consultation stage, before commencement of the Act, and how this has been reflected in the subsequent preparation of DPDs.	Noted.	
<i>1.36</i>				
9527 - GO-East	Object	We would also draw your attention to the value of undertaking a self-assessment of the soundness of the DPDs as you prepare and finalise the submission versions, and of making this available when you formally submit these documents. This has been recommended by the Planning Inspectorate as a good way for local authorities to undertake an audit of how submission DPDs meet each of the soundness criteria against which they will be tested and so aid consultees, the Inspector and the overall examination process.	Noted.	

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****Councils' Assessment****Change to Draft DPD****PART A - CORE STRATEGY DPD****2.1**

8377 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	<p>South Cambridgeshire District should play a proper part in the future planning of the Region as a whole, not just the Cambridge Sub-Region.</p> <p>The Green Belt surrounding Cambridge should not be maintained to the extent that it stifles the development of the City to its full potential, and its ability to play a full and proper role within the Sub-Region and the Region. Some development on land that is currently Green Belt may be appropriate and a review of the Green Belt should be provided for.</p>	<p>Draft RSS14 for the East of England plans development across the region as a whole. It contains within it the saved Structure Plan 2003, which sets out the detailed development strategy for the Cambridge sub region. The Structure Plan responded to RSS6 and proposes a review of the Cambridge Green Belt to accommodate the growth pressures of the area, whilst retaining Cambridge as a compact historic city. The Structure Plan carried out this strategic Green Belt review and identified locations around Cambridge where the land could be released from the Green Belt to allow for major urban extensions to the City, such as at Cambridge East. Apart from those strategic releases, the Cambridge Green Belt will be retained in its present extent in accordance with national guidance in PPG2. The remit of the LDF is to plan for development in South Cambridgeshire to 2016, in accordance with the adopted Structure Plan. The extent of the Green Belt releases is addressed in the individual Area Action Plans for the major development areas.</p>
9911 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	<p>The Local Development Framework in its current edition fails adequately to address brownfield redevelopment opportunities, such as the Bayer CropScience Ltd site, yet alone the specific circumstances of the Hauxton site itself.</p>	<p>A policy is proposed in the Site Specific Policies DPD, to reflect the brownfield land opportunity this site provides.</p>
9406 - Jarrow Investments Ltd 10717 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	<p>The "vision" needs to be updated to reflect the sustainable communities initiative of the ODPM for the London/Stansted/Cambridge/Peterborough corridor. As a consequence, the reference in paragraph 2.1 to South Cambridgeshire only meeting the needs of the Cambridge sub region should be deleted. In its place, paragraph 2.1 should acknowledge that the London/Stansted/Cambridge/Peterborough growth corridor initiative means that South Cambridgeshire should accommodate an appropriate proportion of the development needs arising in the corridor.</p>	<p>Whilst the first tranche of LDDs are being prepared in accordance with the Structure Plan due to the emphasis on early delivery of RSS6, the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS14), which covers the period to 2021, carries forward the Structure Plan strategy for South Cambs to 2016 and proposes a similar rate of development up to 2021, which will be largely delivered through the major developments that will continue beyond 2016. The development strategy plans to meet the needs of the Cambridge sub region. This therefore accepts the RSS6/Structure Plan recognition of the importance of the Cambridge sub region to the national economy and the need to protect its special economic role. The Core Strategy will be reviewed once RSS14 is adopted.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9418 - Anglian Water Services Ltd	Object	Anglian Water Services objects to this Paragraph. The development of Chesterton Sidings should be appropriate to the surrounding land uses, including Milton Wastewater Treatment Works. The Chesterton Sidings area should only be developed as a phased part of the whole of the Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) area. The nature, scale and layout of any development on the Chesterton Sidings site should not prejudice the development of the rest of the Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) area.	Policy SP/3 provides the detail for the development of Chesterton Sidings as a mixed-use site. It also requires the development of a masterplan for the whole site, which will include details of any phasing requirements.	
9948 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	Hospital and health care services, social care services, police and fire services, education services, water and energy provision, all of which at present are stretched to the limit in Cambridgeshire, will be unable to cope with the 33% increase in population envisaged by 2016.	New development will be required to meet the needs of its residents, in accordance with policies DP/1 and DP/3. This may include on-site provision or financial contributions, of a scale and kind to the proposed development. The District Council is working closely with Cambridgeshire Horizons on the provision of the necessary infrastructure to support growth.	
10294 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Duxford, Land South of Rectory Road)	Object	We maintain our objection to the Council's general approach to the location of new residential development. Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites, including Huntsman/Hexcel Site, Duxford.	<p>The Structure Plan sets the development strategy for the Cambridge area within the framework provided by RSS6 and proposes that in order to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, that land be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in order to bring forward urban extensions which would locate significant levels of development at the top of the development sequence and closest to services and facilities. The principle of Green Belt release is therefore already established and the LDF is taking forward the development strategy at the local level.</p> <p>The rural strategy focuses development within the larger villages with better access to services and facilities in accordance with the Structure Plan. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council identified Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres which are the most sustainable locations for development and undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. PPG3 makes clear that issues of sustainability and location are also appropriate factors to take into account in considering redevelopment of brownfield sites. Any proposals for development on brownfield sites outside of village frameworks will be considered within this policy framework.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9694 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds	Support	The RSPB supports the strategic vision as outlined in paragraph 2.1. It will be particularly important for the district to plan for new and enhanced greenspace infrastructure to meet the needs of the expanding population. Well planned and designed greenspace can provide access and recreation opportunities for people in a wildlife rich environment. This would be in accordance with structure plan policy 7/3. Provision of new greenspace should be specifically mentioned within the reference to objective ST/f "to provide and enable provision of enhanced infrastructure including greenspace with opportunities for quiet recreation to meet the needs of the expanded population".	Support noted.	
8564 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the overall Strategic Vision for South Cambridgeshire with positive support given to Objectives ST/e, ST/i and ST/j which all seek to safeguard the essential character, the environment and the community wellbeing of Croxton and South Cambridgeshire.	Support noted.	
10168 - East of England Regional Assembly	Support	The strategic vision for South Cambridgeshire is supported, and is considered to be in general conformity with the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy as set out in the Consultation Draft East of England Plan, December 2004.	Support noted.	
10295 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Support	We support the principle of promoting sustainable development, particularly the need to make the best and most efficient use of land and buildings, and through mixed-use development.	Support noted.	
7997 - Kelshall Parish Council - Clerk	Support	Thank you for keeping us informed but we feel that at this time we are not directly affected.	Noted.	
<b>2.2</b>				
9099 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships supports the Strategic Vision but request paragraph 2.2 be reworded to omit the word "small" in relation to the new town to the north west of Cambridge and the phrase "villages will be kept separate from one another and from Cambridge, Northstowe and the Market Towns." Instead, the paragraph should emphasise opportunities for existing communities in South Cambridgeshire, whom as part of the sub regional growth area will be able to access new and improved local services, new public transport, housing, and employment contributing to the long term sustainability of South Cambridgeshire and the sub region.	The wording "small town" reflects that in Structure Plan Policy P1/1. The requirement for separation of villages from one another and from Cambridge and Northstowe is necessary for the retention of their separate identities and to prevent settlements merging and creating urban sprawl. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a need to maximise opportunities for existing residents to access new facilities and services provided by new developments, this can be achieved in a more sustainable way through the provision of improved infrastructure, such as for walking, cycling and improved public transport. This will maximise integration, connecting existing residents to new developments, whilst maintaining their separate identity. This approach is incorporated into the Area Actions Plans for each of the major development sites.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10718 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	<p>In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London/Stansted/Cambridge/ Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Limited is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. As a consequence, paragraph 2.2 should be amended to read:</p> <p>a) (4th line) "...and in two small new towns north west and south east of the city".</p> <p>b) (13th line) "...and from Cambridge, Northstowe, Hanley Grange and the Market Towns".</p>	<p>The adopted RSS6 and Structure Plan propose a new settlement in the period to 2016. The Structure Plan locates this at Longstanton/Oakington. In view of the urgency to bring forward and implement the Cambridge Sub Region strategy, the first tranche of LDF documents implement the adopted strategy. The emerging draft RSS14 does not propose any further new settlements in the sub region to 2016. There is therefore no strategic context for any allocation for a further new town in this plan and this issue would need to be considered further as part of a future review of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. The Council's view is that the priority must be on the delivery of the current strategy and to allow that new development to "bed in" and community identity to become established and to assess the impact of the current planned scale of development on Cambridge and the surrounding area before any consideration of any further new settlements close to Cambridge. Notwithstanding this principle, the Council does not consider that the site of the Hanley Grange proposal close to Duxford represents a suitable option for a new town. The site lies in a sensitive area of landscape which would adversely affect the adjoining Green Belt and would harm the setting of Cambridge in long distance views from the higher land to the south of Cambridge. It is not well served by existing public transport and whilst it is fairly close to Whittlesford Bridge railway station, it is not close enough for this to be a realistic and accessible option for local travel into Cambridge, but is likely to attract commuters to Stansted and London. The policy principle is for development in the Cambridge area to meet the needs of the successful Cambridge Phenomenon and not the needs of areas further to the south which should meet their own needs close to where they arise.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10296 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We object to the Council's 'blanket' approach in applying the sequential approach to the location of new residential development, with only limited development within villages. This approach provides no flexibility to facilitate previously developed brownfield sites within village locations to come forward for development as part of a balanced scheme.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Policy P1/1 goes on to state that when selecting sites, consideration should be given to the reuse of brownfield sites within settlements, then on other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. Although there are no further allocations in the rural area, this approach does not preclude the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks with development of a scale and kind appropriate to its location, as detailed in policies ST/3-ST/6.	
9007 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	Throughout the various documents that comprise the Pre submission participation document the case for the provision of an increased level of Affordable Housing is well made and fully supported. The shortfall in the number of Affordable Housing units is a matter of serious concern throughout the Cambridge Sub Region and reference should be made to this fact in the vision statement. The Trust suggests that a reference is added in paragraph 2.2 and also to objectives pages 11-13	Agree, the issue of meeting local housing needs is an important one, and should be reflected in the Vision.	Amend last sentence to read: "The emphasis will be on providing quality homes for all, including affordable housing to meet local needs, to ensure the creation of sustainable and balanced communities."
10169 - East of England Regional Assembly	Support	The strategic vision for South Cambridgeshire is supported, and is considered to be in general conformity with the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy as set out in the Consultation Draft East of England Plan, December 2004.	Support noted.	
8379 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Support	Support the focusing of development in South Cambridgeshire on urban extensions to the City of Cambridge. However these should be located in the most sustainable locations to support sustainable and viable growth of the City and Sub-Region.	Support noted. Structure Plan policies P1/1 and P9/2 detail a sequence to development requiring the bulk of development in the more sustainable locations on the edge of Cambridge and a new town, with limited development in the rural area, which is less sustainable.	
<i>Objectives</i>				
9915 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Generally support subject to SCDC agreeing that the Hauxton site redevelopment meets appropriate criteria.	Support noted. The Bayer CropScience site is proposed to be allocated for mixed use development in the Site Specific Policies DPD.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8444 - English Heritage	Object	It would be appropriate to give greater emphasis to the need for high quality design, given the importance of this in the context of accelerated growth and the major urban extensions to Cambridge. PPS1 gives support for a much more rigorous approach to design, and this is especially relevant here given the sensitive nature of the district, and the historic importance of Cambridge. We note that design is covered by a number of policies, for instance in policy DP/2, but if the environmental gains referred to in para 3.3 are to be achieved, the step-change in development should be accompanied by a step-change in design standards. The Plan could also refer to initiatives such as Shape Cambridge which have been established to help raise design standards.	The need for good design is at the forefront of national policy, similar to sustainability issues, and now forms an integral part of all new development. It is also contained in a number of policies in the LDF, including policies in the Development Principles chapter. To include reference to an initiative such as Shape Cambridge in the reasoned justification would be contrary to PPS12 given that it does not justify the policy. Any references to such initiatives would be more applicable in the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.	
10966 - Cambridgeshire County Council 10968 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The strategic objectives should include "creating developments which minimise the use of resources and maximise recycling and re-use of resources." The need to reduce pollution to air, land and water and reduce waste are not specifically addressed in the objectives.	Agree, these are important objectives and should be incorporated into Objective ST/g.	Amend Objective ST/g to read: "To ensure development addresses sustainability issues, including climate change mitigation and adaptation issues, maximising recycling and reuse of resources, and reduce waste and pollution."
9384 - East of England Development Agency	Support	The Local Development Documents for South Cambridgeshire should take account of EEDA's policies for the Cambridge Sub-Region contained in the Regional Economic Strategy 2004 to match labour supply and demand; facilitating development of the R&D cluster of companies; encourage links with other sub-regions; diversify economy of the market towns; establish high quality sustainable new communities; enhance the natural and built environment and support Cambridgeshire Horizons as the local delivery vehicle.	Paragraphs 2.40 - 2.45 and Figure 4 illustrate the employment land supply and demonstrate the LDF has sufficient employment allocations to meet the requirements of the Structure Plan. Policy ET/3 permits cluster development for Research and Development. The remit of the LDF is to meet the needs for development in South Cambridgeshire and not the Market Towns, which lie outside the district. The policies in the LDF will, collectively, ensure the development of sustainable communities and respect and enhance the natural and built environment. The District Council is working closely with Cambridgeshire Horizons on the provision of the necessary infrastructure to support growth.	
9623 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Support	Elements from the text need to be clearly stressed in the objectives. In addition, some objectives are not clearly identified. Add-□Improve sustainability-□Ensure that growth does not result in the merging of individual villages or in coalescence with the built-up area of Cambridge. Rural centre development should not be at the expense of local employment opportunities - which are key to the sustainability of communities.	The Strategy Objectives are overarching for the whole LDF. These are amplified in more detail in the Objectives contained in each of the chapters throughout the Development Control Policies DPD. The policies in the LDF seek to ensure the separate identities of settlements and prevent coalescence with each other and Cambridge. The development strategy seeks to ensure the development of sustainable communities, for example, Policies ET/5 and ET/7 permit employment in the rural area.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10427 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. 10441 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10416 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10451 - Centex Strategic Land	Support	Agree in principle with the provision of a set of strategic objectives to guide development and growth during the timeframe of the development plan and for the most part support the sequential approach to the location of development, seeking to encourage sustainable patterns of development.	Support noted.	
<i>ST/a</i>				
10971 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	ST/a -A strategic objective should include the need to support housing and employment opportunities, which meet the needs of all sections of the community.	Objective ST/b seeks to locate development where there is the opportunity to satisfy day-to-day needs. Objective ST/f also seeks to provide and enable provision of infrastructure to meet the population's needs. In addition, new development will be required to meet the needs of all sections of the community, in accordance with policies DP/1 and DP/3. This may include on-site provision or financial contributions, of a scale and kind to the proposed development.	
8762	Object	The word "adequate" should be stripped out of this policy objective as it has no place here. What is an adequate level of housing is set out in the Structure Plan and in RPG14. The Council needs simply to ensure a continuous supply of housing.	The LDF must demonstrate that it has an adequate supply of land available to meet the total housing and employment needs in the district to 2016, and that there will be a continuous supply across the plan period. These are two separate, but related objectives and should be retained to accord with the requirements of the Structure Plan and emerging RSS14.	
10972 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	ST/a- requires monitoring of both employment and household population (this is not picked up in the monitoring requirements)	Policy ST/8 and a new monitoring chapter, as well as the Council's Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing and employment land is available throughout the plan period.	
10728 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	These objections relate to: (a) The failure of the Plan to ensure that strategic objective ST/a (in respect of the provision of an adequate and continuous supply of housing land) can be achieved;	Policy ST/1 and paragraphs 2.4 - 2.29 detail the housing land supply to ensure adequate provision and Policy ST/7 ensures this supply will be phased to provide a continuous supply throughout the plan period.	
8336 - The English Courtyard Association (Whittlesford, Walled Garden North of Church Lane)	Object	Please find enclosed draft plan showing the walled garden at Whittlesford. We believe this to be ideal for a site for sheltered housing. This view is based on the needs for elderly housing within the rural area of South Cambs. The absence of such provision in this local plan/LDF needs to be addressed.	Paragraphs 5.23 - 5.27 sets out the approach to housing for the elderly, and explain that applications will be determined in accordance with the policies in the Development Principles chapter on sites within Village Frameworks. The proposed site is outside the Village Framework, within the Cambridge Green Belt and Conservation Area therefore it is not suitable.	
8380 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Support - but policy should make explicit reference to the need to pay full regard to the planning framework provided by the RSS and the Structure Plan, and to the District's Housing Need Survey.	Support noted. The LDF accords with the planning framework in the adopted Structure Plan and the adopted and emerging RSS, and the policies in the Housing Chapter seek to address the housing need identified in the Housing Needs Survey. This is made explicit in the introduction and in the reasoned justification behind many of the policies.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8526 - The Fairey Family 9044 - Foregreen Developments Ltd	Object	The words "adequate and" should be deleted from this objective. The Structure Plan and RPG14 already identify the extent of housing land for which allocations need to be made. It is therefore superfluous to use this wording.	The LDF must demonstrate that it has an adequate supply of land available to meet the total housing and employment needs in the district to 2016, and that there will be a continuous supply across the plan period. These are two separate, but related objectives and should be retained to accord with the requirements of the Structure Plan and emerging RSS14.	
7949 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Support	Support Strategy Objectives as set out in Part A - Core Strategy DPD section 2.2. In particular Arlington supports the objective to ensure the provision of an adequate and continuous supply of land for housing and employment to meet strategic requirement and contribute towards the further economic development of the area.	Support noted.	
<i>ST/b</i>				
10973 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	ST/b- requires the monitoring of employment. In order to monitor this objective the LDF should consider establishing appropriate consultation and surveys for new settlements etc. This is the only way that they can satisfactorily measure the extent to which 'day to day' needs are met locally.	Policy ST/8 and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of employment land is available throughout the plan period.	
10290 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Support	We support the objectives in Policy ST/b and Policy ST/k which seeks to locate development where it will ensure the maximum use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of countryside.	Support noted.	
<i>ST/c</i>				
8381 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Support	Support the focus of the objective	Support noted.	
<i>ST/d</i>				
9104 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships wishes to see rewording to emphasise opportunities for Longstanton and Oakington residents to benefit from Northstowe.	Whilst it is acknowledged that the development of a new town will provide opportunities for existing residents in nearby villages to access a better range of facilities and services, the objective is to create a sustainable new town which serves the needs of the residents who will live there. It is not justifiable in planning terms for new development to meet the needs of existing residents and such a change to the wording of Objective ST/d could imply that Northstowe would fulfil such a function. Notwithstanding, the Northstowe Area Action Plan includes policies to ensure that there is suitable sustainable forms of access for village residents to services and facilities in Northstowe in the form of pedestrian and cycle links.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10719 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	<p>In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Ltd is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. As a consequence, an additional sub clause of Policy ST/d is required. This would state:</p> <p>"To create a sustainable small new town close to but separate from the villages of Hinxton and Duxford connected to Cambridge by a high quality public transport system".</p>	<p>The adopted RSS6 and Structure Plan propose a new settlement in the period to 2016. The Structure Plan locates this at Longstanton/Oakington. In view of the urgency to bring forward and implement the Cambridge Sub Region strategy, the first tranche of LDF documents implement the adopted strategy. The emerging draft RSS14 does not propose any further new settlements in the sub region to 2016. There is therefore no strategic context for any allocation for a further new town in this plan and this issue would need to be considered further as part of a future review of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. The Council's view is that the priority must be on the delivery of the current strategy and to allow that new development to "bed in" and community identity to become established and to assess the impact of the current planned scale of development on Cambridge and the surrounding area before any consideration of any further new settlements close to Cambridge. Notwithstanding this principle, the Council does not consider that the site of the Hanley Grange proposal close to Duxford represents a suitable option for a new town. The site lies in a sensitive area of landscape which would adversely affect the adjoining Green Belt and would harm the setting of Cambridge in long distance views from the higher land to the south of Cambridge. It is not well served by existing public transport and whilst it is fairly close to Whittlesford Bridge railway station, it is not close enough for this to be a realistic and accessible option for local travel into Cambridge, but is likely to attract commuters to Stansted and London. The policy principle is for development in the Cambridge area to meet the needs of the successful Cambridge Phenomenon and not the needs of areas further to the south which should meet their own needs close to where they arise.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8953 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	PPG3 provides advice in Annex C that where the footprint of a building only occupies a proportion of the site, and the remainder is open land, redevelopment should not normally occur to the boundary of the curtilage. This is particularly important when the open land already performs a planning function, for example green separation between two settlements. The policy is too simplistic and provides no flexibility for the retention of open land within the curtilage of a previously developed site, such the former MoD Barracks at Oakington, which serves an existing planning function including green separation.	Objective ST/k seeks to maximise the use of brownfield land in the development of Northstowe to minimise the use of greenfield land in accordance with national guidance in PPG3. PPG3 Annex C is particularly relevant in the context of considering a specific redevelopment proposal for a single brownfield site. In the context of deciding the most appropriate location for a new settlement which will be significantly larger than any available brownfield land, then the emphasis is on making best use of the whole of the brownfield site, compatible with achieving a good development and meeting other planning objectives such as maintaining village character of nearby rural settlements. The Northstowe Area Action Plan includes policies which maximise use of brownfield land at Oakington Airfield, whilst also ensuring adequate separation from nearby villages.	
9463 - English Partnerships	Object	The word 'small' should be deleted from the reference to the new town.	The wording "small town" reflects that in Structure Plan Policy P1/1.	
11442 - Bellway Homes	Support	The high quality Rapid Transit System will improve the sustainability of settlements along its corridor, including Swavesey.	Support noted.	
<i>ST/e</i>				
7950 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Support	Support the general principle of ensuring that development is in keeping with its surrounding environment, however, it should be noted that this desire should not prevent innovation in new design development. We believe that it is very important for development to show progress in design which meets the needs of new generations.	Support noted. Policy DP/2 will ensure all development is of high quality design and provided the development integrates with its surroundings it does not preclude innovative design.	
9680 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support ST/e.	Support noted.	
<i>ST/f</i>				
7954 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Support	Continued infrastructure investment should be made to ensure that the necessary infrastructure support is put in place to meet existing and future needs as far as possible.	Support noted. New development will be required to meet the needs of its residents, in accordance with policies DP/1 and DP/3. This may include on-site provision or financial contributions, of a scale and kind to the proposed development, and may benefit existing residents. The District Council is working closely with Cambridgeshire Horizons on the provision of the necessary infrastructure to support growth.	
7951 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Support	We also recognise the importance of an enhanced infrastructure network and more specifically the need to ensure that continued investment is made to the local infrastructure to meet the needs of the expanded population.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>ST/g</i>				
10034 - Bellway Homes	Object	Policy ST/G should include a definition of 'climate-proofed'.	"Climate proofed" is explained at paragraph 8.2.	Add definition of "climate proofed" to the Glossary.
8952 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	The policy sets out one of the objectives of the Local Development Framework and in principle is acceptable. However, it is vague in stating that new development should be 'climate proofed' since there is no explanation of what this actually means. Proposed Amendment - The wording after 'issues' should be deleted.	"Climate proofed" is explained at paragraph 8.2.	Add definition of "climate proofed" to the Glossary.
10974 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	ST/g - Welcome strategic consideration of climate change mitigation and adaptation. Strongly support this objective.	Support noted.	
<i>ST/h</i>				
7952 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Support	Cambridge is a world leader in research and technology based industries, higher education and research. This ensures a constant stream of highly skilled and capable workers which in turn makes a significant contribution to local employment and economic growth within the Cambridge area. Arlington supports the District Council's important commitment to this cause and believes that this and the desire to capture these skilled workers through further office development in the area should remain an important theme for future planning policy.	Support noted.	
9771 - Anglia Polytechnic University	Support	Anglia Polytechnic University (APU) is intent upon improving and expanding its presence in Cambridge as an accessible higher education facility, thereby contributing to the world-wide reputation of Cambridge as an educational centre of excellence. APU supports Objective ST/h in the context of its expansion plans and the need to overcome the current inadequacies of its East Road Campus.	Support noted.	
10195 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University welcomes the inclusion as part of the Strategic Vision and the chapter on the Economy of the objective to support the Cambridge Area's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, higher education and research, particularly through the development of clusters. The University would expect that planning applications which seek to strengthen the Cambridge Area's position as a world leader in these respects will be supported by the Council.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>ST/i</i>				
7868 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Object	We are concerned by the apparently low priority given to informal access to recreation and the countryside for a wide variety of reasons and purposes, through the existing and possible network of Rights of Way. Such access has implications for Health; Transportation; Education; as well as Countryside Recreation and Natural Bio-diversity.	Objective ST/i requires increased access to the countryside as an integral part of all new development. This is also incorporated into a number of policies, including TR/4 and the Area Action Plans for the major development locations.	
10956 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	In general would comment that whilst LDF has certainly attempted to pick up on some of the aspects of countryside access covered in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, there is still little express inclusion of policies to protect and improve public rights of way network corresponding to the Structure Plan policies P8/9 and P4/2.	Policies TR/1 and TR/4 require adequate provision for non-car modes, including walking and cycling, and ensures that the rights of way network is not undermined. The Area Action Plans for the major development sites also require provision as an integral part of the development. The policies in the LDF will be read together, so there is no need to duplicate policies.	
7870 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Object	We welcome the mention of access to the countryside, but would ask that it is seen in a very much wider context than natural Bio-diversity. It is the informal access to the countryside for a variety of purposes and reasons which concerns us, and we believe that it needs and deserves to be a specific objective in its own right.	Improved access to the countryside is an important objective and is covered in Objective ST/i, which states that "opportunities for increased access to the countryside and enjoyment of biodiversity should be viewed as integral requirements of new development." Objective ST/b also refers to meeting needs for recreation, which can also include access to the countryside. Some issues have had to be grouped otherwise this would create a very long list of objectives, contrary to the principles of succinct plans in PPS12. This does not in any way lessen the importance of the objective.	
9716 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds	Support	The RSPB support objective ST/i. However, it should be explicit in the objective that new developments will be expected to protect and enhance existing biodiversity and contribute towards creating new areas of habitat capable of supporting biodiversity and also delivering significant additional public benefit through new rights of way provision.	Support noted. This is already explicit in Objective ST/i and amplified in the Natural Environment Chapter of the Development Control Policies DPD.	
10975 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	ST/i - Welcome inclusion of "increased access to the countryside should be viewed as integral requirements of new development".	Support noted.	
<i>ST/j</i>				
7871 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	We believe that mention could be made here of enhancing informal access to the countryside landscape, as well as preserving it.	Objective ST/i requires increased access to the countryside as an integral part of all new development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>ST/k</i>				
7929 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	Subject to the provision of adequate development to meet the proper needs of rural communities and businesses (on which we make comments later), the CLA supports the policy to locate development to maximise the use of brownfield land and to minimise the erosion of the countryside.	The development strategy in the LDF is in accordance with the adopted Structure Plan, locating development in the more sustainable locations in the sequence and reusing brownfield sites within the built-up areas. Other than at the urban extensions to Cambridge, the use of greenfield sites will be resisted.	
8946 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	PPG3 states that where the footprint of a building only occupies a proportion of the site, and the remainder is open land, redevelopment should not normally occur to the boundary of the curtilage. This is particularly important when the open land already performs a planning function, for example green separation between two settlements. Policy ST/k is too simplistic since it provides no flexibility to retain open land which serves an existing planning function even though it forms part of the curtilage of a previously developed site.	Objective ST/k seeks to maximise the use of brownfield land to minimise the use of greenfield land in accordance with national guidance in PPG3. The development strategy sets out the location of development in accordance with Structure Plan policies P1/1 and P9/2. The development strategy only permits redevelopment on brownfield sites within village frameworks. Where redevelopment is permitted, policies such as DP/2 will ensure a high quality of design is achieved and the local character is respected. Any proposals for brownfield sites outside frameworks will be considered on their merits against the development strategy and guidance in PPG3, including the appropriate extent of development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10428 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. 10442 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10418 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10452 - Centex Strategic Land	Object	<p>The Council's housing distribution strategy fails to accord with the sequential approach to housing in PPG3, which establishes the brownfield first principle except where previously developed sites perform so poorly in relation to sustainability criteria so as to preclude their use for housing before a particular greenfield site.</p> <p>On this basis, we propose an amendment to ST/k: "To locate development where it will ensure maximum use of previously developed land in sustainable locations and minimise loss of countryside and the best and most versatile agricultural land, unless greenfield sites are considered more sustainable alternatives when considered against the requirements set out in PPG3".</p>	<p>RSS6 and the Structure Plan set the development strategy for the Cambridge area having taken into account PPG3 and determining that a strategy that focuses large scale development in and on the edge of Cambridge and in a new town close to Cambridge is the most sustainable form of development to best meet the needs of the area. The Structure Plan also identifies a limited proportion of development in South Cambs at identified Rural Centres. Objective ST/k therefore recognises the overarching development strategy but also recognises the parallel objective of making best use of previously developed land. The majority of the major developments include the re-use of previously developed land, such as Oakington Airfield and Cambridge Airport and the North Works site north of Newmarket Road. Structure Plan Policy P1/1 state that when selecting sites, consideration should be given to the reuse of brownfield sites within settlements, then on other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. Therefore, the Council does not need to consider the redevelopment of brownfield sites outside of the village frameworks, the final stage in the selection process. Any proposals for brownfield sites outside frameworks will be considered on their merits against the development strategy and guidance in PPG3.</p>	
7953 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Support	<p>Support the District Council's desire to maximise the use of previously developed land and minimise loss of countryside and the best and most versatile agricultural land. It is however essential to ensure that there is a constant supply of employment sites to contribute to economic development which may require a review of the existing Green Belt boundary. Arlington would also like to see that existing opportunities on brownfield sites are not overlooked.</p>	<p>Support noted. Paragraphs 2.40 - 2.45 and Figure 4 illustrate the employment land supply and demonstrate the LDF has sufficient employment allocations.</p>	
10291 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Support	<p>We support the objectives in Policy ST/b and Policy ST/k which seeks to locate development where it will ensure the maximum use of previously developed land and minimise the loss of countryside.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<b>2.3</b>				
9222 - Defence Lands Ops North (Waterbeach Barracks)	Object	<p>Land at Waterbeach Barracks.</p> <p>It is considered that in order to highlight the availability of Waterbeach Barracks for development within the plan period and the RSS period up to 2021, a new policy should be included in the plan to state; 'There is potential for 6,000 units, and up to 10,000 by 2021 to be provided at a new settlement at Waterbeach Barracks, in order to meet development needs in the District. The land should be safeguarded for development as a new settlement, which can be extended within the next plan period up to 2021.'</p>	<p>The adopted RSS6 and Structure Plan propose a new settlement in the period to 2016. The Structure Plan locates this at Longstanton/Oakington. In view of the urgency to bring forward and implement the Cambridge Sub Region strategy, the first tranche of LDF documents implement the adopted strategy. The emerging draft RSS14 does not propose any further new settlements in the sub region to 2021. Whilst it is recognised that the Panel at the Structure Plan EIP made comments about the potential suitability of Waterbeach for a new settlement, there is no strategic context for any allocation in this plan and this issue would need to be considered further as part of a future review of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. The Council's view is that the priority must be on the delivery of the current strategy and to allow that new development to "bed in" and community identity to become established and to assess the impact of the current planned scale of development on Cambridge and the surrounding area before any consideration of any further new settlements close to Cambridge.</p>	
10033 - House Builders Federation	Object	<p>The text refers to the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan requirement for 20,000 dwellings between 1999-2016. It would seem more appropriate to now instead refer to the dwelling requirement between 2001-2021 in the East of England Plan which may be adopted by the time this Development Plan Inquiry ends. Particularly given that other policies in the Council's LDF Documents refer directly to the content of the East of England Plan (RSS14). Furthermore, the Government's proposed changes to PPG3 (July 2005) now advocate provision for 15 years housing land supply in Development Plans.</p>	<p>The plan period to 2016 is too short. A period of circa 10 years will not address the long-term development requirements of this major growth sub-region. Whilst the Structure Plan has an end-date of 2016 the new RSS, the East of England Plan has an end date of 2021 and should be taken into account given that it should be approved during 2006.</p>	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10330 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Policy ST/1 is therefore in accordance with this approach, with the majority of development to be accommodated at the major development sites at Northstowe and the urban extensions to Cambridge. The development of these sites will include the re-use of previously developed land, such as Oakington Airfield and Cambridge Airport and the North Works site north of Newmarket Road. Policy P1/1 goes on to state that when selecting sites, consideration should be given to the reuse of brownfield sites within settlements, then on other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. Therefore, the Council does not need to consider the redevelopment of brownfield sites outside of the village frameworks, the final stage in the selection process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>ST/1 Housing Provision</i>				
10329 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Policy ST/1 is therefore in accordance with this approach, with the majority of development to be accommodated at the major development sites at Northstowe and the urban extensions to Cambridge. The development of these sites will include the re-use of previously developed land, such as Oakington Airfield and Cambridge Airport and the North Works site north of Newmarket Road. Policy P1/1 goes on to state that when selecting sites, consideration should be given to the reuse of brownfield sites within settlements, then on other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. Therefore, the Council does not need to consider the redevelopment of brownfield sites outside of the village frameworks, the final stage in the selection process.	
10368	Object	The amount of growth included for a minor service village should be increased to at least 50 or more dwellings in line with the services and facilities that the village possesses and to reduce the need for the amount of housing at Northstowe. Indeed if appropriate larger villages are identified for further growth, the need for Northstowe could be substantially reduced, or even rescinded.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. Therefore, reallocation of housing down the sequence and down the settlement hierarchy would be contrary to policy. Minor Rural Centres, did not meet the criteria to be designated a Rural Centre as they have a poorer level of services and facilities. As a result, development in Minor Rural Centres would be less sustainable and it is appropriate to limit development to a scale appropriate to the village.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10280 - Stannifer	Object	Policy ST/1 does not have regard to the Sustainable Communities Plan and the increase in housing provision emerging from RSS14. Notwithstanding this fact, the housing provision made in the LDD will not be delivered by 2016. The release of the green belt sites around Cambridge is constrained by the need to complete the review of the green belt, the need to complete Masterplans and the need to provide infrastructure. Similarly, the development of Northstowe is being delayed by the RTS proposals and the need to improve the A14.	The development strategy in the LDF plans for development to 2016 in accordance with the adopted and saved Structure Plan 2003. The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS14) covers a longer period to 2021, and is beyond the scope of this LDF. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans, which take into account of factors such as the review of the Green Belt and A14 improvements. Policy ST/8 and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing and employment land is available throughout the plan period.	
10204 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	<p>The University objects to the fact that there is no indicative housing total shown for housing on land to be removed from the Green Belt between Huntingdon Rd and Madingley Rd.</p> <p>While land will not be released here until the University can demonstrate need, the Masterplanning work that the University has been undertaking suggests that land for up to 1,400 houses in the District could be required and provided up to 2016 and beyond. Figure 1 should be amended to show this indicative figure.</p> <p>The University would also wish the housing totals in Policy ST/1 to reflect the approach outlined in the Barker Report : Recommendation 9 (see over)</p>	The Cambridge North West Area Action Plan (AAP) is not part of the first tranche of DPDs. As a result, the detail has not been worked up and it is not possible to include housing figures for this site it within the Core Strategy. Once the AAP is produced, the figures will be incorporated into a review of the Core Strategy. This is explained in Note 2 to Figure 1.	
10031 - House Builders Federation	Object	The text refers to the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan requirement for 20,000 dwellings between 1999-2016. It would seem more appropriate to now instead refer to the dwelling requirement between 2001-2021 in the East of England Plan which may be adopted by the time this Development Plan Inquiry ends. Particularly given that other policies in the Council's LDF Documents refer directly to the content of the East of England Plan (RSS14). Furthermore, the Government's proposed changes to PPG3 (July 2005) now advocate provision for 15 years housing land supply in Development Plans.	The development strategy in the LDF plans for development to 2016 in accordance with the adopted and saved Structure Plan 2003. The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS14) covers a longer period to 2021, and is beyond the scope of this LDF.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10607 - David Wilson Estates	Object	Following an assessment of the Housing Land Supply figures, it is considered that there will be a shortfall for the authority in seeking to meet the local housing requirement figure to 2016. The authority is specifically referred to objections 3 and 5, which detail in full the justification for this objection. In summary, it is considered that there would be a shortfall of some 4,776 dwellings at Northstowe by 2016, together with an outstanding housing requirement of 740 dwellings in relation to the housing allocations in rural areas. Accordingly, a total of 5,516 dwellings are required to be reallocated to more appropriate sites, base on the settlement hierarchy.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The Council has undertaken further work on the rural housing numbers, including the production of a housing trajectory. As part of this work the Council revisited the housing allocations rolled forward from Local Plan 2004 and deleted the sites with planning permission at March 2005 (as these are now counted as commitments), deleted those allocations in the less sustainable settlements that cannot be relied upon to come forward for development in the plan period, and updated the housing land supply information with data to the end of March 2005. The Council is able to demonstrate sufficient housing land supply to meet the remainder of the requirement in the rural area.	
10425 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. 10439 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10414 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10449 - Centex Strategic Land	Object	A number of concerns regarding the soundness and appropriateness of the Council's approach to the emerging housing strategy. Particularly concerned as to the ability of the proposed housing allocations to deliver the requisite dwelling numbers during the plan period, and consider that unless additional housing allocations are proposed through the plan process, there is likely to be a material shortfall in housing completions to 2016 in accordance with Structure Plan requirements. Particularly concerned that the major development sites will not deliver and lead to an under provision of 32%, requiring new allocations, such as client's land at Cambourne.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9342	Object	Further housing allocations in appropriate, sustainable locations, such as Great Abington, need to be made if the District Council is to achieve anywhere near the proposed 20,000 dwelling completions in the District by the year 2016, as required by the Structure Plan.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The Council has undertaken further work on the rural housing numbers, including the production of a housing trajectory. As part of this work the Council revisited the housing allocations rolled forward from Local Plan 2004 and deleted the sites with planning permission at March 2005 (as these are now counted as commitments), deleted those allocations in the less sustainable settlements that cannot be relied upon to come forward for development in the plan period, and updated the housing land supply information with data to the end of March 2005. The Council is able to demonstrate sufficient housing land supply to meet the remainder of the requirement in the rural area. The detailed housing land supply information is included in the report to Council on 15th November 2005.	
10270	Object	The Adopted Structure Plan 2003 identifies a requirement to provide 20,000 additional homes in South Cambridgeshire between 1999 and 2016. Whilst Policy P9/1 on housing distribution does provide an "indicative" distribution, both between districts and within them between urban, green belt review, new settlement and rural areas, it does not follow that "taking a sequential approach to development means that if more development can be located in and on the edge of Cambridge than the Structure Plan envisaged then the amount of development in villages will be correspondingly lower".	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. The strategy allocates the single largest proportion of the development (9,600 dwellings), nearly half of the housing requirement of 20,000 dwellings in the period 1999-2016, to the rural area.	
10731 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	These objections relate to: (b) Policy ST1, in respect of the unrealistic reliance on achieving 6,000 units at Northstowe in the Plan period;	Policy ST/8 the housing trajectory to be included in the submission DPD and the Annual Monitoring Reports will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for Northstowe is contained in the Area Action Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10646 - Munro Group Ltd	Object	We have serious reservations regarding the ability to meet the target of providing 20,000 additional homes in South Cambridgeshire between 1999 -2016, based on unrealistic assumptions regarding the implementation of feasibility and timescale of implanting the large scale urban extensions as outlined in figure 1 of the core strategy. Against this backdrop far greater flexibility is required within the smaller Rural and Minor Rural Centres in allocating land and amending the development frameworks in anticipation of a significant shortfall in the implementation of housing. This includes Waterbeach.	The DPDs make adequate and appropriate housing provision in accordance with the Structure Plan and adopted and emerging RSS. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Reports will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The adopted RSS6 and Structure Plan propose a new settlement in the period to 2016. The Structure Plan locates this at Longstanton/Oakington. In view of the urgency to bring forward and implement the Cambridge Sub Region strategy, the first tranche of LDF documents implement the adopted strategy. The emerging draft RSS14 does not propose any further new settlements in the sub region to 2021. Whilst it is recognised that the Panel at the Structure Plan EIP made comments about the potential suitability of Waterbeach for a new settlement, there is no strategic context for any allocation in this plan and this issue would need to be considered further as part of a future review of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. The Council's view is that the priority must be on the delivery of the current strategy and to allow that new development to "bed in" and community identity to become established and to assess the impact of the current planned scale of development on Cambridge and the surrounding area before any consideration of any further new settlements close to Cambridge.	
9529 - GO-East	Object	Also in terms of delivery, we would expect each of the DPDs that have a bearing on housing delivery to include a housing trajectory in accordance with PPS12 (paragraph 4.25).	Agree. A housing trajectory will be included in the Submission LDF.	Include a Housing Trajectory in the Core Strategy DPD that examines delivery of housing numbers in the LDF, and include relevant elements in the Site Specific Policies DPD, and Area Action Plans.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10689 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	The Council has not demonstrated that enough land is genuinely available, through the LDF process, to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement to 2016.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The Council has undertaken further work on the rural housing numbers, including the production of a housing trajectory. As part of this work the Council revisited the housing allocations rolled forward from Local Plan 2004 and deleted the sites with planning permission at March 2005 (as these are now counted as commitments), deleted those allocations in the less sustainable settlements that cannot be relied upon to come forward for development in the plan period, and updated the housing land supply information with data to the end of March 2005. The Council is able to demonstrate sufficient housing land supply to meet the remainder of the requirement in the rural area. The detailed housing land supply information is included in the report to Council on 15th November 2005.	
10964 - Mrs A J Johnson and Mr B Moore	Object	We do not consider that there is any 'realistic prospect'(see paragraph 2.5) of the draft Core Strategy DPD or the Council's approach resulting in the provision of 'approximately 20,000 new homes' in the period 1999 - 2016. Simply stated, this is partly because the Council is sailing far too close to the wind in terms of the assumptions that it is making on the likely delivery of historic allocations, consents, and windfall sites. There is also, in our opinion, no prospect whatsoever of the 4,400 homes proposed for the edge of Cambridge, or the 6,000 proposed at the new town of Northstowe actually coming forward by 2016. In light of this, and in order to secure a 'continuous supply' of housing land, the District Council should make urgent plans to increase significantly the number of housing allocations in a variety of locations around the District, in order to ensure that the Structure Plan figure is - if not met - then at the very least, approached.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the new Monitoring chapter and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. Figure 3 provides housing land supply information demonstrating that the outstanding rural housing requirement between March 2005 and 2016 is 1,087 dwellings. The remaining development at a limited number of housing allocations carried forward from Local Plan 2004 and at Cambourne, to achieve an overall density across the settlement of 30 dph, will more than accommodate this requirement. Therefore, the allocation of additional housing is not required.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11223 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	There should be clarification as how the average density is pegged at 30 dph and not at a higher rate as defined by PPG3 and within HG/1 & SP/18. If the latter was the case the increase in development would be nearer the 1,500 turned down by the Inspector as premature. Accordingly reference to the review of the Cambourne Masterplan in accordance with the increased density should be incorporated in ST/1. It is of particular importance to clarify this as HG/1 recommends higher average net density of over 40 dph in more sustainable locations; this is the type of location that Cambourne is identified as.	Cambourne was originally planned in the late 1980s/early 1990s and in a very different policy context than that applying today. It is difficult to change approach in the planning of a new village so far through it's implementation in a way that reflects changed policy priorities but without undermining the character and nature of the village as originally planned. The original density of housing development at Cambourne was below the 30dph minimum required by changes in national policy and contained in the Structure Plan. The Council has accepted in its draft LDF documents that it would be appropriate for the remaining areas of Cambourne, within the village frameworks identified as part of the original permission, to be developed at higher densities to reflect that change in national policy such that the average net density of Cambourne as a whole is raised to 30dph. Because this involves a significant increase of around 700 dwellings, it is also essential that any proposals provide for the necessary additional services and facilities to serve the additional population. It is considered that Policy SP/18 in the Site Specific Policies DPD should be revised to clarify the Council's intentions for additional dwellings at Cambourne.	Revise 1st sentence of Policy SP/18 to read:  "Development of the remainder of Cambourne will be at residential densities SUCH THAT THE OVERALL NET DENSITY OF CAMBOURNE AS A WHOLE IS APPROXIMATELY 30DPH....."  Revise paragraph 11.29 by deleting the 2nd and 3rd sentences and replacing to read:  "...At Cambourne the remaining areas within the village frameworks, should be developed at higher densities than the earlier parts of the development to reflect changes in national policy towards higher residential densities, such that the average net density of Cambourne as a whole is raised to 30dph...."
10401	Object	Policy ST/1 should be amended to read as follows: 'Through its housing allocations, the District Council will seek to make provision for approximately 20,000 new homes in South Cambridgeshire during the period 1999 - 2016. This is unlikely to include all of the required 4,400 homes proposed on sites on the edge of Cambridge, or the 6,000 proposal at the new town of Northstowe as provided for in the 2003 Structure Plan. Accordingly, significant additional allocations will be made in the rural area, in rural Centres and other villages, (including Minor Rural Centres) in order to attempt to achieve the Structure Plan target figure of 20,000 new homes.'	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10633 - Spicers Ltd 10658 - Atkins Property Development Ltd	Object	By interrogating the Council's housing land supply calculations there appears to be a shortfall of 5,516 dwellings which will need to be reallocated to appropriate sites if these are to be delivered by 2016.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The Council has undertaken further work on the rural housing numbers, including the production of a housing trajectory. As part of this work the Council revisited the housing allocations rolled forward from Local Plan 2004 and deleted the sites with planning permission at March 2005 (as these are now counted as commitments), deleted those allocations in the less sustainable settlements that cannot be relied upon to come forward for development in the plan period, and updated the housing land supply information with data to the end of March 2005. The Council is able to demonstrate sufficient housing land supply to meet the remainder of the requirement in the rural area.	
9528 - GO-East	Object	We think that the Core Strategy and other DPDs will need to include a clearer and more robust implementation and monitoring framework that should set out how delivery will be achieved and measured. Clearly, we recognise that this is not possible in a detailed manner for developments that will be phased towards the end of the Structure Plan period, such as the majority of the Cambridge East development. However, we would expect the Core Strategy to include a commentary on when the sites are expected to come forward for development, the anticipated delivery timescales, as well as some of the main dependencies, risks to delivery and any contingencies. This overall implementation framework should then be built on in further detail in respect of the main sites through the AAPs and allocations DPD.	It is agreed that the submission Core Strategy will include a new phasing and delivery chapter which addresses the mechanisms for delivering the development strategy, including the role of Cambridgeshire Horizons as the delivery vehicle. It will include a housing trajectory which will estimate the potential implementation of development. It will also include a new monitoring chapter which which draws from the Monitoring Strategy and includes indicators against which the Council's Annual Monitoring Report will test the implementation of the LDF, as required under the new plan making system.	Include new chapter 3 Phasing and Delivery, incorporating the existing section Phasing of Housing Land, comprising Policy ST/7 and it's supporting text which should be moved from Chapter 2.  Include new chapter 4 Monitoring to incorporate Policy ST/8 and supporting text and amplified to include a range of indicators drawn from the Monitoring Strategy and provide supporting text.
8382 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The figures promoted within the policy should not be finalised until the emerging RSS Panel has reported.	The plan period to 2016 is too short. A period of circa 10 years will not address the long-term development requirements of this major growth sub-region. Whilst the Structure Plan has an end-date of 2016 the new RSS, the East of England Plan has an end date of 2021 and should be taken into account given that it should be approved during 2006.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9049 - Foregreen Developments Ltd	Object	Further housing allocations in appropriate, sustainable locations, such as Waterbeach, need to be made if the District Council is to achieve anywhere near the proposed 20,000 dwelling completions in the District by the year 2016, as required by the Structure Plan.	The DPDs make adequate and appropriate housing provision in accordance with the Structure Plan and adopted and emerging RSS. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Reports will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The adopted RSS6 and Structure Plan propose a new settlement in the period to 2016. The Structure Plan locates this at Longstanton/Oakington. In view of the urgency to bring forward and implement the Cambridge Sub Region strategy, the first tranche of LDF documents implement the adopted strategy. The emerging draft RSS14 does not propose any further new settlements in the sub region to 2021. Whilst it is recognised that the Panel at the Structure Plan EIP made comments about the potential suitability of Waterbeach for a new settlement, there is no strategic context for any allocation in this plan and this issue would need to be considered further as part of a future review of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. The Council's view is that the priority must be on the delivery of the current strategy and to allow that new development to "bed in" and community identity to become established and to assess the impact of the current planned scale of development on Cambridge and the surrounding area before any consideration of any further new settlements close to Cambridge.	
9211 - Defence Lands Ops North (Waterbeach Barracks)	Object	Land at Waterbeach Barracks. On behalf of DE it is considered that Waterbeach Barracks should be recognised, after Northstowe, as a suitable location for substantial housing development. It is previously developed land, and would safeguard other, more sensitive sites in the Cambridge Sub-Region, from development until they are actually required, as well as provide a location for development should the urban extension sites fail to come forward. The Commitment to a new settlement at Northstowe does not preclude consideration being given to a second new settlement to meet RSS growth requirements for Cambridge, nor does it diminish its potential advantages.	The adopted RSS6 and Structure Plan propose a new settlement in the period to 2016. The Structure Plan locates this at Longstanton/Oakington. In view of the urgency to bring forward and implement the Cambridge Sub Region strategy, the first tranche of LDF documents implement the adopted strategy. The emerging draft RSS14 does not propose any further new settlements in the sub region to 2021. Whilst it is recognised that the Panel at the Structure Plan EIP made comments about the potential suitability of Waterbeach for a new settlement, there is no strategic context for any allocation in this plan and this issue would need to be considered further as part of a future review of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. The Council's view is that the priority must be on the delivery of the current strategy and to allow that new development to "bed in" and community identity to become established and to assess the impact of the current planned scale of development on Cambridge and the surrounding area before any consideration of any further new settlements close to Cambridge.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8763	Object	Further housing allocations in appropriate, sustainable locations, such as Willingham, need to be made if the District Council is to achieve anywhere near the proposed 20,000 dwelling completions in the District by the year 2016, as required by the Structure Plan.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The Council has undertaken further work on the rural housing numbers, including the production of a housing trajectory. As part of this work the Council revisited the housing allocations rolled forward from Local Plan 2004 and deleted the sites with planning permission at March 2005 (as these are now counted as commitments), deleted those allocations in the less sustainable settlements that cannot be relied upon to come forward for development in the plan period, and updated the housing land supply information with data to the end of March 2005. The Council is able to demonstrate sufficient housing land supply to meet the remainder of the requirement in the rural area. The detailed housing land supply information is included in the report to Council on 15th November 2005.	
10373 - J W Burgess & Son	Object	It is our view that Swavesey should be promoted in the hierarchy and the amount of land allocated at Northstowe could be reduced. We do not accept that Swavesey and other similar villages are not in sustainable locations. Indeed, the factors in support of this proposal indicate that it is a totally sustainable location and further development can be accommodated within the framework of the village. Indeed if that was applied to other sustainable locations, the concept of the new village of Northstowe could probably be deleted in its entirety.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations and is a step change away from the dispersal policies in the adopted Local Plan. Swavesey is a Group Village with a poor level of services and facilities and does not warrant elevation up the settlement hierarchy, as it does not meet the criteria for designation as a Rural Centre. Therefore, reallocation of housing down the sequence and down the settlement hierarchy would be contrary to policy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9110 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships would request that this policy be re-worded to reflect Northstowe's ultimate potential size beyond 2016 of at least 10,000 dwellings, supported by a strategic masterplan which articulates long term sustainable development achieved through high quality public realm, services and community provision, higher densities where appropriate and necessary infrastructure.	The Cambridgeshire Structure Plan does not require that 10,000 dwellings be provided at Northstowe, rather in the range of 8,000 to 10,000 dwellings. Three options for the size of Northstowe (8,000, 9,000 and 10,000) were investigated at the Preferred Options stage in 2004. The Examination in Public Panel who heard a lot of evidence on the potential size for Northstowe found no reason to express to favour 10,000 over 8,000 dwellings and commented only that the critical threshold appeared to be 8,000 dwellings. All of the work to date demonstrates that at 8,000 dwellings Northstowe will have a full range of services and facilities required for a small new town, indeed the 'feeder route' for the proposed Guided Bus System will ensure that it has a better public transport system than most comparable sized towns. The analysis of site options also demonstrated that the impacts on surrounding communities and the countryside would be minimised by development at the lower end of the range - a conclusion which was overwhelmingly supported at the Preferred Options consultation stage.	
8527 - The Fairey Family	Object	Further housing allocations in appropriate, sustainable locations, such as Linton, need to be made if the District Council is to achieve anywhere near the proposed 20,000 dwelling completions in the District by the year 2016, as required by the Structure Plan.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The Council has undertaken further work on the rural housing numbers, including the production of a housing trajectory. As part of this work the Council revisited the housing allocations rolled forward from Local Plan 2004 and deleted the sites with planning permission at March 2005 (as these are now counted as commitments), deleted those allocations in the less sustainable settlements that cannot be relied upon to come forward for development in the plan period, and updated the housing land supply information with data to the end of March 2005. The Council is able to demonstrate sufficient housing land supply to meet the remainder of the requirement in the rural area. The detailed housing land supply information is included in the report to Council on 15th November 2005.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9507 - Fenstanton Parish Council	Object	The effects of future development in South Cambridgeshire may have a 'ripple' effect on our community. The current A14 presents already established problems for our parishioners travelling to work. The current health and education infrastructure is at capacity and any further growth will have a detrimental effect on existing communities.	The A14 is the responsibility of the Highways Authority who are charged with upgrading the route, and have recently undertaken public consultation on the preferred route. New development will be required to meet the needs of its residents, in accordance with policies DP/1 and DP/3, including the provision of necessary infrastructure to serve the development. This may include on-site provision or financial contributions, of a scale and kind to the proposed development. The District Council is also working closely with Cambridgeshire Horizons on the provision of the necessary infrastructure to support growth.	
8760 - The Cambourne Consortium	Object	It is submitted that assumed delivery at Northstowe should be reduced in recognition that the assumptions as to the delivery of housing are no longer sound. The Core Strategy should ensure that existing housing land at Cambourne is used more efficiently for housing provision. The opportunity to increase housing provision beyond the assumption of 30 dwellings per hectare would provide a compensatory provision to the housing which will not be completed at Northstowe.	The housing trajectory to be included in the submission DPD will address the delivery of Northstowe. Cambourne was originally planned in the late 1980s/early 1990s and in a very different policy context than that applying today. It is difficult to change approach in the planning of a new village so far through it's implementation in a way that reflects changed policy priorities but without undermining the character and nature of the village as originally planned. The original density of housing development at Cambourne was below the 30dph minimum required by changes in national policy and contained in the Structure Plan. The Council has accepted in its draft LDF documents that it would be appropriate for the remaining areas of Cambourne, within the village frameworks identified as part of the original permission, to be developed at higher densities to reflect that change in national policy such that the average net density of Cambourne as a whole is raised to 30dph. Because this involves a significant increase of around 700 dwellings, it is also essential that any proposals provide for the necessary additional services and facilities to serve the additional population. It is considered that Policy SP/18 in the Site Specific Policies DPD should be revised to clarify the Council's intentions for additional dwellings at Cambourne.	Revise 1st sentence of Policy SP/18 to read:  "Development of the remainder of Cambourne will be at residential densities SUCH THAT THE OVERALL NET DENSITY OF CAMBOURNE AS A WHOLE IS APPROXIMATELY 30DPH....."  Revise paragraph 11.29 by deleting the 2nd and 3rd sentences and replacing to read:  "...At Cambourne the remaining areas within the village frameworks, should be developed at higher densities than the earlier parts of the development to reflect changes in national policy towards higher residential densities, such that the average net density of Cambourne as a whole is raised to 30dph....."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10647 - Munro Group Ltd 10895 - H C Moss (Builders) Ltd 10498 - Mr. B. Baker, Mr. R Mallandine, The W Scrambler Trust 10958 - Mrs A J Johnson and Mr B Moore 10475 - Balsham (Building) Ltd 11022 - Trustees of the Estate of the Late D L January 10594 10524 10833 10649 10619 10550 10777 10510 10502 10913 10592 10560 10900 10960 10417 10526	Object	For the reasons detailed in the accompanying representations, it is considered that policy ST/1 should be amended to read as follows: 'Through its housing allocations, the District Council will seek to make provision for approximately 20,000 new homes in South Cambridgeshire during the period 1999 - 2016. This is unlikely to include all of the required 4,400 homes proposed on sites on the edge of Cambridge, or the 6,000 proposal at the new town of Northstowe as provided for in the 2003 Structure Plan. Accordingly, significant additional allocations will be made in the rural area, in rural Centres and other villages, (including Minor Rural Centres) in order to attempt to achieve the Structure Plan target figure of 20,000 new homes.'	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8 and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10720 - Jarrow Investments Ltd (Hanley Grange New Settlement)	Object	<p>In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a higher housing provision than 20,000 units (1999-2016) will be required. Since the higher housing completion rate will continue beyond 2016, it is suggested that this can best be achieved by a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. It is recommended that the 1999 to 2016 housing provision is increased to 23,000 dwellings. The policy should be amended as follows:</p> <p>(a) (1st line) "for approximately 23,000 new homes..."</p> <p>(b) (4th line) "6000 homes at the new town of Northstowe, 2500 dwellings at the new town of Hanley Grange and 9600 ....":</p>	<p>The adopted RSS6 and Structure Plan propose a new settlement in the period to 2016. The Structure Plan locates this at Longstanton/Oakington. In view of the urgency to bring forward and implement the Cambridge Sub Region strategy, the first tranche of LDF documents implement the adopted strategy. The emerging draft RSS14 does not propose any further new settlements in the sub region to 2016. There is therefore no strategic context for any allocation for a further new town in this plan and this issue would need to be considered further as part of a future review of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. The Council's view is that the priority must be on the delivery of the current strategy and to allow that new development to "bed in" and community identity to become established and to assess the impact of the current planned scale of development on Cambridge and the surrounding area before any consideration of any further new settlements close to Cambridge. Notwithstanding this principle, the Council does not consider that the site of the Hanley Grange proposal close to Duxford represents a suitable option for a new town. The site lies in a sensitive area of landscape which would adversely affect the adjoining Green Belt and would harm the setting of Cambridge in long distance views from the higher land to the south of Cambridge. It is not well served by existing public transport and whilst it is fairly close to Whittlesford Bridge railway station, it is not close enough for this to be a realistic and accessible option for local travel into Cambridge, but is likely to attract commuters to Stansted and London. The policy principle is for development in the Cambridge area to meet the needs of the successful Cambridge Phenomenon and not the needs of areas further to the south which should meet their own needs close to where they arise.</p>	
10363 10357	Object	<p>The accommodation of significant growth in most of the main villages could reduce the size of Northstowe. Northstowe is partly a "greenfield" development, whilst our client's proposal (for the allocation of 5 acres in the northern part of Swavesey) is "brownfield" and should be given priority in any settlement strategy of the LDF. We therefore object to the Core Strategy of the pre-submission draft document and recommend that Swavesey should be included under Policy St/3 (or at the very least ST/4 and that Northstowe should be decreased in size.</p>	<p>The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. Swavesey is a Group Village with a poor level of services and facilities and does not warrant elevation up the settlement hierarchy, as it does not meet the criteria for designation as a Rural Centre. Therefore, reallocation of housing to such a location would be contrary to policy.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9457 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Housing allocations should be revisited, with a view to securing more on the edge of Cambridge and less in the rural areas, in the interests of sustainability.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and the general location of development on the edge of Cambridge in Policy P9/2c. Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The Council has undertaken further work on the rural housing numbers, including the production of a housing trajectory. As part of this work the Council revisited the housing allocations rolled forward from Local Plan 2004 and deleted the sites with planning permission at March 2005 (as these are now counted as commitments), deleted those allocations in the less sustainable settlements that cannot be relied upon to come forward for development in the plan period, and updated the housing land supply information with data to the end of March 2005. The Council is able to demonstrate sufficient housing land supply to meet the remainder of the requirement in the rural area. The detailed housing land supply information is included in the report to Council on 15th November 2005.	
10205 - East of England Regional Assembly	Support	The Assembly supports ST/1 as reflecting both current Structure Plan, and emerging Regional Spatial Strategy.	Support noted.	
9912 - Old Road Securities Plc	Support	Support is given to the acknowledgement of the role that Rural Centres and Other Villages can play in bringing forward housing development.	Support noted.	
9364 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Support	Network Rail supports the objective to provide an adequate supply of housing land throughout the Structure Plan period 1999-2016.	Support noted.	
8329 - The Marshall Group	Support	ST/1 - Housing Provision Marshall welcomes the provision for 4,400 homes on the edge of Cambridge within the plan period to 2016. At North of Newmarket Road and at North of Cherry Hinton, up to 3,500 homes could be accommodated, whilst the airport remains operational.	Support noted.	
7872 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	We would ask that opportunities for and sensitive support of informal recreation, such as walking, should be an integral part of housing development and development: it should not be seen as a last minute add-on.	Support noted. Policies TR/1 and TR/4 require adequate provision for walking and cycling and that it is designed at the outset. The Area Action Plans for the major development sites also require provision as an integral part of the development.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9916 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support	Support noted.	
10977 - Cambridgeshire County Council 10980 - Cambridgeshire County Council 11001 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support Policy ST/1 Housing Provision.	Support noted.	
<i>2.4</i>				
10721 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	<p>In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Ltd is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton.</p> <p>As a consequential amendment to paragraph 2.4 arising from the recommended changes to Policy ST/1, the paragraph should read (line 6) " ...and new towns at Northstowe and Hanley Grange north west and south east of Cambridge respectively".</p>	<p>The adopted RSS6 and Structure Plan propose a new settlement in the period to 2016. The Structure Plan locates this at Longstanton/Oakington. In view of the urgency to bring forward and implement the Cambridge Sub Region strategy, the first tranche of LDF documents implement the adopted strategy. The emerging draft RSS14 does not propose any further new settlements in the sub region to 2016. There is therefore no strategic context for any allocation for a further new town in this plan and this issue would need to be considered further as part of a future review of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. The Council's view is that the priority must be on the delivery of the current strategy and to allow that new development to "bed in" and community identity to become established and to assess the impact of the current planned scale of development on Cambridge and the surrounding area before any consideration of any further new settlements close to Cambridge.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this principle, the Council does not consider that the site of the Hanley Grange proposal close to Duxford represents a suitable option for a new town. The site lies in a sensitive area of landscape which would adversely affect the adjoining Green Belt and would harm the setting of Cambridge in long distance views from the higher land to the south of Cambridge. It is not well served by existing public transport and whilst it is fairly close to Whittlesford Bridge railway station, it is not close enough for this to be a realistic and accessible option for local travel into Cambridge, but is likely to attract commuters to Stansted and London. The policy principle is for development in the Cambridge area to meet the needs of the successful Cambridge Phenomenon and not the needs of areas further to the south which should meet their own needs close to where they arise.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<b>2.5</b>				
10178 - East of England Regional Assembly	Object	The housing allocations should be broken down to the period 1999-2001, 2001-2016 to enable easier comparison with emerging East of England Plan. Same point applies to Housing land supply figure 1 and figure 3 (separate representation forms not submitted).	Whilst this is not essential, it is recognised that it will assist regional monitoring and it should be possible to present the information in this way as the time frames referred to relate purely to past completions rather than allocations.	Split the housing completions information into two time periods, 1999-2001 and 2001-2005.
<b><i>ST/2 Re-Using Previously Developed Land and Buildings</i></b>				
9365 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Object	Policy ST/2 sets a target of 37% of new dwellings to be built on previously developed land. Whilst this target has been set to reflect the target set in the Structure Plan, paragraph 23 of PPG3 sets a national target of 60%. Policy H3 of RSS14 promotes the re-use of previously developed land and buildings "as the first priority". Policy SS4 sets a target of at least 60% of all new development in the region on or using previously used land or buildings and encourages local development documents to "energetically pursue" the re-use of previously developed land. Network Rail would therefore encourage the Council to place more emphasis on optimising the use of previously developed land in line with Government guidance set out in PPG3.	Structure Plan Policy P5/2 sets an overall target for at least 50% of new dwellings to be located on previously developed land or utilise existing buildings. A specific target of 37% was established for South Cambridgeshire to reflect the nature of the district and the growth that must be accommodated. Higher targets in other districts counter this. Policy SS4 of RSS14 applies the same principle, requiring 60% across the region as a whole and paragraph 4.23 recognises that the proportion achieved varies in different parts of the region. The target of 37% will be achieved through the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the delivery of urban extensions to Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe. The development strategy also permits the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.	
9721 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds	Object	The RSPB supports the principle of re-developing brownfield sites. However, it is important to note that existing buildings and brownfield sites may have nature conservation value in their own right. For example, a range of species of birds will nest in derelict buildings or amongst rubble and scrub growth on a brownfield site. Barn owl is a species which is often found in derelict buildings and redevelopment of farm buildings for example, can remove nesting sites for this species. Proposals to redevelop brownfield sites could therefore have nature conservation impacts. Paragraph 2.6 should be amended to reflect the potential nature conservation value of brownfield sites and make explicit that development proposals to re-utilise existing sites will, nonetheless, be expected to undertake appropriate surveys to determine the wildlife value of the site. Development proposals may need to be amended to protect or provide for wildlife already on the site.	Agree, it is important to recognise that brownfield sites could have biodiversity interest. However, this is better incorporated into Policy NE/6 on Biodiversity.	Add a new paragraph to Policy NE/6 after paragraph 4: "Previously Developed Land will not be considered to be devoid of biodiversity. The re-use of such sites must be undertaken carefully with regard to existing features of biodiversity interest. Development proposals will be expected to include measures that maintain and enhance important features whilst incorporating them within any development of the site."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9919 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The previously developed land target of 37% is substantially below the national target of 60% to be achieved by 2008 (during the plan period for the Local Development Framework) and should be improved if possible. This is more likely to be achieved through a more positive approach towards the redevelopment of brownfield sites, such as Bayer CropScience Ltd, Hauxton. A specific 'previously developed land policy' is required elsewhere in the plan, in particular, to reinforce Strategic Objective ST/k	Disagree. The Bayer CropScience site offers a specific opportunity in a relatively sustainable location, and should be addressed through a site specific policy. A general district wide policy would not be appropriate, as the appropriateness of redevelopment is so dependent on site specific circumstances, and would not be consistent with the Structure plan / RSS search sequence.	
9230 - Defence Lands Ops North	Object	On behalf of our client Defence Estates, we object to this policy, and recommend that the rate of development on previously-developed land is increased to 60% to comply with the draft RSS14, rather than the current adopted Structure Plan. The policy should state: 'Between 1999 and 2016 at least 60% of new dwellings will either be located on previously developed land or utilise existing buildings.'	Structure Plan Policy P5/2 sets an overall target for at least 50% of new dwellings to be located on previously developed land or utilise existing buildings. A specific target of 37% was established for South Cambridgeshire to reflect the nature of the district and the growth that must be accommodated. Higher targets in other districts counter this. Policy SS4 of RSS14 applies the same principle, requiring 60% across the region as a whole and paragraph 4.23 recognises that the proportion achieved varies in different parts of the region.	
9936 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	A new policy should be introduced to facilitate the redevelopment of windfall brownfield sites that are likely to come forward during the course of the Plan period. Emerging government policy out for consultation states that 'local authorities in housing markets identified for growth should consider windfall applications favourably, so long as they are sustainable.' (Planning for Housing Provision, ODPM 2005)	The development strategy permits the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.	
10332 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We support the principle of Policy ST/2 . We note reference in the Sustainability Appraisal that the 'limited stock of brownfield land means new development will inevitably result in the loss of high quality agricultural land'. In our view, this suggests that there may be a shortfall in meeting the 37% policy requirement given the limited stock of brownfield land. There would still be a substantial shortfall in achieving the Government's target of 60. We consider that the Council should be looking to maximise all opportunities to bring forward previously development brownfield sites for development.	Support noted. Structure Plan Policy P5/2 sets an overall target for at least 50% of new dwellings to be located on previously developed land or utilise existing buildings. A specific target of 37% was established for South Cambridgeshire to reflect the nature of the district and the growth that must be accommodated. Higher targets in other districts counter this. Policy SS4 of RSS14 applies the same principle, requiring 60% across the region as a whole and paragraph 4.23 recognises that the proportion achieved varies in different parts of the region. The target of 37% will be achieved through the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the delivery of urban extensions to Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe. The development strategy also permits the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.	
10797 - Jesus College (Cambridge)	Support	Policy ST/2 is supported. Brownfield sites can make a sustainable contribution to the delivery of housing requirements.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>KEY DIAGRAM</i>				
8383 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Land known as Barton Road North and Barton Road South should be defined as 'Major Development Sites' on the framework key diagram. The sites should be promoted elsewhere in the plan for mixed-use development.	<p>(1) The major development sites defined on the Key Diagram are those which form part of the development strategy to meet the required housing provision in the period 1999-2016. The land proposed does not form a part of the development strategy and is not needed to meet the housing target. Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this. Figures 1 - 3 demonstrate the housing land supply will meet the requirement, therefore the allocation of additional housing is not required.</p> <p>(2) Development of this objection site would require the land to be removed from the Cambridge Green Belt. As part of the process of determining where the existing Green Belt around Cambridge could be re-drawn to permit development without causing undue harm to the character and setting of Cambridge, the District Council commissioned two landscape character based studies - David Brown Landscape Design dated December 1998 and Landscape Design Associates dated September 2002. Both of these studies which also informed the debate and conclusions of Structure Plan EIP Panel concluded that the existing countryside on the western side of Cambridge, including this objection site, are an important part of the setting of Cambridge and should remain in the Green Belt.</p>	
9914 - Old Road Securities Plc	Object	Amend Key Diagram to include Linton and Waterbeach as Rural Centres. Delete these settlements as Minor Rural Centres.	Linton and Waterbeach did not meet the Structure Plan guidelines (in paragraph 1.17) for definition as a Rural Centre. In recognition of the role these villages perform providing services and facilities for a local hinterland, they have been designated Minor Rural Centres. The Key Diagram reflects their status.	
11287 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	As mentioned in other comments - Maps omit layer showing public rights of way - we see this as a serious omission. South Cambridgeshire DC should have an electronic copy of the Definitive Map already, and we can provide an up to date one.	The Key Diagram is a diagrammatic portrayal of the development strategy and it is not appropriate to show detailed policy areas. However, there is no requirement to show public rights of way on the Proposals Map and it would not be appropriate as there are no policies in the LDF that directly relate to existing public rights of way, which are dealt with under separate legislation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10724 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Ltd is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. As a consequence, the Key Diagram should be amended to show a major development site in the triangle formed by the A11, A505 and A1301 (Hanley Grange).	The adopted RSS6 and Structure Plan propose a new settlement in the period to 2016. The Structure Plan locates this at Longstanton/Oakington. In view of the urgency to bring forward and implement the Cambridge Sub Region strategy, the first tranche of LDF documents implement the adopted strategy. The emerging draft RSS14 does not propose any further new settlements in the sub region to 2016. There is therefore no strategic context for any allocation for a further new town in this plan and this issue would need to be considered further as part of a future review of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. The Council's view is that the priority must be on the delivery of the current strategy and to allow that new development to "bed in" and community identity to become established and to assess the impact of the current planned scale of development on Cambridge and the surrounding area before any consideration of any further new settlements close to Cambridge. Notwithstanding this principle, the Council does not consider that the site of the Hanley Grange proposal close to Duxford represents a suitable option for a new town. The site lies in a sensitive area of landscape which would adversely affect the adjoining Green Belt and would harm the setting of Cambridge in long distance views from the higher land to the south of Cambridge. It is not well served by existing public transport and whilst it is fairly close to Whittlesford Bridge railway station, it is not close enough for this to be a realistic and accessible option for local travel into Cambridge, but is likely to attract commuters to Stansted and London. The policy principle is for development in the Cambridge area to meet the needs of the successful Cambridge Phenomenon and not the needs of areas further to the south which should meet their own needs close to where they arise.	
<i>2.7</i>				
10035 - House Builders Federation	Object	The text refers to the provision of 4,400 dwellings on the edge of Cambridge between 1999-2016. It would seem more appropriate to now instead refer to the dwelling requirement up to 2021 in the East of England Plan, which may be adopted by the time this Development Plan Inquiry ends. Particularly given that other policies in the Council's LDF Documents refer directly to the content of the East of England Plan (RSS14). Furthermore, the Government's proposed changes to PPG3 (July 2005) now advocate provision for 15 years housing land supply in Development Plans.	The plan period to 2016 is too short. A period of circa 10 years will not address the long-term development requirements of this major growth sub-region. Whilst the Structure Plan has an end-date of 2016 the new RSS, the East of England Plan has an end date of 2021 and should be taken into account given that it should be approved during 2006.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10340 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	<p>The Structure Plan sets the development strategy for the Cambridge area within the framework provided by RSS6 and proposes that in order to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, that land be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in order to bring forward urban extensions which would locate significant levels of development at the top of the development sequence and closest to services and facilities. The principle of Green Belt release is therefore already established and the LDF is taking forward the development strategy at the local level.</p> <p>The rural strategy focuses development within the larger villages with better access to services and facilities in accordance with the Structure Plan. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council identified Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres which are the most sustainable locations for development and undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. PPG3 makes clear that issues of sustainability and location are also appropriate factors to take into account in considering redevelopment of brownfield sites. Any proposals for development on brownfield sites outside of village frameworks will be considered within this policy framework.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Figure 1</i>				
10443 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10453 - Centex Strategic Land	Object	Whilst the Council considers that some 4,480 dwellings could come forward from the Cambridge urban extensions, our assessment identifies a more realistic assessment of 2,230 dwellings. This results in a shortfall of 2,250 dwellings against the Council's assessment. The housing land supply strategy should be amended with the deletion of those sites that are unlikely to come forward for development during the plan period and their substitution with more realistic allocations, including that proposed by our clients at Histon.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the new Monitoring chapter and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. Figure 3 provides housing land supply information demonstrating that the outstanding rural housing requirement between March 2005 and 2016 is 1,087 dwellings. The remaining development at a limited number of housing allocations carried forward from Local Plan 2004 and at Cambourne, to achieve an overall density across the settlement of 30 dph, will more than accommodate this requirement. Therefore, the allocation of additional housing is not required.	
10429 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. 10419 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd	Object	Whilst the Council considers that some 4,480 dwellings could come forward from the Cambridge urban extensions, our assessment identifies a more realistic assessment of 2,230 dwellings. This results in a shortfall of 2,250 dwellings against the Council's assessment. The housing land supply strategy should be amended with the deletion of those sites that are unlikely to come forward for development during the plan period and their substitution with more realistic allocations, including that proposed by our clients at North Cambourne.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the new Monitoring chapter and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. Figure 3 provides housing land supply information demonstrating that the outstanding rural housing requirement between March 2005 and 2016 is 1,087 dwellings. The remaining development at a limited number of housing allocations carried forward from Local Plan 2004 and at Cambourne, to achieve an overall density across the settlement of 30 dph, will more than accommodate this requirement. Therefore, the allocation of additional housing is not required.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10832	Object	We have serious reservations regarding the ability to meet the target of providing 10,000 additional homes in South Cambridgeshire between 1999 -2016, based on unrealistic assumptions regarding the implementation of feasibility and timescale of implanting the large scale urban extensions as outlined in figure 1 of the core strategy. far greater flexibility is required within the smaller Rural and Minor Rural Centres in allocating land and amending the development frameworks in anticipation of a significant shortfall in the implementation of housing. This includes Waterbeach.	The DPDs make adequate and appropriate housing provision in accordance with the Structure Plan and adopted and emerging RSS. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Reports will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The adopted RSS6 and Structure Plan propose a new settlement in the period to 2016. The Structure Plan locates this at Longstanton/Oakington. In view of the urgency to bring forward and implement the Cambridge Sub Region strategy, the first tranche of LDF documents implement the adopted strategy. The emerging draft RSS14 does not propose any further new settlements in the sub region to 2021. Whilst it is recognised that the Panel at the Structure Plan EIP made comments about the potential suitability of Waterbeach for a new settlement, there is no strategic context for any allocation in this plan and this issue would need to be considered further as part of a future review of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. The Council's view is that the priority must be on the delivery of the current strategy and to allow that new development to "bed in" and community identity to become established and to assess the impact of the current planned scale of development on Cambridge and the surrounding area before any consideration of any further new settlements close to Cambridge.	
10297 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	The Council's fundamental approach to the delivery of new housing fails to consider previously developed sites in village locations.	The development strategy permits the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.	
10206 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	<p>The University objects to the fact that there is no indicative housing total shown for housing on land to be removed from the Green Belt between Huntingdon Rd and Madingley Rd.</p> <p>While land will not be released here until the University can demonstrate need, the Masterplanning work that the University has been undertaking suggests that land for up to 1,400 houses in the District could be required and provided up to 2016 and beyond. Figure 1 should be amended to show this indicative figure.</p> <p>The University would also wish the housing totals in Policy ST/1 to reflect the approach outlined in the Barker Report : Recommendation 9 (see over)</p>	The Cambridge North West Area Action Plan (AAP) is not part of the first tranche of DPDs. As a result, the detail has not been worked up and it is not possible to include housing figures for this site it within the Core Strategy. Once the AAP is produced, the figures will be incorporated into a review of the Core Strategy. This is explained in Note 2 to Figure 1.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11345 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	The assumed completions are unlikely to arise in the Plan period.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the new Monitoring chapter and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. Figure 3 provides housing land supply information demonstrating that the outstanding rural housing requirement between March 2005 and 2016 is 1,087 dwellings. The remaining development at a limited number of housing allocations carried forward from Local Plan 2004 and at Cambourne, to achieve an overall density across the settlement of 30 dph, will more than accommodate this requirement. Therefore, the allocation of additional housing is not required.	
11346 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Netherhall Farm)	Object	Other sites at the edge of Cambridge should be identified in the LDF process. Our clients, Taylor Woodrow Development, content that land at Netherhall Farm, located within Cambridge City, should be allocated for housing in order to ensure that the required number of completions can be achieved.	The site is located outside of the district and therefore cannot be considered in relation to the South Cambridgeshire LDF. Any proposal for redevelopment on this site would need to be considered by Cambridge City Council.	
10244 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Object	TMLC suggests that Figure 1 could be presented more clearly and explanation is required of how the 70 - 170 shortfall has been derived.	Agreed. Figure 1 has been re-presented taking the mid-points of the figures where forecast housing provisions was shown as a range in the original. The forecast shortfall of housing provision within that part of the urban extensions within South Cambridgeshire is 220 dwellings out of a total of 4,400 dwellings by 2016. This shortfall is insignificant because: (a) the Structure Plan figure is a guideline not a target, (b) the Structure Plan brackets together South Cambridgeshire's and Cambridge City's housing figures for these stages in the sequence and this number can therefore be made up from development within Cambridge; (c) the table does not yet include any housing forecasts for the area to be covered by the North West Cambridge AAP.	Amend Figure 1 by taking the mid-point number for those housing figures presented as a range in the original.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10036 - House Builders Federation	Object	The text refers to the provision of 4,400 dwellings on the edge of Cambridge between 1999-2016. It would seem more appropriate to now instead refer to the dwelling requirement up to 2021 in the East of England Plan, which may be adopted by the time this Development Plan Inquiry ends. Particularly given that other policies in the Council's LDF Documents refer directly to the content of the East of England Plan (RSS14). Furthermore, the Government's proposed changes to PPG3 (July 2005) now advocate provision for 15 years housing land supply in Development Plans.	The plan period to 2016 is too short. A period of circa 10 years will not address the long-term development requirements of this major growth sub-region. Whilst the Structure Plan has an end-date of 2016 the new RSS, the East of England Plan has an end date of 2021 and should be taken into account given that it should be approved during 2006.	
<i>2.10</i>				
9366 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Support	Network Rail supports the Council's allocation of a high density housing-led mixed-use development at Chesterton Sidings and the recognition that the site should be "brought forward for development at the earliest opportunity".	Support noted.	
<i>2.12</i>				
10341 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	<p>The Structure Plan sets the development strategy for the Cambridge area within the framework provided by RSS6 and proposes that in order to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, that land be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in order to bring forward urban extensions which would locate significant levels of development at the top of the development sequence and closest to services and facilities. The principle of Green Belt release is therefore already established and the LDF is taking forward the development strategy at the local level.</p> <p>The rural strategy focuses development within the larger villages with better access to services and facilities in accordance with the Structure Plan. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council identified Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres which are the most sustainable locations for development and undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. PPG3 makes clear that issues of sustainability and location are also appropriate factors to take into account in considering redevelopment of brownfield sites. Any proposals for development on brownfield sites outside of village frameworks will be considered within this policy framework.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8225	Object	Closing Marshall's and the airport will result in the loss of thousands of jobs. Where are all the people that you want to house in Cambridge East going to work?	The development of Cambridge East for housing as part of the wider development strategy is needed to help to redress the existing imbalance between jobs and housing in the Cambridge area.	
9013 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Paragraph 2.12 and 2.14 are premature in that there is no certainty that Cambridge Airport and the associated businesses will relocate. This will impact upon the ability of the site to deliver the full extent of the major housing led mixed use development anticipated during the latter stages of the plan period and beyond 2016.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and identifies Cambridge East as a major urban extension to Cambridge. This is based on the assumption that Cambridge Airport will relocate. Neither South Cambridgeshire nor Cambridge City Councils are relying on any development on the Airport site itself to come forward by 2016. If for any reason it does not relocate, the development strategy will need to be reviewed in the next Regional Plan.	
<i>2.13</i>				
10342 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	<p>The Structure Plan sets the development strategy for the Cambridge area within the framework provided by RSS6 and proposes that in order to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, that land be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in order to bring forward urban extensions which would locate significant levels of development at the top of the development sequence and closest to services and facilities. The principle of Green Belt release is therefore already established and the LDF is taking forward the development strategy at the local level.</p> <p>The rural strategy focuses development within the larger villages with better access to services and facilities in accordance with the Structure Plan. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council identified Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres which are the most sustainable locations for development and undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. PPG3 makes clear that issues of sustainability and location are also appropriate factors to take into account in considering redevelopment of brownfield sites. Any proposals for development on brownfield sites outside of village frameworks will be considered within this policy framework.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8226	Object	Simply 'ensuring that the expanded City does not extend beyond the current alignment of Airport Way' will not prevent the City from 'coalescing with ... Teversham', because Teversham starts immediately to the east of Airport Way. The separation must be at least 500 metres, otherwise Teversham will effectively be part of the Cambridge urban area. This separation area must remain within the Green Belt.	The Cambridge East Area Action Plan provides more detail for the development of this urban quarter. Policy CE/2 (4) states that it will be "physically separate from surrounding villages especially the closest villages of...Teversham where there will be Green Separation to maintain their character..." Policy CE/6 sets out a requirement for a minimum of 200m of Green Separation. It is proposed that the Green Separation will remain within the Green Belt.	
10981 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Note and welcome repeated statement regarding provision of "associated recreation, access and landscape improvements" relating to Area Action Plans.	Support noted.	
<i>2.14</i>				
10343 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	<p>The Structure Plan sets the development strategy for the Cambridge area within the framework provided by RSS6 and proposes that in order to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, that land be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in order to bring forward urban extensions which would locate significant levels of development at the top of the development sequence and closest to services and facilities. The principle of Green Belt release is therefore already established and the LDF is taking forward the development strategy at the local level.</p> <p>The rural strategy focuses development within the larger villages with better access to services and facilities in accordance with the Structure Plan. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council identified Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres which are the most sustainable locations for development and undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. PPG3 makes clear that issues of sustainability and location are also appropriate factors to take into account in considering redevelopment of brownfield sites. Any proposals for development on brownfield sites outside of village frameworks will be considered within this policy framework.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9015 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Paragraph 2.12 and 2.14 are premature in that there is no certainty that Cambridge Airport and the associated businesses will relocate. This will impact upon the ability of the site to deliver the full extent of the major housing led mixed use development anticipated during the latter stages of the plan period and beyond 2016.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and identifies Cambridge East as a major urban extension to Cambridge. This is based on the assumption that Cambridge Airport will relocate. Neither South Cambridgeshire nor Cambridge City Councils are relying on any development on the Airport site itself to come forward by 2016. If for any reason it does not relocate, the development strategy will need to be reviewed in the next Regional Plan.	
10982 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Note and welcome repeated statement regarding provision of "associated recreation, access and landscape improvements" relating to Area Action Plans.	Support noted.	
<i>2.15</i>				
10344 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	<p>The Structure Plan sets the development strategy for the Cambridge area within the framework provided by RSS6 and proposes that in order to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, that land be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in order to bring forward urban extensions which would locate significant levels of development at the top of the development sequence and closest to services and facilities. The principle of Green Belt release is therefore already established and the LDF is taking forward the development strategy at the local level.</p> <p>The rural strategy focuses development within the larger villages with better access to services and facilities in accordance with the Structure Plan. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council identified Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres which are the most sustainable locations for development and undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. PPG3 makes clear that issues of sustainability and location are also appropriate factors to take into account in considering redevelopment of brownfield sites. Any proposals for development on brownfield sites outside of village frameworks will be considered within this policy framework.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2.16</i>				
10345 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	<p>The Structure Plan sets the development strategy for the Cambridge area within the framework provided by RSS6 and proposes that in order to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, that land be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in order to bring forward urban extensions which would locate significant levels of development at the top of the development sequence and closest to services and facilities. The principle of Green Belt release is therefore already established and the LDF is taking forward the development strategy at the local level.</p> <p>The rural strategy focuses development within the larger villages with better access to services and facilities in accordance with the Structure Plan. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council identified Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres which are the most sustainable locations for development and undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. PPG3 makes clear that issues of sustainability and location are also appropriate factors to take into account in considering redevelopment of brownfield sites. Any proposals for development on brownfield sites outside of village frameworks will be considered within this policy framework.</p>	
10983 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Note and welcome repeated statement regarding provision of "associated recreation, access and landscape improvements" relating to Area Action Plans.	Support noted.	
<i>2.17</i>				
10246 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Support	TMLC supports the promotion of the former Monsanto Land for early development. Given the previously developed nature of much of the site and its favourable location adjacent to the existing urban area, the Trumpington Park and Ride facility and the southern terminus of the proposed Guided Busway, the redevelopment of the former Monsanto site offers an excellent opportunity to develop a high quality, mixed-use sustainable urban extension for Cambridge, which is consistent with national, regional and local planning policy objectives. Additionally the previously developed nature and existing road network make to site ideal for early use.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2.18</i>				
10346 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	<p>The Structure Plan sets the development strategy for the Cambridge area within the framework provided by RSS6 and proposes that in order to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, that land be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in order to bring forward urban extensions which would locate significant levels of development at the top of the development sequence and closest to services and facilities. The principle of Green Belt release is therefore already established and the LDF is taking forward the development strategy at the local level.</p> <p>The rural strategy focuses development within the larger villages with better access to services and facilities in accordance with the Structure Plan. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council identified Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres which are the most sustainable locations for development and undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. PPG3 makes clear that issues of sustainability and location are also appropriate factors to take into account in considering redevelopment of brownfield sites. Any proposals for development on brownfield sites outside of village frameworks will be considered within this policy framework.</p>	
10249 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Support	TMLC supports the promotion of the former Monsanto Land for early development. Given the previously developed nature of much of the site and its favourable location adjacent to the existing urban area, the Trumpington Park and Ride facility and the southern terminus of the proposed Guided Busway, the redevelopment of the former Monsanto site offers an excellent opportunity to develop a high quality, mixed-use sustainable urban extension for Cambridge, which is consistent with national, regional and local planning policy objectives. Additionally the previously developed nature and existing road network make the site ideal for early use.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2.19</i>				
10347 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	<p>The Structure Plan sets the development strategy for the Cambridge area within the framework provided by RSS6 and proposes that in order to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, that land be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in order to bring forward urban extensions which would locate significant levels of development at the top of the development sequence and closest to services and facilities. The principle of Green Belt release is therefore already established and the LDF is taking forward the development strategy at the local level.</p> <p>The rural strategy focuses development within the larger villages with better access to services and facilities in accordance with the Structure Plan. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council identified Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres which are the most sustainable locations for development and undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. PPG3 makes clear that issues of sustainability and location are also appropriate factors to take into account in considering redevelopment of brownfield sites. Any proposals for development on brownfield sites outside of village frameworks will be considered within this policy framework.</p>	
10551 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 10556 - Persimmon Homes	Object	The text infers that only land within Cambridge City's administrative boundary will form part of the north west extension. It is submitted that this assumption cannot be made until the overall development needs have been assessed and Area Action Plan formulated for this area.	Text at Paragraph 2.19 states the area known as north west Cambridge will comprise built development within the city's administrative area and countryside recreation, access and landscape improvements within the Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire's area.	
8798 - Windsor Road Residents	Object	We strongly agree with the proposal that "A revised Green Belt will ensure that the expanded City does not coalesce with Girton or Histon Village". However, we propose that further details are required, including minimum dimensions for the green buffer between Girton/Histon and the new Huntingdon Road /Histon Road development in Cambridge city before we can comment satisfactorily.	The Green Belt between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road is not proposed to be amended. A new policy is proposed to be included in the Submission version of the Site Specific Policies DPD to set out the requirements for landscape, biodiversity, recreation and public access enhancements in this area as part of built development within Cambridge City's administrative area.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10614 - David Wilson Estates	Object	Key Diagram, paragraphs 2.19 to 2.21 inclusive. To dismiss so briefly at paragraph 2.19 the potential of the A15 Huntingdon Road/Histon Road area to deliver a sustainable residentially-led development on the edge of Cambridge, in accordance with the accepted settlement hierarchy, is fundamentally wrong. A full review of this edge of Cambridge site is therefore required before other locations are identified for development at locations below edge of Cambridge locations in the settlement hierarchy, and as identified additionally through objections 1, 3 and 5.	<p>The Council's approved Local Development Scheme indicates that an Area Action Plan will be prepared for NW Cambridge to include land between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road and Histon Road. Council has subsequently agreed to prepare a joint Area Action Plan with Cambridge City Council for NW Cambridge. However, the preparation of a Project Brief for a Cambridge North West AAP raises questions about the benefits of including any of the land north of Huntingdon Road in the AAP for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Draft Cambridge Local Plan allocates land up to the City boundary for housing development. The City Local Plan will be adopted in June 2006.</li> <li>2. The South Cambs Local Development Scheme says that the land in South Cambs will be retained as Green Belt/countryside for landscaping and countryside access/recreation, having regard to the significant level of work undertaken by the Council and its consultants during the preparation of the Structure Plan. Two studies were undertaken for the Council. The first study concluded that the open fields between the City boundary, Girton village and the A14 provide an important landscape setting to Cambridge (Landscape Setting Study by David Brown 1998). The second study concluded that while there is potential for some land between the existing edge of Cambridge and the A14 to be sensitively developed it is important that the setting and separation of Girton is to be maintained and similarly views from the A14 to historic landmarks, and the green edge to the city should be enhanced (Cambridge Green Belt Study: LDA 2002). Other work confirms this view stating that the site is clearly visible from the A14 to the north and development would adversely affect the current interface between the edge of the city and surrounding countryside and potentially create coalescence with the city (Buchanan Cambridge Sub Region Study 2001). The Council therefore already has a clear view is that the land allocated in the City is capable of being developed sensitively as an extension to Cambridge but that any further development in South Cambs would encroach into the open countryside in a way that would undermine the landscape setting of the City and separation with Girton. The joint AAP would simply carry forward the policies in the City Local Plan and reflect this Council's view as set out in its LDS.</li> <li>3. NIAB (the landowner) and David Wilson Homes (development partner) are keen to make a planning application and to start development - even though the AAP process has</li> </ol>	<p>Revise paragraph 2.19 to delete reference to land between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road in the sub heading and add the following to the end of the paragraph:</p> <p>"...in accordance with the policy in the Site Specific Policies DPD."</p> <p>Insert new subheading above paragraph 2.20 "Cambridge North West - between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road" and revise the paragraph to read:</p> <p>"Land will also be removed from the Green Belt NORTH WEST of the City between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road which crosses the City and South Cambridgeshire district boundary. A revised Green Belt will ensure that the expanded City does not coalesce with Girton village. THE STRUCTURE PLAN MAKES CLEAR IT will [not be available] ONLY BE BROUGHT FORWARD for development [until] WHEN the University can show A CLEAR NEED FOR THE LAND TO BE RELEASED. THE COUNCIL CONSIDERS THAT IN THE INTERESTS OF USING THIS LAND RESOURCE CAREFULLY LAND SHOULD ONLY BE RELEASED FROM THE GREEN BELT ON AN EXCEPTIONAL BASIS IN VIEW OF THE PARTICULAR AND DEMONSTRATED NEEDS OF THE UNIVERSITY, THIS INCLUDES THE TEST that there is no other suitable University or College land or building available elsewhere in the City."</p> <p>Add the following to the end of paragraph 2.21:</p> <p>"... prepared jointly with Cambridge City Council."</p>

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****Councils' Assessment****Change to Draft DPD**

been brought forward and work has started, relying on the AAP could delay development in the City if associated landscaping and recreation proposals are to be secured.

4. NIAB/David Wilson Homes representations make clear that they want to develop in South Cambs. The objections to the SCDC Core Strategy seeking development in the District are an appropriate mechanism for addressing this issue without delay and, if repeated at Submission, will be considered by the Inspector who will hold a public examination next summer. This will provide certainty on the extent of development and appropriate land uses much more quickly than an AAP, even under an earlier programme.

5. If there are issues that affect land both sides of Huntingdon Road, such as orbital movements, these can be addressed through informal joint working between the two district Councils and the County Council as highway authority through a non-statutory Area Development Framework, in a similar way to work currently in progress in the Cambridge Southern Fringe.

In the light of all these factors, it is proposed to revise the area of cover of the NW Cambridge AAP to cover only land between Huntingdon Road and Madingley Road. This will be made clear in the Core Strategy DPD. It is also proposed to insert a policy into the SCDC Site Specific Policies DPD proposing that the land in South Cambs north of Huntingdon Road be kept as Green Belt and enhanced through landscape/biodiversity/access/recreation proposals.

Insert new policy and supporting text into the Site Specific Policies DPD to read:

"POLICY SP/x North West Cambridge: Huntingdon Road to Histon Road - Countryside Recreation, Access and Landscape Improvements

1. The countryside bounded by the City edge, A14 and Girton village will be subject to landscape enhancement, habitat creation and provision for recreation adjoining development within Cambridge City between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road.

2. Planning permission for development within Cambridge City between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road will include a planning obligation requirement for contributions to the implementation of a Countryside Enhancement Strategy comprising an integrated landscape, biodiversity, recreation and public access enhancement strategy, which will complement the existing landscape character of the area and protect and enhance the setting of Cambridge and the countryside edge of Girton village.

x.x The Cambridge Local Plan allocates land released from the Green Belt for a new housing-led mixed-use development between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road. No change to the Green Belt boundary is proposed within South Cambridgeshire. The revised Green Belt boundary will ensure that the expanded City does not coalesce with Girton or Histon villages and that the quality of the setting of Cambridge is

***Representations******Nature Representation Summary******Councils' Assessment******Change to Draft DPD***

maintained.

x.x This rural area provides an opportunity for improved countryside access and informal recreation to serve both the development proposed in the City and existing development in this sector of Cambridge. There should also be associated landscape and biodiversity enhancements in the area as far north as the A14 trunk road to help enhance the quality of the setting of Cambridge.

x.x Any urban related open uses, such as playing fields, should be carefully located to ensure they do not reduce the effectiveness of the separation in visual terms between these two settlements and therefore should be located away from the area between the new edge of Cambridge and Girton village."

10984 - Cambridgeshire County Council

Support

Note and welcome repeated statement regarding provision of "associated recreation, access and landscape improvements" relating to Area Action Plans.

Support noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<p>2.20</p> <p>10208 - Chancellor, Masters &amp; Scholars of the University of Cambridge</p>	Object	<p>The University welcomes the preparation of an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the land to be released from the Green Belt west of the City between Huntingdon Rd. and Madingley Rd.</p> <p>The University wants this AAP to be included in the first tranche of Development Documents and is concerned that any delay will result in the University being unable to meet identified development needs in this location at an early date.</p> <p>The 'test' for this release of land included in paragraph 2.20 does not reflect that contained in the approved Structure Plan and paragraph 2.20 should be amended to ensure consistency with the Structure Plan.</p>	<p>The Council has agreed to amend the Local Development Scheme to bring forward the programme for the Cambridge North West AAP, and for it to be a joint AAP with Cambridge City Council. It is clearly not possible to include it in the first tranche of documents which are well advanced. However, the timetable for the AAP will seek to bring it forward as quickly as practicable.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.20 should be amended to make clear what is the policy of the Structure Plan and what is the approach being taken by the District Council.</p>	<p>Delete 3rd sentence onwards in paragraph 2.20 (which starts "That part of this land...") and replace as follows:</p> <p>"...Land at north west Cambridge is only being released from the Green Belt to provide for the long term development needs of Cambridge University. The Structure Plan makes clear it will only be brought forward for development when the University can show a clear need for the land to be released. The Council considers that in the interests of careful husbandry of this area where land is being released from the Green Belt on an exceptional basis in view of the particular needs of the University, this includes the test that there is no other suitable University or College land or building available elsewhere in the City."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10348 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	<p>The Structure Plan sets the development strategy for the Cambridge area within the framework provided by RSS6 and proposes that in order to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, that land be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in order to bring forward urban extensions which would locate significant levels of development at the top of the development sequence and closest to services and facilities. The principle of Green Belt release is therefore already established and the LDF is taking forward the development strategy at the local level.</p> <p>The rural strategy focuses development within the larger villages with better access to services and facilities in accordance with the Structure Plan. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council identified Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres which are the most sustainable locations for development and undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. PPG3 makes clear that issues of sustainability and location are also appropriate factors to take into account in considering redevelopment of brownfield sites. Any proposals for development on brownfield sites outside of village frameworks will be considered within this policy framework.</p>	
8796 - Windsor Road Residents	Object	<p>We strongly support the proposal that "Associated countryside recreation, access and landscape improvements within the Green Belt will be made in South Cambridgeshire as far North as the A14 trunk road.</p> <p>We propose that further details are necessary before we can comment satisfactorily.</p>	Support noted. A new policy is proposed to be included in the Submission version of the Site Specific Policies DPD to set out the requirements for this area.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2.21</i>				
10349 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Whilst the Council may determine it necessary to release Green Belt land to meet the housing requirement, in our view the Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites.	<p>The Structure Plan sets the development strategy for the Cambridge area within the framework provided by RSS6 and proposes that in order to ensure a sustainable pattern of development, that land be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge in order to bring forward urban extensions which would locate significant levels of development at the top of the development sequence and closest to services and facilities. The principle of Green Belt release is therefore already established and the LDF is taking forward the development strategy at the local level.</p> <p>The rural strategy focuses development within the larger villages with better access to services and facilities in accordance with the Structure Plan. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council identified Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres which are the most sustainable locations for development and undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. PPG3 makes clear that issues of sustainability and location are also appropriate factors to take into account in considering redevelopment of brownfield sites. Any proposals for development on brownfield sites outside of village frameworks will be considered within this policy framework.</p>	
<i>2.22</i>				
10620 - David Wilson Estates 10678 - Atkins Property Development Ltd	Object	Objection to the ability of the new town of Northstowe to deliver 6,000 new dwellings by 2016 and a likely large shortfall of some 4,776 dwellings.	The development of Northstowe is on course to complete a substantial element of the proposed 6,000 dwellings by 2016, in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P9/1. The developer is currently estimating delivery of 5,300 dwellings by 2016 and the Council will encourage the full provision if at all possible. The Housing Trajectory will set this out. It also makes clear that current assessments do not take account of any provision to 2016 at North West Cambridge pending the preparation of an Area Action Plan. Plan, Monitor and Manage will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9115 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships would request that these paragraphs 2.22 & 2.23 be re-worded to reflect Northstowe's ultimate potential size beyond 2016 of at least 10,000 dwellings, supported by a strategic masterplan which articulates long term sustainable development achieved through high quality public realm, services and community provision, higher densities where appropriate and necessary infrastructure. The word 'small' should be deleted from the reference to the new town.	The Northstowe Area Action Plan (AAP) provides greater detail on planning the new town. At an earlier stage of plan production the public had the opportunity to consider 3 sites for Northstowe with associated housing provision in the 8,000-10,000 dwelling range. As a result, the AAP now identifies the site size and scale of development that can be accommodated within it as an ultimate size of 8,000 dwellings (6,000 of which will be delivered by 2016 in accordance with the Structure Plan). Paragraph 2.22 states "a small new town of 8,000 homes will be built, of which 6,000 homes will be provided by 2016", which fully accords with Policy P9/3 of the Structure Plan.	
8924 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Paragraph 2.22 conflicts with Policy P9/3 in the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, which states that the new settlement at Northstowe should have capacity ultimately for 8,000 to 10,000 dwellings in order to make a significant contribution to the longer term needs of the sub-region. Paragraph 2.22 is premature in concluding that the final capacity of Northstowe will be 8,000 dwellings, particularly since the local development framework only runs until 2016, and policy P9/3 in the adopted Structure Plan makes it clear that any capacity above 6,000 dwellings should be accommodated after 2016.	The Northstowe Area Action Plan (AAP) provides greater detail on planning the new town. At an earlier stage of plan production the public had the opportunity to consider 3 sites for Northstowe with associated housing provision in the 8,000-10,000 dwelling range. As a result, the AAP now identifies the site size and scale of development that can be accommodated within it as an ultimate size of 8,000 dwellings (6,000 of which will be delivered by 2016 in accordance with the Structure Plan). Paragraph 2.22 states "a small new town of 8,000 homes will be built, of which 6,000 homes will be provided by 2016", which fully accords with Policy P9/3 of the Structure Plan.	
10202 - East of England Regional Assembly	Object	Reference to the size of Northstowe reaching 8,000 should be replaced by phrase "8500 by the year 2021" as this is the proposal in the submitted Draft East of England Plan, December 2004.	The housing target included in draft RSS14 was inserted at the time that the District Council was considering Options. Now that the Council has considered the results of the Options Consultation, it has made representations of on draft RSS14 that the strategic reference should be amended to 8,000 dwellings.	
9043 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Paragraph 2.22 conflicts with Policy P9/9 in the adopted Structure Plan. In considering the new settlement at Longstanton / Oakington, the Policy states that there should be 'completion of a rapid transport link through the new settlement'. The Policy anticipates that the settlement will be located on both sides of the Rapid Transit route. The second sentence in Paragraph 2.22 of the Core Strategy DPD indicates that the new town will be developed adjoining a new Rapid Transit route. The Paragraph does not therefore fully reflect Policy 9/9 of the adopted Structure Plan.	Structure Plan Policy P9/9 makes reference to "completion of rapid transit link through the new settlement". A dedicated local busway is proposed through the town linking to the Guided Busway. The County Council's proposals indicate how this could be connected. Therefore paragraph 2.22 fully accords with Policy P9/9 and the detail is included in the Northstowe Area Action Plan. This issue is addressed under separate representations in relation to the Northstowe AAP.	
10985 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Note and welcome repeated statement regarding provision of "associated recreation, access and landscape improvements" relating to Area Action Plans.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2.23</i>				
9059 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Paragraph 2.23 conflicts with policy P9/3 in the adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003, which states that the new settlement at Northstowe should have capacity ultimately for 8,000 to 10,000 dwellings in order to make a significant contribution to the longer term needs of the sub-region. Paragraph 2.23 is premature in concluding that the ultimate size of Northstowe will be 8,000 dwellings particularly since the local development framework only runs until 2016 and policy P9/3 in the adopted Structure Plan makes it clear that any capacity above 6000 dwellings should be accommodated after 2016.	The Northstowe Area Action Plan (AAP) provides greater detail on planning the new town. At an earlier stage of plan production the public had the opportunity to consider 3 sites for Northstowe with associated housing provision in the 8,000-10,000 dwelling range. As a result, the AAP now identifies the site size and scale of development that can be accommodated within it as an ultimate size of 8,000 dwellings (6,000 of which will be delivered by 2016 in accordance with the Structure Plan). Paragraph 2.22 states "a small new town of 8,000 homes will be built, of which 6,000 homes will be provided by 2016", which fully accords with Policy P9/3 of the Structure Plan.	
10726 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Ltd is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. As a consequence, two new paragraphs need to be inserted between paragraphs 2.23 and 2.24 detailing the Hanley Grange proposal. Add new Paragraphs 2.23A and 2.23B	The adopted RSS6 and Structure Plan propose a new settlement in the period to 2016. The Structure Plan locates this at Longstanton/Oakington. In view of the urgency to bring forward and implement the Cambridge Sub Region strategy, the first tranche of LDF documents implement the adopted strategy. The emerging draft RSS14 does not propose any further new settlements in the sub region to 2016. There is therefore no strategic context for any allocation for a further new town in this plan and this issue would need to be considered further as part of a future review of the development strategy for the Cambridge area. The Council's view is that the priority must be on the delivery of the current strategy and to allow that new development to "bed in" and community identity to become established and to assess the impact of the current planned scale of development on Cambridge and the surrounding area before any consideration of any further new settlements close to Cambridge. Notwithstanding this principle, the Council does not consider that the site of the Hanley Grange proposal close to Duxford represents a suitable option for a new town. The site lies in a sensitive area of landscape which would adversely affect the adjoining Green Belt and would harm the setting of Cambridge in long distance views from the higher land to the south of Cambridge. It is not well served by existing public transport and whilst it is fairly close to Whittlesford Bridge railway station, it is not close enough for this to be a realistic and accessible option for local travel into Cambridge, but is likely to attract commuters to Stansted and London. The policy principle is for development in the Cambridge area to meet the needs of the successful Cambridge Phenomenon and not the needs of areas further to the south which should meet their own needs close to where they arise.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Figure 2</i>				
10444 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10454 - Centex Strategic Land	Object	No objections to the principle of the allocation of land at Northstowe. However, have concerns regarding achieving housing delivery rates. Our clients are of the opinion that the allocation is likely to yield a maximum of 2,000 to 3,000 dwellings during the plan period resulting in a shortfall in the range of between 3,000 and 4,000 on the 6,000 dwelling allocation.	The development of Northstowe is on course to complete a substantial element of the proposed 6,000 dwellings by 2016, in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P9/1. The developer is currently estimating delivery of 5,300 dwellings by 2016 and the Council will encourage the full provision if at all possible. The Housing Trajectory will set this out. It also makes clear that current assessments do not take account of any provision to 2016 at North West Cambridge pending the preparation of an Area Action Plan. Plan, Monitor and Manage will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	
10430 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. 10420 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd	Object	No objections to the principle of the allocation of land at Northstowe. However, have concerns regarding achieving housing delivery rates. Our clients are of the opinion that the allocation is likely to yield a maximum of 2,000 to 3,000 dwellings during the plan period resulting in a shortfall in the range of between 3,000 and 4,000 on the 6,000 dwelling allocation. Our clients consider the shortfall can, in part, be met by a 2,500 dwelling allocation at Cambourne, north of the A428.	The development of Northstowe is on course to complete a substantial element of the proposed 6,000 dwellings by 2016, in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P9/1. The developer is currently estimating delivery of 5,300 dwellings by 2016 and the Council will encourage the full provision if at all possible. The Housing Trajectory will set this out. It also makes clear that current assessments do not take account of any provision to 2016 at North West Cambridge pending the preparation of an Area Action Plan. Plan, Monitor and Manage will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed. Notwithstanding, any significant shortfall at the top levels of the sequence would require a review of the development strategy for the Sub Region as the next most sustainable location is at Market Towns and not in rural villages.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2.24</i>				
10632 - David Wilson Estates	Object	<p>Policy P9/1 of the Adopted Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 states clearly that the housing distribution figures are indicative only. The content of paragraph 2.24 is therefore misleading, particularly in the context of the settlement hierarchy of:</p> <p>i) Cambridge, (ii) Cambridge edge through Green Belt releases, (iii) New town of Northstowe, (iv) South Cambridgeshire and Rural Areas. This sequential approach is accepted and logical in planning terms and to therefore seek to provide such a high number of dwellings in the rural area when a thorough review of edge of Cambridge locations has not been undertaken is fundamentally flawed.</p>	<p>Structure Plan Policy P9/1 provides the indicative sequential housing distribution in the district. It is not possible for a Structure Plan policy to provide absolute housing numbers in the various locations, given that it is a strategic plan. The Structure Plan provides the broad housing locations and numbers, and the LDF works up the detail, defining the sites, taking into account local circumstances and other planning considerations, to determine the site capacities. The LDF covers the period 1999-2016, therefore some development (approximately a third of the rural requirement of 9,600) has already been completed in accordance with the adopted Local Plan 2004. In addition, a third of the requirement is accounted for in unimplemented planning permissions. Therefore, over two thirds of the rural housing requirement has already been accounted for, and additional development will come forward as windfalls during the plan period regardless of whether rural housing allocations are carried forward. A certain amount of development is beneficial in the rural area to help provide housing for local needs, including affordable housing and help to sustain rural services and facilities, in accordance with PPG3.</p>	
8006 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	<p>Rural settlement strategy will lead to social polarisation since it ignores the growth needs of existing communities and their families. Whole strategy needs to be re-appraised. Reference to policy/paragraph 2.24 - 2.36.</p>	<p>Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. The strategy allocates the single largest proportion of the development (9,600 dwellings), nearly half of the housing requirement of 20,000 dwellings in the period 1999-2016, to the rural area and permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10673 - Atkins Property Development Ltd	Object	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan states that the housing distribution requirement is "indicative" only. At all levels of the sequential approach to developments, the housing distribution requirements should therefore have some flexibility to allow for re-allocation. For example, the 9,600 dwellings for the Rural Areas should not be considered a ceiling.	Structure Plan Policy P9/1 provides the indicative sequential housing distribution in the district. It is not possible for a Structure Plan policy to provide absolute housing numbers in the various locations, given that it is a strategic plan. The Structure Plan provides the broad housing locations and numbers, and the LDF works up the detail, defining the sites, taking into account local circumstances and other planning considerations, to determine the site capacities. The LDF covers the period 1999-2016, therefore some development (approximately a third of the rural requirement of 9,600) has already been completed in accordance with the adopted Local Plan 2004. In addition, a third of the requirement is accounted for in unimplemented planning permissions. Therefore, over two thirds of the rural housing requirement has already been accounted for, and additional development will come forward as windfalls during the plan period regardless of whether rural housing allocations are carried forward. Whilst a certain amount of development is beneficial in the rural area to help provide housing for local needs, including affordable housing and help to sustain rural services and facilities, in accordance with PPG3, the emphasis of the development strategy is appropriately on locating the majority of new development in the most sustainable locations close to services and facilities and focused on Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe.	
8979 - The Cambourne Consortium	Object	The LDD is unsound in its approach to the use of land with the benefit of planning permission for housing at Cambourne. The approach should be to make the best use of housing land in accordance with the provisions of Structure Plan Policy P5/3 rather than to adopt a 'do minimum' approach of applying a density of 30 dwellings per hectare.	Paragraphs 57 and 58 of PPG3 require minimum densities of 30 dph and encourage higher densities (between 30-50 dph), particularly at places with good public transport accessibility. HG/1 accords with this approach and Structure Plan Policy P5/3; a district-wide policy, which is worded to reflect and respect the lower densities in villages, but at the same time bring new development in villages up to a minimum density of 30dph. In more accessible locations densities of at least 40 dph will be required. There is flexibility in the wording to take account of the differing local circumstances. Development at Cambourne has occurred at an average density slightly lower than 30dph and it is proposed to bring the remainder of the development site forward in accordance with HG/1, with parts of the development close to facilities and services or a public transport stop at a higher density.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Figure 3</i>				
10848 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	Objection to computation of outstanding housing requirement of 493 as this relies on an over optimistic assessment of windfall rates.	Disagree. Since the Draft Urban Capacity Study 2004 (utilising data at March 2003), the methodology has been subsequently tested against data at March 2004 and March 2005. On both occasions the rate of completions adheres closely to that anticipated by the study. This includes the small windfall rate. Therefore the study does not appear to be overoptimistic. Housing provision will continue to be monitored annually to ensure housing land supply targets are being met.	
10635 - David Wilson Estates	Object	In the light of objections 7 and 10, components 3 and 4 respectively should be amended 1,424 and 590. Accordingly, the final figure in relation to the outstanding housing requirement equates to 740 dwellings and not 493. In its totality, figure 3 should therefore read as follows: Structure Plan Guidance for 1999 - 2016, 9,600 Components of supply: 1. Completions to end March 2004, 3,721 2. Unimplemented planning permissions at end March 2004 (3,472 discounted by 10% non-implementation allowance), 3,125 3. Forecast windfalls 2004 - 2016 (from urban Capacity Study 2005), 1,424 4. Rural Housing Allocations, 590 Outstanding requirement to be identified at end March 2004, 740.	Whilst the error in component 3 of figure 3 in the Pre-submission draft plan is acknowledged (it should have reflected the outcome of the Urban Capacity Study 2005), the outstanding requirement figure in that table was sound. Table 3, examining housing land supply in the rural area, will be updated for the submission DPD. It identifies sufficient capacity to meet structure plan 2003 guidance. This is available as an appendix to the Special Council Report of 15th November 2005.	
10431 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. 10445 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10421 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10455 - Centex Strategic Land	Object	Object as it fails to provide for sufficient growth at certain of the identified Rural Centres. Our assessment results in a 960 dwelling shortfall on the Council's figure. The housing distribution strategy needs to be more flexible in relation to meeting the strategic housing needs, to include growth at the Rural Centres where it would meet PPG3 criteria. Amend the strategy to provide for additional growth at the identified Rural Centres, including at Histon as a sustainable urban extension.	Whilst the error in component 3 of figure 3 in the Pre-submission draft plan is acknowledged (it should have reflected the outcome of the Urban Capacity Study 2005), the outstanding requirement figure in that table was sound. Table 3, examining housing land supply in the rural area, will be updated for the submission DPD. It identifies sufficient capacity to meet structure plan 2003 guidance. This is available as an appendix to the Special Council Report of 15th November 2005. Whilst the Structure Plan allows for a limited proportion of the overall development provision to take place in identified rural centres, additional allocations outside the village framework are not required.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10037 - House Builders Federation	Object	The text refers to the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan requirement between 1999-2016. It would seem more appropriate to now instead refer to the dwelling requirement up to 2021 in the East of England Plan, which may be adopted by the time this Development Plan Inquiry ends. Particularly given that other policies in the Council's LDF Documents refer directly to the content of the East of England Plan (RSS14). Furthermore, the Government's proposed changes to PPG3 (July 2005) now advocate provision for 15 years housing land supply in Development Plans.	The plan period to 2016 is too short. A period of circa 10 years will not address the long-term development requirements of this major growth sub-region. Whilst the Structure Plan has an end-date of 2016 the new RSS, the East of England Plan has an end date of 2021 and should be taken into account given that it should be approved during 2006.	
10618 - Dixon International Group Ltd	Object	Object to Figure 3, Housing Land Supply in the Rural Area (page 22). Figure 3 is incorrect. The "Forecast Windfall 2004-2016" (Component 3) should read 1424 and not 1875. The "Rural Housing Allocations" component should read 590 not 837. Component 3 is an error and the correct figure should be taken from the Urban Capacity Study June 2005. With respect to Component 4 please see our representation to Policy ST/4 and SP/1. As a result the outstanding requirement to be identified is 740 not 493.	Whilst the error in component 3 of figure 3 in the Pre-submission draft plan is acknowledged (it should have reflected the outcome of the Urban Capacity Study 2005), the outstanding requirement figure in that table was sound. Table 3, examining housing land supply in the rural area, will be updated for the submission DPD. It identifies sufficient capacity to meet structure plan 2003 guidance. This is available as an appendix to the Special Council Report of 15th November 2005.	
10684 - Atkins Property Development Ltd	Object	Figure 3 is incorrect. The "Forecast Windfall 2004-2016" (component 3) should read 1,424 and not 1,875. The "Rural Housing Allocations" Component 4 should read 590 not 837. Component 3 is an error and the correct figure should be taken from the Urban Capacity Study June 2005. With respect to Component 4 please see our representations to Policy ST/4 and SP/1. As a result the outstanding requirement to be identified is 740 not 493.	Whilst the error in component 3 of figure 3 in the Pre-submission draft plan is acknowledged (it should have reflected the outcome of the Urban Capacity Study 2005), the outstanding requirement figure in that table was sound. Table 3, examining housing land supply in the rural area, will be updated for the submission DPD. It identifies sufficient capacity to meet structure plan 2003 guidance. This is available as an appendix to the Special Council Report of 15th November 2005.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8126 - D H Barford + Co Limited 8324 8385 - Mr. D. Barford	Object	The assumptions with regard to housing are inadequate and there is a need to identify additional housing allocations in order to meet the Structure Plan requirement. Achieving 4,400 dwelling completions in and around Cambridge and 6,000 dwelling completions in the Northstowe settlement is remote when bearing in mind the considerable lead in times. The 10% non-implementation allowance for unimplemented planning permissions is inadequate. The windfall forecast based on the Urban Capacity Study is considered inadequate and does not allow for the fact most opportunities for development and redevelopment within the larger villages have now been exhausted. A non-implementation discount should be applied to the outstanding rural housing allocations.	Although the Council still aims to implement the Structure Plan 2003 with regard to the major developments, if monitoring identified that sufficient numbers were not coming forward, a review would take place at higher levels in the search sequence than the rural area. The 10% non-implementation allowance on existing permissions was utilised by the Inspector when examining Local Plan 2004. It is considered reasonable to continue with this approach. The windfall figure (updated for March 2005) is considered sound. The Urban Capacity methodology has now been tested against two additional years, and has proved as accurate measure of supply. The study reflects capacity of settlements based on their designation in the Core Strategy. In preparation of the housing trajectory, housing allocations have been reviewed to ensure they are able to contribute to land supply. Only those where there is a high confidence of them coming forward, that do not already have the benefit of planning permission, will be included in the submission DPD.	
10732 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	These objections relate to: (c) Paras 2.24-2.29 and Figure 3 in respect of Rural Settlement Policy, and the over-reliance on dispersed rural allocations, windfalls and unimplemented consents to make up the 9,600 units required by the Structure Plan;	Many of the rural allocations in the Core Strategy have been carried forward from the 2004 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan which were scrutinised against the requirements of PPG3 "Housing" and the policies in the 2003 Cambridgeshire Structure Plan by the Inspector who considered objections at that Local Plan Inquiry. The majority of sites in Policy SP/1 have planning permission and are proposed to be removed as 'proposals' from the Site Specific Policies. These sites cannot therefore be substituted for development in Cambourne or anywhere else. Those sites are counted as commitments and are included in Figure 3 of the Core Strategy which shows the Housing Land Supply in Rural Areas - a 10% discount is applied to all planning permissions in Figure 3 where development has not yet started and where there has not yet been an indication from the developer of a proposed housing trajectory to allow for a proportion of planning permissions which may not be implemented. The remaining allocations in policy SP/1 are at Impington, Waterbeach, Papworth Everard and Heathfield. (NB. The allocations at Papworth Everard and Heathfield also have planning permission which was granted after March 2005 - the operative date for the most recent housing land supply figures).	
9922 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The Bayer CropScience Ltd site should be included in the residential land availability statistics. The site is suitable for residential development, in part at least, during the early part of the Plan period. Consequently the figures should be adjusted to reflect this redevelopment opportunity.	The BayerCropscience Hauxton site is proposed to be allocated for mixed use development. The details of a policy are dealt with through representations on the Site Specific Policies DPD Policy SP/1.	Update figure 3 to reflect the consequential changes of allocating Bayer Cropscience Hauxton site for mixed use development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2.29</i>				
8315 - Barker Parry Town Planning	Object	The general reliance on land coming forward in Cambourne to meet the remaining rural areas housing figures effectively prevents any reasonable scale of development in the other Rural Centres. Growth in Rural Areas is necessary to enable the settlements to continue to thrive and support local infrastructure	The outstanding allocations at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres and the remaining development at Cambourne coming forward at higher densities to achieve 30 dph across Cambourne as a whole, will more than accommodate the remaining housing requirement in the rural area obviating the need to make any further housing allocations. Whilst there are no further housing allocations in the rural area, the development strategy permits the development within village frameworks of Rural Centres in accordance with Policy ST/3. There is no cap on the extent of development permitted within the frameworks of Rural Centres provided adequate services, facilities and infrastructure, are available.	
9943	Object	Object to all of the outstanding housing requirement being allocated in Cambourne. A choice and variety of sites should be provided within the District through the Local Development Framework. Fulbourn, and the land, identified through these representations would provide for this.	The remaining development at Cambourne, at a minimum density of 30 dph, will more than accommodate the remaining housing requirement in the rural area obviating the need to make any further housing allocations. Whilst there are no further housing allocations in the rural area, the development strategy permits the development within village frameworks of Minor Rural Centres in accordance with Policy ST/4.	
11222 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	Cambourne Parish Council would prefer to see Cambourne developed in line with the approved masterplan so as to try and achieve the sustainability set out within the document and associated 106 agreement with no additional dwellings being constructed. However the Parish Council understands the constraints placed on SCDC by PPG3, but we view the lack of clarity within ST/1 sub section Rural Settlement Policy, as it does not clearly define the actual bench mark that the additional 700 houses is based on as this gives the range 3,700 to 4,000 houses.	The remaining development at Cambourne will need to meet a minimum density of 30 dph to accord with PPG3 and make better use of the land. Development at this density can be achieved through good design to be in keeping with that which has already taken place. Policy SP/18 and text in paragraphs 11.28 and 11.29 explain that development on the remainder of the land within the original masterplan at a minimum density of 30 dph is likely to bring forward around 700 additional dwellings to that in the original outline planning permission.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8128 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	It is proposed that any shortfall in housing can be satisfied through increasing the housing density at Cambourne. However, this strategy overlooks the scope to accommodate development in more sustainable preferable locations. This strategy involves increasing reliance on greenfield development, contrary to the Structure Plan and regional strategy which advocate development on previously developed land within villages in preference to greenfield development. In light of the above the Council needs to explore preferable alternative locations to meet any shortfall in housing development.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Policy ST/1 is therefore in accordance with this approach, with the majority of development to be accommodated at the major development sites at Northstowe and the urban extensions to Cambridge. The development of these sites will include the re-use of previously developed land, such as Oakington Airfield and Cambridge Airport and the North Works site north of Newmarket Road. Policy P1/1 goes on to state that when selecting sites, consideration should be given to the reuse of brownfield sites within settlements, then on other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites. The LDF covers the period 1999-2016, therefore some development (approximately a third of the rural requirement of 9,600) has already been completed in accordance with the adopted Local Plan 2004. In addition, a third of the requirement is accounted for in unimplemented planning permissions. Therefore, over two thirds of the rural housing requirement has already been accounted for. The rest of the rural housing requirement can be accommodated without the need for further allocations. The additional 700 dwellings at Cambourne is to be provided through increased densities on land already with planning permission and does not involve the use of any further greenfield land.	
<i>ST/3 Rural Centres</i>				
9172 - David Wilson Homes (S Midlands)	Object	There is insufficient evidence to support the identification of this limited number of settlements. Experience has shown that many rural settlements are capable of accommodating modest housing growth, the scale of such growth being unrelated to the existing size of the settlement. A full appraisal of the environmental capacity of the villages is required, together with robust community involvement.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. However, in recognition of the role some villages, which failed to meet the criteria, have in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland an additional category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced. The development strategy permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6, whereby the scale of development accords with the sustainability of the settlement. The Urban Capacity Study 2005 provided a full appraisal of sites capable of redevelopment within village frameworks and the results incorporated into the housing land supply data for the rural area in Figure 3.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9397	Object	Fulbourn is a perfect centre for rural growth, positioned with easy access to Cambridge and three miles from the A11 for easy London access. Fulbourn was chosen previously for rural expansion, but now rejected. There are serious traffic problems north of Cambridge where new development is planned, it seems inexplicable as to why Fulbourn should not be considered.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Fulbourn only meets two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area to the east and south-east of Cambridge it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
9378	Object	Object to Fulbourn being left out of the Rural Centre Framework. People are forced to live miles away from their home village due to high housing cost and Local Council's reluctance to release land for building. Council should re-look at Fulbourn as a village for expansion to secure reasonable cost housing for inhabitants.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Fulbourn only meets two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area to the east and south-east of Cambridge it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre. Developments of up to 25 dwellings will be permitted in accordance with Policy ST/4 and affordable housing will be required in accordance with Policy HG/3.	
9402	Object	Fulbourn Institute Football Club has gained promotion to the Ridgeon's Football League and needs to upgrade its facilities by gaining a new ground. The ground needs to be enclosed, with changing rooms and floodlights. This will help the club whilst establishing a new facility within the village.	The football club has been advised that the proposed development would not be compatible with a location in the Cambridge Green Belt and it would not be appropriate for the Core Strategy to include an allocation for development which fails all the tests for a location in the green belt. The club has already been in discussion with development control officers concerning a site off Stonebridge and has been advised that the location is not suitable. The only land close to Fulbourn which is excluded from the green belt is an attractive area of countryside adjoining the conservation area to the north of Cow Lane which is also not suitable for such a development.	No change.
8177 - Messrs Mailer & Sharp	Object	The village of Bassingbourn has a wide range of facilities, including shops and schools and therefore is a satisfactory location for further housing growth in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. In our opinion the settlement should be included in Policy ST/3 as a rural centre.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population, excluding the population resident at Bassingbourn Barracks, was around 2,600. It is possible that Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth has a range of services and facilities which might merit its inclusion as a Minor Rural Centre, particularly given that there is a village college in the village. However, it is considered that the proximity to Royston means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10644 - Munro Group Ltd	Object	We are concerned that the key criteria for selecting Rural Centres are far too simplistic, and that insufficient villages have been identified as Rural Centres.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Agree that the approach to Rural Centres may in some respects have been applied in an over-prescriptive way and agree more weight needs to be given to the role of Rural Centres in providing services. As a result, an additional category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced for those villages which fail to meet the criteria yet perform a role in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland.	
10334 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We object to the Council's approach to Rural Centres, which assumes that other smaller locations which compare less favourably in terms of existing sustainability are incapable of becoming more sustainable through balanced development which involves improvements to local facilities and services.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. However, in recognition of the role some villages, which failed to meet the criteria, have in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland an additional category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced. The development strategy permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6, and may lead to improvement in services, facilities and infrastructure within these settlements.	
9626 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	There is provision in the Minor Rural Centres for the possibility of S46 contributions. The same provision is required for Rural Centres. Policy DP/4 may be sufficient, in which case the provision in ST/4 is unnecessary. If DP/4 is not sufficient, then the provision for Rural Centres should match that for Minor Rural Centres.	Policy ST/3 requires adequate services, facilities and infrastructure to be available or made available to serve new development in Rural Centres. Therefore, if there is insufficient available, the developer will be required to provide such in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms, in accordance with Policy DP/4. As such, the additional wording is superfluous.	
8368 - Barker Parry Town Planning	Object	The identification of only 5 Rural Centres in a District as rural as South Cambridgeshire is an indicator of the stringency of the selection criteria applied by the Council. There are 12 settlements currently identified in the adopted Local Plan all of which were considered by the Council to be sustainable. The reduction in the number of such settlements and the concomitant reduction in the scale of development that is considered appropriate will undermine the ability of such settlements to continue to thrive and to support and even expand local services and facilities.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. However, agree that policy may in some respects have been applied in an over-prescriptive way and agree more weight needs to be given to the role of Rural Centres in providing services. As a result, an additional category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced for those villages which fail to meet the criteria yet perform a role in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. Whilst there are only 5 Rural Centres, 7 settlements have been categorised as Minor Rural Centres, one more than the number of sustainable settlements in the adopted Local Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8002 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	The overall approach of the Rural Settlement Policy is too restrictive and will result in increased social polarisation in the District's existing settlements. The whole strategy should be re-appraised with this key issue in mind.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. The strategy allocates the single largest proportion of the development (9,600 dwellings), nearly half of the housing requirement of 20,000 dwellings in the period 1999-2016, to the rural area and permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6. However, agree that the approach to Rural Centres may in some respects have been applied in an over-prescriptive way and agree more weight needs to be given to the role of Rural Centres in providing services. As a result, an additional category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced for those villages which fail to meet the criteria yet perform a role in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland.	
9464	Object	Bar Hill should not become a Rural Centre because it does not meet the criteria. We have no post office. The A14 cannot cope with further development. The A14 is a joke for children going to secondary school and for other going elsewhere if there is a hold up on the road. The access road into Bar Hill is not adequate and further development will only make problems worse.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.
9462	Object	Bar Hill should not be reclassified as a Rural Centre. There is no suitable site within the village for development on a large scale.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9453 9451	Object	I would like to see Fulbourn re-instated as a Rural Centre for growth in the future and cannot understand why it was taken out and replaced with Bar Hill. We need homes for our young families, and for our older residents who would like to downsize without leaving the village.	Following representations made at the last stage of plan production, it became apparent that the level of services and facilities generally fell below the level of those in other Rural Centres. In particular, the doctor's surgery in Fulbourn is a branch surgery with limited opening hours, the library facility is very limited and the village is not very well related to a secondary school. If these considerations are taken into account, Fulbourn cannot be considered to meet the Village Facilities Key Criterion. Fulbourn would therefore only meet two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area to the east and south-east of Cambridge it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
9401	Object	Fulbourn has been deleted as one of the Rural Centres for growth when it was chosen in Oct/Nov 2004. Fulbourn's facilities are of the highest standard - Bar Hill has been identified as an alternative but has poor services. More thought should be given before finally rejecting Fulbourn as a Rural Centre for growth.	Following representations made at the last stage of plan production, it became apparent that the level of services and facilities generally fell below the level of those in other Rural Centres. In particular, the doctor's surgery in Fulbourn is a branch surgery with limited opening hours, the library facility is very limited and the village is not very well related to a secondary school. If these considerations are taken into account, Fulbourn cannot be considered to meet the Village Facilities Key Criterion. Fulbourn would therefore only meet two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area to the east and south-east of Cambridge it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
8369 - Barker Parry Town Planning	Object	Restricting any scale of development to the 5 Rural Centres also effectively precludes the provision of affordable housing being provided in the remaining settlements in the District.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. The development strategy permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6. Therefore, there is scope for windfall development to come forward in any village and these will be required to provide 50% affordable housing in accordance with Policy HG/3.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10447 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10457 - Centex Strategic Land	Object	Object to the proposed set of objectives for the Rural Centres as set out in the Policy. Our clients consider that their proposals for growth at Histon can help provide additional housing provision in a sustainable manner. The LDF should be amended with the addition of a new policy ST/X, allocating land at Impington lane, Histon for development.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The Council has undertaken further work on the rural housing numbers, including the production of a housing trajectory. As part of this work the Council revisited the housing allocations rolled forward from Local Plan 2004 and deleted the sites with planning permission at March 2005 (as these are now counted as commitments), deleted those allocations in the less sustainable settlements that cannot be relied upon to come forward for development in the plan period, and updated the housing land supply information with data to the end of March 2005. The Council is able to demonstrate sufficient housing land supply to meet the remainder of the requirement in the rural area. Therefore there is no need to allocate any further sites to meet the rural element of the housing requirement.	
10888 - Ashdale Land & Property Consultants	Object	We are concerned that the key criteria for selecting Rural Centres are far too simplistic, and that insufficient villages have been identified as Rural Centres. These concerns are raised in the context of serious reservations regarding the ability to meet the target of providing 20,000 additional homes in South Cambridgeshire between 1999 -2016, based on unrealistic assumptions regarding the implementation of feasibility and timescale of implanting the large scale urban extensions as outlined in figure 1 of the Core Strategy. Far greater flexibility is required within the smaller Rural and Minor Rural Centres in allocating land and amending the development frameworks. This includes Waterbeach.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Agree that the approach to Rural Centres may in some respects have been applied in an over-prescriptive way and more weight needs to be given to the role of Rural Centres in providing services. As a result, an additional category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced for those villages which fail to meet the criteria yet perform a role in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10733 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	These objections relate to: (d) Policies ST3, ST4, ST5 and ST6 in respect of the criteria for windfall development in the rural areas;	South Cambridgeshire is made up of 101 villages of varying sizes. It is necessary for the Core Strategy to include a policy for the Rural Areas which allows adequate housing provision in each village to meet local needs. The policies in the Core Strategy allow for those needs to be met by windfall development at a level appropriate to the scale and availability of services in each village. The bones of this settlement rural policy were put in place in the 2004 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan which had regard to the policies in the 2003 Cambridgeshire Structure Plan and is consistent with national planning policy set out in PPG3 "Housing".	
10042 - Bellway Homes	Object	The methodology and approach adopted by the Council in its selection of Rural Centres relies too heavily on achieving a threshold of 3,000 population. Other factors, such as accessibility, village facilities, access to secondary education and employment are of a higher priority. The list of Rural Centres should therefore include Swavesey.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Swavesey was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population as of mid 2001 was 2,480. Despite the good range of services and facilities at Swavesey, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to the new town of Northstowe and St Ives means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	
10877	Object	Objection is made to the fact that the Rural Centres, which are defined as the most sustainable settlements within the District, have only two housing allocations in two villages, totalling a notional allocation of 95 dwellings. In the light of the number of additional dwellings to be accommodated within the District, and the fact that Policy ST/3 identifies five villages as being the most sustainable villages within the District, it is considered totally illogical that further land allocations have not been made within the identified Rural Centres. It is argued, therefore, that additional land allocations should be made within, and more appropriately, on the periphery of the existing settlement boundaries.	The Council has undertaken further work on the rural housing numbers, including the production of a housing trajectory. As part of this work the Council revisited the housing allocations rolled forward from Local Plan 2004 and deleted the sites with planning permission at March 2005 (as these are now counted as commitments), deleted those allocations in the less sustainable settlements that cannot be relied upon to come forward for development in the plan period, and updated the housing land supply information with data to the end of March 2005. The Council is able to demonstrate sufficient housing land supply to meet the remainder of the requirement in the rural area. Therefore there is no need to allocate any further sites to meet the rural element of the housing requirement.  The detailed housing land supply information is included in the report to Council on 15th November 2005.	
9677 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support Policy ST/3.	Support noted.	
10911 - Ely Diocesan Board	Support	This policy is strongly supported. The avoidance of any upper limit on scheme size is welcomed as this allows flexibility to make the most efficient use of available land, subject to making necessary improvements to infrastructure.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7876 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	We are concerned with both Rural Centres and the Minor Rural Centres, that the network of 'internal' Rights of Way, and their links to those of other Centres and parishes is carefully considered.	Support noted. Policy TR/4 requires development to provide for travel by non-car modes and ensures that the rights of way network is not undermined.	
<i>1st Bullet</i>				
7859	Object	Object to classification of Bar Hill as a Rural Centre. Bar Hill is presently classified as a Rural Growth Settlement which states that development outside the perimeter road (Saxon Way) will not be permitted. Classification to a Rural Centre will have adverse implications for Bar Hill. The village is designed round the concept of the Radburn principle which segregates pedestrians and vehicles. Any development of housing outside the perimeter road would undermine this concept. Any increase in the housing stock will put undue pressure on the exit/entry to the village, there are already frequent delays.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.
7832	Object	I object to Bar Hill being classified as a Rural Centre. The reasons are: Increased traffic - traffic in and out of Bar Hill at peak periods is already high, and will worsen when Northstowe is developed. Green areas on the perimeter of the village are used by many residents for leisure. There is no secondary school; Public transport is dependent on the A14. Also policing, at present, for this large village is virtually nonexistent and consequently there is a lot of 'yobbish' behaviour.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/5.
8127	Object	We do not wish Bar Hill to be changed from a 'Rural growth Settlement' to a Rural Centre. Bar Hill has only one effective means of ingress/egress which is already overloaded by traffic using the oversize Tesco superstore. One of the main attractions of Bar Hill is this single access point and no 'through road' option. We in the village do not wish to see traffic further increased or indeed the possible inclusion in the future of a 'joining' road to another village. We are satisfied that Bar Hill fulfils the requirements of its current occupants and we do not wish to see this destroyed by further unnecessary expansion.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.
7995 7994 9446 7961	Object	I object to Bar Hill being reclassified as a Rural Centre. I want it to stay as a Rural Growth Settlement, with no development outside the perimeter road.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7948	Object	Rural centres DPD Preferred Option Report Oct 2004, para 5.1 shows Bar Hill failed 2 out of 4 criteria for rural centre status. S.C.D.C Special meeting Thu 20 Jan 2005 shows councillor R. Hall claimed Bar Hill should be a de facto Rural Centre. He proposed that Bar Hill be included in list of R.C.'s. Both without consultation with residents of Bar Hill. His reasoning, without evidence is that Bar Hill would lose bus services when Northstowe is completed.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.
7833	Object	Substantial areas of the village are of high density; Existing green areas are limited, and insufficient to meet the needs of the current population; There is no secondary school; There is only one exit from the village onto an already congested road. It was always assumed this village would not expand beyond the ring road.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.
8885	Object	I object to Bar Hill becoming a Rural Centre for the following reasons. We have recently lost our post office with little chance of getting it back. Our connection to the local secondary school is very much dependant on traffic conditions on the A14. An accident on the A14 can lead to local roads becoming congested and when all of the road works start for Northstowe the problems will initially become worse. This is not a sustainable option for this village until many other problems are sorted out.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a minor rural centre, under Policy ST/4.
9578 - Bar Hill Parish Council	Object	The Parish Council of Bar Hill object to becoming a rural centre under the Local Development Framework as Roger Hall acted without the permission of the Parish Council. It is felt that being a rural centre would not be of benefit to the residents of Bar Hill.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.
7817 - Bar Hill Parish Council	Object	Bar Hill Parish Council object to Bar Hill being classified as a Rural Centre. The reasons are: No support from the Parish Council ever existed; substantial areas of the village are of high density; Existing green areas are limited, and insufficient to meet the needs of the current population; There is no secondary school; Public transport is dependent on the A14. Becoming a Rural Centre would open up the possibility of future development that would not be in the interest of residents.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9941	Object	Oppose the identification of Bar Hill as a Rural Centre. Bar Hill is a less sustainable village than Fulbourn. It is in a general area where the substantial majority of the allocated development within the District is to take place. The village is poorly served by public transport and is in an area of the greatest traffic congestion. The identification of Fulbourn as a Rural Centre provides the opportunity for an additional location for a Rural Centre with potential for growth on the east side of Cambridge.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.
8322 - Mr Philip Kratz	Object	Bar Hill should not be designated as a Rural Centre. It is in the general vicinity of major development for South Cambridgeshire, and is less sustainable than other locations, such as Fulbourn, which would better meet the needs of the Cambridge sub-area. Not only is the settlement poorly served by public transport, it is in the area of greatest traffic congestion, with uncertainty surrounding potential solutions for that congestion.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.
9489	Object	Bar Hill should revert back to a Minor Rural Centre. It lacks a Post Office (essential). The change to a Rural Centre was not agreed by residents, in fact the majority are against the decision. Bar Hill does not have the capacity for any further development.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.
9571	Object	Bar Hill should not be a rural centre because there is no post office, and access to the secondary school is dependent on the A14 being accident free, which it rarely is.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.
10664 - Atkins Property Development Ltd	Support	Bar Hill is rightly classified as a Rural Centre (see attached report of evidence).	Support noted, but Bar Hill is proposed to be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	
<i>2nd Bullet</i>				
7819	Object	Cambourne is likely to be less suitable as a Rural Centre when the developer subsidy is withdrawn after the recent Cambourne Enhanced decision.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Cambourne has been designated a Rural Centre in recognition of the planned range of services and facilities it will have when fully developed, which will meet these criteria, and are likely to be developed during the plan period.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7818	Object	Cambourne should not be chosen as a rural centre at least until it meets the minimum requirements: A secondary School; Half hourly bus service in peak times. It also fails on location being 10 miles from a major town or city.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Cambourne has been designated a Rural Centre in recognition of the planned range of services and facilities it will have when fully developed, which will meet these criteria, and are likely to be developed during the plan period.	
10433 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. 10423 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd	Object	Object to the proposed set of objectives for the Rural Centres as set out in the Policy. Our clients consider that their proposals for growth at north Cambourne would meet sustainability requirements set out in PPG3 and would have no adverse impact on the setting of Lower and Greater Cambourne to the south. The LDF should be amended with the addition of a new policy ST/X, allocating land at north Cambourne for development. This should be supplemented by an Area Action Plan.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The Council has undertaken further work on the rural housing numbers, including the production of a housing trajectory. As part of this work the Council revisited the housing allocations rolled forward from Local Plan 2004 and deleted the sites with planning permission at March 2005 (as these are now counted as commitments), deleted those allocations in the less sustainable settlements that cannot be relied upon to come forward for development in the plan period, and updated the housing land supply information with data to the end of March 2005. The Council is able to demonstrate sufficient housing land supply to meet the remainder of the requirement in the rural area. Therefore there is no need to allocate any further sites to meet the rural element of the housing requirement.	
10432 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. 10422 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd	Support	Support the identification of Cambourne as a Rural Centre.	Support noted.	
<i>3rd Bullet</i>				
10211 - Scotsdales Garden Centre	Support	The inclusion of Great Shelford and Stapleford in the "Rural Centres" category is an acceptable approach, in recognition of the settlement's size, facilities and function.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>4th Bullet</i>				
9625 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Histon & Impington should not be classified as a Rural Centre. They should be Infill Only. Contrary to 2.2 growth will not bring about improvements in the relative sustainability of the villages. DP/8 para 3 implies the requirement of a capacity test for any development. Developers have no incentive and Development Control have no resources to perform such a test. Inspectors at any appeal will expect the LDF to detail the results of any research in the policy statement and supporting notes. Histon & Impington do not have the necessary infrastructure to take further, even limited, growth, particularly on the B1049.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Histon and Impington met 3 of the 4 criteria and came very close to meeting the 4th. Although Policy ST/3 allows for unlimited growth in the Rural Centres this is only permitted within the village framework, in accordance with Policy DP/8, and will be dependent upon the availability of adequate services, facilities and infrastructure to serve it. If such is not available, applicants will be required to provide such to make development acceptable in planning terms.	
10446 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 10456 - Centex Strategic Land	Support	Support the identification of Histon as a Rural Centre.	Support noted.	
7869	Support	The designation of Histon and Impington as a Rural Centre is supported.	Support noted.	
<i>5th Bullet</i>				
11441 - Dencora/Helical Bar	Support	Sawston is properly identified as a Rural Centre.	Support noted.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
8341 - CPRE	Object	Rural Centres. At end of policy add '...by the district council using its powers under Section 46 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to secure funding contributions at an appropriate level.' This wording would bring the policy in line with ST/4 Minor Rural Centres.	Policy ST/3 requires adequate services, facilities and infrastructure to be available or made available to serve new development in Rural Centres. Therefore, if there is insufficient available, the developer will be required to provide such in order to make the development acceptable in planning terms, in accordance with Policy DP/4. As such, the additional wording is superfluous.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2.30</i>				
9978 - Laing Homes North Thames	Object	Our particular concern is that at the start of the District Council's process of identifying Rural Centres they have immediately eliminated those centres with less than 3,000 people. There may well be other settlements with less than 3,000 people but which can meet the other key criteria set out in paragraph 2.30.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. This states that "Rural Centres will generally have a population of at least 3,000..." It is considered that a population of 3,000 is required to support the level of services and facilities that is associated with a Rural Centre. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. However, the Council also considered those settlements that were likely to grow to around 3,000 population during the plan period, through the development of housing allocations. These included Longstanton, Papworth Everard and Swavesey. However, none of these settlements met more than two of the four criteria, and were therefore discounted.	
<i>2.31</i>				
7972 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	Village frameworks are too restrictive and should be re-appraised to allow for local needs housing.	Village frameworks have been defined to take account of the present extent of the built-up area and to avoid incremental growth in unsustainable locations, and gradual encroachment into the countryside. The development strategy permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6. Policy HG/5 allows for exceptions sites outside the village framework for 100% affordable housing where there is an identified local need.	
10640 - David Wilson Estates	Object	In the light of the recent appeal decision relating to Cambourne, the thrust of paragraph 2.31 is far too presumptuous at this stage. It is therefore suggested that this paragraph be deleted in its entirety.	The remaining development at Cambourne will need to meet a minimum density of 30 dph to accord with PPG3 and make better use of the land. Development on the remainder of the land within the original masterplan at a minimum density of 30 dph is likely to bring forward around 700 additional dwellings to that in the original outline planning permission. Housing land supply data demonstrates that Cambourne will more than accommodate this outstanding rural housing requirement.	
10737 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	These objections relate to: (e) The failure of the Plan to assess alternative options for the location of the proposed additional 700 units for Cambourne;	Housing land supply data demonstrates that Cambourne will more than accommodate this outstanding rural housing requirement, therefore the Council has no need to find alternative locations.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10669 - Atkins Property Development Ltd	Object	On the basis of the recent appeal decision relating to "Cambourne Enhanced" the Core Strategy should not contain the first sentence of paragraph 2.31 as it is presumptuous at this stage in light of the Inspector's / Secretary of States conclusions. Delete paragraph 2.31.	The remaining development at Cambourne will need to meet a minimum density of 30 dph to accord with PPG3 and make better use of the land. Development on the remainder of the land within the original masterplan at a minimum density of 30 dph is likely to bring forward around 700 additional dwellings to that in the original outline planning permission. Housing land supply data demonstrates that Cambourne will more than accommodate this outstanding rural housing requirement.	
10299 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We object in principle to Paragraph 2.31, which restricts development to within the village frameworks. Whilst we acknowledge the principle of this, we consider that the current wording of the DPD provides no flexibility to enable sites, such as our client's site, to come forward for development. Our client's site is directly adjacent to the village framework and in our view forms part of the settlement of Duxford. It is a previously developed brownfield site and its redevelopment would be in accordance with national planning policy. We consider that our client's site should be included as a residential-led allocation and identified on the Proposals Map.	Village frameworks have been defined to take account of the present extent of the built-up area and to avoid incremental growth in unsustainable locations, and gradual encroachment into the countryside. The development strategy permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6. The remaining development at Cambourne will need to meet a minimum density of 30 dph to accord with PPG3 and make better use of the land. Development on the remainder of the land within the original masterplan at a minimum density of 30 dph is likely to bring forward around 700 additional dwellings to that in the original outline planning permission. Housing land supply data demonstrates that Cambourne will more than accommodate this outstanding rural housing requirement. Therefore, the Council does not need to make further housing allocations or amend village frameworks to accommodate additional residential development.	
<i>ST/4 Minor Rural Centres</i>				
10893 - H C Moss (Builders) Ltd	Object	Objection is raised to the proposed limit of 25 dwellings on any development site in Minor Rural Centres. There is no support for the selection of such an arbitrary scale of development in the Structure Plan. Given the crisis which is impending in terms of the District Council's ability to provide 20,000 dwellings in the plan period, there would appear to be no rationale for this artificial cap.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy. The development strategy permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10688	Object	An objection is made to Policy ST/4 and the maximum limit of 25 dwellings which will be permitted in any development scheme. It is considered there is no support for the selection of such an arbitrary scale of development in the adopted Structure Plan. Given the crisis which we believe is pending in terms of the District Council's ability to provide the required dwellings in the plan period, there is no rationale for this artificial limit. In addition, such a limit might result in the inefficient use of land.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy. The development strategy permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.	
10734 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	These objections relate to: (d) Policies ST3, ST4, ST5 and ST6 in respect of the criteria for windfall development in the rural areas;	South Cambridgeshire is made up of 101 villages of varying sizes. It is necessary for the Core Strategy to include a policy for the Rural Areas which allows adequate housing provision in each village to meet local needs. The policies in the Core Strategy allow for those needs to be met by windfall development at a level appropriate to the scale and availability of services in each village. The bones of this settlement rural policy were put in place in the 2004 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan which had regard to the policies in the 2003 Cambridgeshire Structure Plan and is consistent with national planning policy set out in PPG3 "Housing".	
10668 - Atkins Property Development Ltd	Object	It is a perverse strategy to propose a scheme size of 25 dwellings in Minor Rural Centres and not for Rural Centres. All new housing up to 2016 should be directed to the Rural Centres only as these are the most sustainable locations.  Delete reference to "25 dwellings" and replace with "15 dwellings".  Delete paragraph 2 of policy completely.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy. The development strategy permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10651 - David Wilson Estates	Object	If minor rural centres are to be identified, it is perverse to identify a potential scheme size which would be acceptable in such centres, whilst not having a comparable approach for rural centres. In the context, therefore, of identifying group villages with potential for residential schemes of up to 8 dwellings, and exceptionally up to 15, it is more logical to then advocate in minor rural centres a maximum threshold of 15 dwellings. This approach is far more compatible with the overall settlement hierarchy, which the authority needs to adopt, and site allocations, giving scope to redirect housing numbers to more sustainable locations higher up the hierarchy. This therefore allows capacity for the edge of Cambridge Urban Extensions to be reviewed on a comprehensive basis.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
11373	Object	<p>It is considered that the maximum cap of 25 dwellings on sites within Minor Rural Centres is unreasonable, and unjustified. There is no support for the selection of such an arbitrary scale of development in the adopted Structure Plan.</p> <p>Given the crisis we believe is impending in terms of the District Council's ability to provide the required 20,000 dwellings in the plan period, there is not considered to be any rationale whatsoever for this artificial cap.</p> <p>By definition, Minor Rural Centres are relatively sustainable locations and therefore should be able to accommodate far greater than 25 dwellings on any one site. Such a restriction on the scale of residential development will also hinder bringing forward the much needed affordable housing within such locations.</p>	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy. The development strategy permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.	
10336 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We also object to Policy ST/4 and Paragraph 2.33 in respect of the threshold of 25 dwellings. We consider that this threshold is arbitrary. We consider that making the best use of an individual site should be assessed against a number of considerations such as site size, density, and the character of the surrounding area; fundamentally, a scheme should be assessed on its merit.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10691	Object	An objection is made to Policy ST/4 and the maximum limit of 25 dwellings which will be permitted in any development scheme. A case in point is a site SP/1e at Willingham which is an area of 1ha. The suggested cap on housing numbers would result in a density lower than that recommended elsewhere in the emerging Local Plan and Central Government advice.	Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy. All development will be required at a minimum density of 30dph to make best use of the land, in accordance with Policy HG/1.	
9949	Object	My Client Mr N Howard would like to object to the omission of Bassingbourn from the list of villages selected as a Minor Rural Centre and propose that it should be upgraded from the status of Group Village. The village has a primary and secondary school, and range of food and non-food shops, provides local employment opportunities and good access to Royston, Cambridge and other local centres.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population, excluding the population resident at Bassingbourn Barracks, was around 2,600. It is possible that Bassingbourn-cum-Knessworth has a range of services and facilities which might merit its inclusion as a Minor Rural Centre, particularly given that there is a village college in the village. However, it is considered that the proximity to Royston means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	
9192 - David Wilson Homes (S Midlands)	Object	The selection of villages in this category has not been subject to a full environmental appraisal in order to determine whether modest growth opportunities, supported by the local community, is possible or even desirable.	There are no new housing allocations in any village. The Urban Capacity Study undertook an appraisal of the larger villages and identified where there is capacity for further development or redevelopment. Regardless of the category that settlements fall into, development will only be permitted within the village framework where it accords with Policies ST/3 - ST/6 and DP/8.	
8003 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	The overall approach of the Rural Settlement is too restrictive and will result in increased social polarisation in the District's existing settlements. The whole strategy should be re-appraised with this key issue in mind.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. The strategy allocates the single largest proportion of the development (9,600 dwellings), nearly half of the housing requirement of 20,000 dwellings in the period 1999-2016, to the rural area and permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9904 - Taylor Vinters	Object	My Client Mr N Howard would like to object to the omission of Bassingbourn from the list of villages selected as Minor Rural Centre and propose that it should be upgraded from the status of a Group Village. The village has a primary and secondary school, and a range of food and non-food shops, provides local employment opportunities and good access to Royston, Cambridge and other local centres.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population, excluding the population resident at Bassingbourn Barracks, was around 2,600. It is possible that Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth has a range of services and facilities which might merit its inclusion as a Minor Rural Centre, particularly given that there is a village college in the village. However, it is considered that the proximity to Royston means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	
8531 - The Fairey Family 8765 9064 - Foregreen Developments Ltd	Object	We object to Policy ST/4 in that, as written, it precludes development of more than 25 dwellings on suitable sites within the village frameworks. There should be no upper limit to the level of acceptable development in these settlements, on suitable sites within the village framework.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
9490	Object	Bar Hill should revert back to a Minor Rural Centre. It lacks a Post Office (essential). The change to a Rural Centre was not agreed by residents, in fact the majority are against the decision. Bar Hill does not have the capacity for any further development.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with these criteria. Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both Public Transport Accessibility and to the Accessibility of Secondary Education. It should be reclassified as a minor rural centre.	Reclassify Bar Hill as a Minor Rural Centre, under Policy ST/4.
11014 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The addition of Minor Rural Centres provides additional foci throughout the District that was previously lacking, and is therefore supported.	Support noted.	
10904 - Ely Diocesan Board	Support	The Minor Rural Centre category recognises sustainable settlements which have service and facilities superior to those of Group Villages which can accommodate a degree of new development.	Support noted.	
9678 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support Policy ST/4.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>1st Bullet</i>				
10378	Support	We support the proposal for Cottenham to be a minor service village in accordance with Policy ST/4. This will permit further growth within Cottenham, including growth that is not specifically frontage development.	Support noted.	
<i>2nd Bullet</i>				
8112 - Cambridge Water Company	Object	Objection is made to the exclusion of Fulbourn from the list of rural centres set out in Policy ST/3. In the October 2004 LDF consultation, Fulbourn was identified as a rural centre. In terms of its facilities and accessibility, including an unrivalled availability of public transport, Fulbourn is arguably the most sustainable settlement in South Cambridgeshire. That point is further reinforced by its proximity to Cambridge. Those may be further enhanced should the possibility of the railway halt being re-opened, come to fruition.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Fulbourn only meets two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area to the east and south-east of Cambridge it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre. Developments of up to 25 dwellings will be permitted in accordance with Policy ST/4.	
10555	Object	Strong objections are made to the statement that residential development schemes up to a maximum size of 25 dwellings will only be permitted within Minor Rural Centres. It is considered there is no support for the selection of such an arbitrary scale of development in the adopted Structure Plan. Given the crisis which is understood to be pending in terms of the Council's ability to provide the required 20,000 dwellings in the period up to 2016, there is not considered to be any rationale for this artificial cap. In particular, such a limitation on development is entirely inappropriate in a centre such as Fulbourn, which is highly sustainable with a high level of services and being in close and easy proximity to the City of Cambridge. Fulbourn should be allocated as a Rural Centre.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy. The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Fulbourn only meets two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area to the east and south-east of Cambridge it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre. Developments of up to 25 dwellings will be permitted in accordance with Policy ST/4.	
9977	Object	The inclusion of Fulbourn in the "Minor Rural Centres" category is an acceptable approach as this provides for larger scale development within the village framework, but we wish to see the village framework boundary amended as explained in our response to the proposed Proposals Map Inset.	Support for Fulbourn being designated a Minor Rural Centre is acknowledged. The issue of the proposed amendment to the village framework is addressed in response to representation 9979.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10826 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department	Object	Given the size, range of facilities, good local employment facilities and proximity to Cambridge, Fulbourn should not have been "downgraded" from its Preferred Option as a Rural Centre. The lack of a separate school seems to have been given particular importance but the excellent public transport facilities seem to have been given less weight. The dropping of Fulbourn from the list of Rural Centres is therefore considered difficult to justify in sustainability terms.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Fulbourn only meets two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area to the east and south-east of Cambridge it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
8325 - Mr Philip Kratz	Object	Fulbourn should be designated as a Rural Centre. It better meets the needs of the Cambridge sub-area than Bar Hill, and it would be wrong to concentrate housing provision in the new settlements. The site owned by G C Lacey & Sons should be removed from the Green Belt, and designated for development.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Fulbourn only meets two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area to the east and south-east of Cambridge it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre. It is not proposed to allocate any additional development in any of the villages, although windfall development would be permitted in accordance with policies ST/3 - ST/6.	
10011 10009 10013 10008	Object	The inclusion of Fulbourn in the "Minor Rural Centres" category is an acceptable approach as this provides for larger scale development within the village framework, but we wish to see the village framework boundary amended as explained in our response to the proposed Proposals Map Inset.	Paragraph 3.27 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that boundaries sometimes cut across large gardens, especially if part of the garden relates more to the countryside than the built up area of the village. In this case the line does follow physical features on the ground, and correctly reflects the built up area of the village.	
9719	Object	Fulbourn should not have been taken out of the Rural Centre Framework. Young people should have the choice to stay in the village where they grew up, and old people should have the right to stay in a place they know and feel comfortable. Fulbourn has the amenities available, if we fall behind other villages we will lose our shops and public transport (already lost library). Fulbourn should grow just as it has in the past.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Fulbourn only meets two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area to the east and south-east of Cambridge it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre. Developments of up to 25 dwellings will be permitted in accordance with Policy ST/4.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9940	Object	Object to the identification of the village of Fulbourn in the emerging Local Development Framework as a Minor Rural Centre. Request the re-instatement of Fulbourn as a Rural Centre with potential for development. This view has already been supported by the Inspector for the second South Cambridgeshire Local Plan who considered that Fulbourn qualified as a Rural Growth Centre. In turn the District Council has accepted and confirmed this status in its Rural Centres Development Plan Document - Preferred Options Report, dated October 2004.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Fulbourn only meets two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area to the east and south-east of Cambridge it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
<i>3rd Bullet</i>				
8388 - Mr. D. Barford	Object	Objection is lodged in respect of the failure to designate Gamlingay a Rural Centre. Gamlingay is a large village when having regard to its function in serving the surrounding rural area, its accessibility to secondary school provision, employment opportunities, primary school and range of shopping, including a post office, and surgery with good accessibility to surrounding market town settlements. Bearing in mind the above and need to have regard to the 'spatial' aspect within the settlement hierarchy, Gamlingay is appropriate to be designated a Rural Centre.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Gamlingay failed to meet any of the Key Criteria. However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
10712 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	We object to the fact that Gamlingay has still not been identified as a Rural Centre. Limiting new housing development to a maximum size of 25 dwellings within the village is unrealistic, given the limited redevelopment opportunities and will not enable the provision of improvements to facilities, particularly education, to achieve the village's full potential to be self-sustaining in respect of local facilities.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Gamlingay failed to meet any of the Key Criteria. However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable as Rural Centres and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
8131 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	Gamlingay is a large village and is a rural centre when having regard to its function in serving the surrounding rural area. It enjoys good accessibility to secondary school provision, employment opportunities, primary school and range of shopping, including a post office, and surgery with good accessibility to surrounding market town settlements. Gamlingay should therefore be recognised and designated a Rural Centre.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Gamlingay failed to meet any of the Key Criteria. However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>4th Bullet</i>				
8528 - The Fairey Family	Object	Linton has a good range of local services and facilities, access to jobs and good public transport links. On behalf of the Fairey family we seek its inclusion as a Rural Centre under Policy ST/3.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Linton only meets one of the Key Criteria (Accessibility of Secondary Education). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
9924 - Old Road Securities Plc	Object	An objection is made to the non-inclusion of Linton as a Rural Centre. Linton is a sustainable location with a good level of employment opportunities and service facilities. It can accommodate additional growth without detriment to existing services and facilities outside the village development limits.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Linton only meets one of the Key Criteria (Accessibility of Secondary Education). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
9918 - Old Road Securities Plc	Object	An objection is made to Linton being identified as a Minor Rural Centre. Linton should be reallocated as a Rural Centre.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Linton only meets one of the Key Criteria (Accessibility of Secondary Education). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
8121	Object	Linton has a full range of local services including a Secondary School and has good public transport services and should be designated as a Rural Centre.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Linton only meets one of the Key Criteria (Accessibility of Secondary Education). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>5th Bullet</i>				
10928 - Carter Jonas	Object	The range of Rural Centres should be extended to cover other important large settlements within the district. Although the status of Melbourn is enhanced, its importance as a key settlement to the south of Cambridge has still not been properly addressed. Melbourn has a village college, good employment opportunities, a good range of facilities and public transport links to Cambridge and Royston. The option of Melbourn as a Rural Centre should be properly assessed through a Sustainability Appraisal.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Melbourn only meets two of the Key Criteria (Accessibility of Secondary Education and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
10892 - H C Moss (Builders) Ltd	Object	Melbourn with its exceedingly wide range of services and facilities and being within close and easy access of Royston, is a settlement that could accommodate significantly more dwellings without detriment to the area.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Melbourn only meets two of the Key Criteria (Accessibility of Secondary Education and Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
10190 10191 10188	Support	The inclusion of Melbourn in the "Minor Rural Centres" category is an acceptable approach as this provides for larger scale development within the village framework.	Support noted.	
<i>6th Bullet</i>				
9921 - Old Road Securities Plc	Object	An objection is made to the non-inclusion of Waterbeach as a Rural Centre. Waterbeach is a sustainable location with a good level of employment opportunities within the settlement and a range of community and retail services and facilities.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Waterbeach only meets one of the Key Criteria (Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10837 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	Waterbeach should be upgraded to Rural Centres status. It has good accessibility to public transport facilities particularly in the form of rail access to Cambridge. The lack of appreciation of the local railway station is a serious underestimation of a sustainability advantage over other selected Rural Centres.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Waterbeach only meets one of the Key Criteria (Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
10910 - Ely Diocesan Board	Object	Waterbeach should be identified as a Rural Centre. It has a population of over 5,000, good access to a secondary school and community facilities in the villages, significant employment opportunities, thriving shops / services centre and direct bus and rail links to Cambridge.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Waterbeach only meets one of the Key Criteria (Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
11374	Object	Waterbeach should be afforded a much greater rate of growth than the Minor Rural Centre designation submits and should be allocated as a Rural Centre.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Waterbeach only meets one of the Key Criteria (Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
9243 - Defence Lands Ops North	Object	On behalf of Defence Estates, Policy ST/3 is objected to on the principle that Waterbeach is not included as a Rural Centre. Waterbeach is a large village with a population of between 4,000 and 5,000. The strategy states at paragraph 2.30 that Rural Centres are the larger more sustainable villages, which generally have a population of at least 3,000. Waterbeach contains an established range of local facilities together with a rail station. Strategic employment is already located within the immediate vicinity, including the Cambridge Research Park on the A10, and local employment on the Waterbeach Industrial Estate.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Waterbeach only meets one of the Key Criteria (Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10645 - Munro Group Ltd 10831	Object	The key criteria for selecting Rural Centres are far too simplistic, and that insufficient villages have been identified as Rural Centres. Waterbeach has a station on the King's Lynn/London Line, which facilities ease of access into Cambridge. Waterbeach is within easy cycling distance of Cambridge and offers a wide range of facilities and employment.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Waterbeach only meets one of the Key Criteria (Local Employment Opportunities). However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
<i>7th Bullet</i>				
9213 - David Wilson Homes (S Midlands)	Object	Willingham should be identified as a Rural Centre.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Willingham failed to meet any of the Key Criteria. However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
10103	Object	Willingham should be identified as a Rural Centre in recognition of its important geographical and functional role. A housing scheme size limit of 25 dwellings is unrealistic and will not enable improvements to facilities. Land at Highgate Farm should be included within the village framework.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Willingham failed to meet any of the Key Criteria. However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre. The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy. Part of the site has developed out of countryside uses, whilst the remainder is agricultural land. Despite the partial development of this site, it still relates better to the countryside than the adjoining built-up area of the village. Further development in this location would be undesirable and it should not become part of the built-up area of the village.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8321 - Barker Parry Town Planning	Object	The criteria for identifying Rural Settlements is far too stringent In a rural District a wider range of settlements should benefit from new development so as to ensure the retention of services. Willingham is a sustainable settlement, previously identified by the Council in the adopted Plan. It has a wide range of services and facilities locally. It will also benefit from the Rapid Transport Route. Willingham should be identified as a rural settlement.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Willingham failed to meet any of the Key Criteria. However, in recognition of the range of shops in the village and the role in serving the needs of the quite remote area it has been designated a Minor Rural Centre.	
8323 - Barker Parry Town Planning	Support	The inclusion of Willingham in the category of minor rural centres is supported.	Support noted.	
9455	Support	We generally support Willingham's identification as a Minor Rural Centre.	Support noted.	
10255	Support	The inclusion of Willingham in the "Minor Rural Centres" category is an acceptable approach as this provides for larger scale development within the village framework.	Support noted.	
10366	Support	We support the identification of Willingham as a minor service village under ST/4.	Support noted.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
10367	Object	The amount of growth included for a minor service village should be increased to at least 50 or more dwellings in line with the services and facilities that the village possesses and to reduce the need for the amount of housing at Northstowe. Indeed if appropriate larger villages are identified for further growth, the need for Northstowe could be substantially reduced, or even rescinded.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. Therefore, reallocation of housing down the sequence and down the settlement hierarchy would be contrary to policy. Minor Rural Centres, did not meet the criteria to be designated a Rural Centre as they have a poorer level of services and facilities. As a result, development in Minor Rural Centres would be less sustainable and it is appropriate to limit development to a scale appropriate to the village.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10371 - J W Burgess & Son	Object	The amount of housing permitted in ST/4 (up to 25 dwellings) should be increased to 50 if not 100 dwellings, given the level of services that can more than accommodate the proposed development (the subject of this representation).	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
10362 10351	Object	We recommend that a minor service village should be increased to at least 50 and even more dwellings, bearing in mind our complementary objection to the size of Northstowe, the principle of which is questionable (for reasons set out in the response form) and given the capacity of most of the larger villages within South Cambridgeshire to take further growth. There is no justification, in sustainability terms, to conclude that most of those villages have reached their logical or sustainable capacity.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. This distribution accords with the housing sequence in PPG3, emphasising the need to maximise development in the more sustainable locations. Therefore, reallocation of housing down the sequence and down the settlement hierarchy would be contrary to policy. Minor Rural Centres, did not meet the criteria to be designated a Rural Centre as they have a poorer level of services and facilities. As a result, development in Minor Rural Centres would be less sustainable and it is appropriate to limit development to a scale appropriate to the village.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 3</i>				
9535 - GO-East	Object	Finally on a point of detail, and as noted previously, most of the DPDs refer to planning obligations in the context of section 46 of the new Planning Act. This is factually incorrect as planning obligations are still governed by section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Section 46 will only be given effect if and when the Secretary of State makes the necessary Regulations referred to in the Act. Given that this is uncertain and that at present the documents are factually incorrect we suggest that the submission DPDs simply refer to "planning obligations" generically.	Noted. References to Section 46 agreements will be amended to refer to planning obligations.	Amend all references to s.46 agreements to refer to s.106 agreements.
8431 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council suggests that all Parish Councils be consulted with regard to needs of their respective parishes, prior to decisions being made relating to financial contributions. Consultation will potentially improve local councils ability to plan for and prepare for service level changes and potential infrastructure investment in the local community.	Support noted. The Council will work closely with Parish Councils.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8423 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	Support for Minor Rural Centre classification with proviso no site specific housing allocations made for Gamlingay and framework remains unaltered (apart from reference to policy SP/6). Trigger point proposed at 4 dwellings for developer contributions not 9 dwellings.	Support noted. Larger development proposals are likely to place a burden on the existing facilities and services in villages and the last paragraph of Policy ST/4 requires developer contributions where this is the case.	
<i>2.32</i>				
10585	Object	The statement that villages close to Northstowe have been discounted as Rural Centres is objected to because of the implication that it would deny the provision of services and local development that the market and local needs would otherwise provide within those settlements. Such denial would be contrary to basic sustainability principles and contrary to the needs of those settlements. The statement also fails to take into account the expected time lag in the development of Northstowe resulting in delay in such provision and in effect planning blight over the development of other settlements.	It is unlikely that settlements in the vicinity of Northstowe would be able to provide the extensive range of facilities and services that a new town could provide. Therefore Northstowe will be much better placed to provide services and facilities for its immediate hinterland. The development strategy permits the development of sites within village frameworks of Minor Rural Centres in accordance with Policy ST/4. This may require financial contributions where there would be a material burden on existing the existing services and facilities.	
10710 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Support	We welcome the recognition that the geographical spread and local service role of larger villages needs to be taken into account in determining an appropriate settlement hierarchy.	Support noted.	
<i>2.34</i>				
8143 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The text refers to developer contributions being sought to obtain necessary improvements where a village 'performs less well against the structure plan criteria'. This statement is vague and does not clarify the basis for requesting contributions. The text should be more specific in identifying specifically where contributions will be justified and how they will be identified.	Larger development proposals are likely to place a burden on the existing facilities and services in villages and the last paragraph of Policy ST/4 requires developer contributions where this is the case. It is agreed that further guidance may be required, however this should be included in a supplementary planning document.	Add to end of last paragraph of policy ST/4: 'Further guidance will be provided in a supplementary planning document.'
<i>ST/5 Group Villages</i>				
9814	Object	Policy ST/5 Group Villages - in relation to Longstanton please see my representations I made under the LDF for Northstowe, which I believe is also connected to the following Core Strategy policies - DP/1 Sustainable policies, DP/2 Design of New Development, DP/3 Development Criteria, DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments, DP/5 Cumulative Development, DP/6 Construction Methods, DP/7 Urban Frameworks, DP/8 Village Frameworks, GB/2 Development in the Green Belt, GB/1 Green Belt Boundary, GB/3 Location and Design of Development, GB/4 Landscape and Design Measures, GB/5 Major Development Site, HG/1 Housing Density.	See response to Northstowe representations.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10775	Object	Objection is raised to the limitation of development up to a maximum of 8 dwellings in Group Villages. It is not considered that there is any justification for limitations on appropriate development within these Villages in terms of Structure Plan advice. Such a policy approach will undoubtedly result, on occasions, in the inefficient use of land, and will cut off the much needed source of affordable housing when larger scale developments could have been brought forward.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
9210 - David Wilson Homes (S Midlands)	Object	There is little to suggest that a comprehensive environmental capacity study has been undertaken in these villages to demonstrate that the proposed threshold of 25 dwellings is valid or that perfectly acceptable development opportunities are not being thwarted by a blanket policy approach to the delineation of village frameworks.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Minor Rural Centres are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy. The development strategy permits the development of sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.	
10616	Object	It is not considered there is any justification for limitations on the scale of appropriate development within Village Frameworks of Villages in terms of Structure Plan policies. Such a policy approach would undoubtedly result in the inefficient use of land, and would prevent much needed affordable housing being brought forward.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9926 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Exceptions should be allowed to the 15 dwelling threshold to reflect major previously developed land redevelopment opportunities. The policy ignores the circumstances of the Bayer CropScience Ltd closure at Hauxton. There should be a separate policy in the Local Development Framework that facilitates the redevelopment of the Bayer CropScience Ltd site for residential as well as other suitable uses. We propose that the last paragraph is changed to :The development of any large redundant brownfield sites for residential development will be considered on their merits.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy. The redevelopment of this, or any other site in the countryside, will be judged against the policies in the development plan.	
10005 - Laing Homes North Thames	Object	This policy limits residential development within village frameworks to eight dwellings per site and at a density of at least thirty dwellings per hectare unless the character of the surrounding area overrides this density. ST/5 also states that development may consist of up to fifteen dwellings where it would make best use of a redundant brownfield site. We would object to the word 'redundant' as this implies other brownfield sites which are still in use for example for employment purposes, would be excluded from redevelopment for residential purposes. Redundancy is not an issue in the current version of PPG3 relating to the definition of previously developed land. Therefore we believe that the word 'redundant' should be removed from this policy approach.	The redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks which are presently in use for employment, service or facility uses are resisted, in accordance with Criteria 4 of Policy DP/8. This is designed to protect rural communities from the loss of vital services and facilities. However, agree that the word "redundant" is not necessary in Policy ST/5, given that it is a duplication of Policy DP/8 and should be deleted.	Delete the word "redundant" from the last paragraph.
10289 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We consider that the threshold of 8 dwellings (or 15 dwellings in exceptional circumstances) is arbitrary. In our view the Council should be looking to maximise and make best use of previously developed brownfield sites.	Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10735 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	These objections relate to: (d) Policies ST3, ST4, ST5 and ST6 in respect of the criteria for windfall development in the rural areas;	South Cambridgeshire is made up of 101 villages of varying sizes. It is necessary for the Core Strategy to include a policy for the Rural Areas which allows adequate housing provision in each village to meet local needs. The policies in the Core Strategy allow for those needs to be met by windfall development at a level appropriate to the scale and availability of services in each village. The bones of this settlement rural policy were put in place in the 2004 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan which had regard to the policies in the 2003 Cambridgeshire Structure Plan and is consistent with national planning policy set out in PPG3 "Housing".	
10798 - Lighthouse Developments	Object	The definition of group villages is too restrictive. There are sites with small villages which could accommodate residential development to the benefit of village amenity. To artificially restrict the potential number of units irrespective of the site's constraints is contrary to the Structure Plan and PPG3. Restricting unit numbers is arbitrary and should be based on a site by site basis including an assessment of sustainability criteria.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
10053 - Bellway Homes	Object	We are concerned about the imposition of a maximum of 15 dwellings being considered as appropriate for development within a 'group village'. The Council should not artificially constrain the site's capacity, and this sits uncomfortably with PPG3 guidance.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
11019 - Cambridgeshire County Council 11015 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	A reference to Section 46 agreements, as shown in policy ST/4 appears to be appropriate.	This would be unnecessary duplication of Policy DP/4, which requires development to provide suitable infrastructure to make the development acceptable in planning terms.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10538 - The W Scambler Trust	Object	It is not thought that there is any justification for limitations on the site of appropriate development within the village frameworks of Group Villages, in terms of the policies in the adopted Structure Plan. Such a policy approach will undoubtedly result in the inefficient use of land, and will prevent a needed source of affordable housing being brought forward in these small sized villages.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
10652 - Varrier Jones Foundation	Object	The settlement of Papworth Everard should be given special status, because of its history of planned redevelopment and unique characteristics. This is confirmed by the special settlement policy at SP/11 of the Core Strategy. On this basis, add the following to text to Policy ST/5:  "Exceptionally if the re-use or redevelopment of the Papworth Hospital or the area to be known as Papwroth West Central is required; development above the scale permitted in a Group Village will be permitted."  Reason: to conform with Policy SP/11.	This would be unnecessary duplication of Policy SP/11.	
10473 - Balsham (Building) Ltd	Object	Objection is raised to the maximum number of 15 dwellings can be accommodated on any one single redundant brownfield site in a Group Village. It is not considered there is any justification for limiting the size of appropriate development within Group Villages in terms of Structure Plan advice. Such a policy would undoubtedly result, on occasions, in the inefficient use of land and would cut off a much needed source of affordable housing in those places where larger scale development could have been brought forward.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9543 - GO-East	Object	Maximum permissible levels of development should be indicative and not prescriptive, in recognition that different circumstances will exist in relation to different development proposals and sites, which should be treated on their individual merits.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy. These are maximum levels and allow differing amounts of development up to the maximum, taking into account local circumstances.	
9679 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy ST/5.	Support noted.	
<i>Barrington</i>				
10768 - Deal Farms Ltd.	Object	It is considered that Barrington, on account of existing built form, size and services is inappropriately classified as a Group Village. If the designation is to be retained, the last two paragraphs of the policy should be deleted so as to facilitate growth in excess of 8 dwellings to be accommodated within the village. It is considered that this policy approach, which is not supported by Structure Plan advice, would result in the inefficient use of land and would possibly cut off a much needed source of affordable housing from those sites where larger scale developments could be brought forward.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Barrington was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population was around 904. The village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland as was not considered as a Minor Rural Centre. The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Barton</i>				
10820 - Messrs J and P Dossett	Object	Bearing in mind the location of Barton within easy cycling distance from Cambridge, it is considered inappropriate for the village to be designated as a Group Village, in which only development up to a maximum of 8 dwellings will normally be permitted. Such a designation is considered to be counter to the interests of sustainability as promoted in the adopted Structure Plan, RPS and Central Government advice. It is recommended, therefore, that there should be no upper limit on the scale of appropriate development within Barton. If there is to be a limit, it should be considerably above 8 dwellings.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Barton was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population was around 799. Due to its proximity to Cambridge the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland as was not considered as a Minor Rural Centre. The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
<i>Bassingbourn</i>				
9959	Object	My Client Mr N Howard would like to object to the omission of Bassingbourn from the list of villages selected as a Minor Rural Centre and propose that it should be upgraded from the status of Group Village. The village has a primary and secondary school, and range of food and non-food shops, provides local employment opportunities and good access to Royston, Cambridge and other local centres.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population, excluding the population resident at Bassingbourn Barracks, was around 2,600. It is possible that Bassingbourn-cum-Knessworth has a range of services and facilities which might merit its inclusion as a Minor Rural Centre, particularly given that there is a village college in the village. However, it is considered that the proximity to Royston means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10541	Object	It is considered that Bassingbourn should be identified as a Minor Rural Centre or Rural Growth Centre, and that there should be greater flexibility applied to facilitate a greater number of villages to qualify for the designation. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, with a sizable population even without the Barracks, shall be designated as a Minor Rural Centre. Artificially restricting the maximum number of dwellings to groups of 8 or 15 is not in the interests of good planning and fails to accord with Structure Plan policy P1/1 and P1/3.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population, excluding the population resident at Bassingbourn Barracks, was around 2,600. It is possible that Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth has a range of services and facilities which might merit its inclusion as a Minor Rural Centre, particularly given that there is a village college in the village. However, it is considered that the proximity to Royston means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	
<i>Bourn</i>				
10659 - Bourn Parish Council	Support	Bourn Parish Council support the designation of Bourn as a Group Village.	Support noted.	
<i>Comberton</i>				
8108 - Comberton Parish Council	Support	Comberton Parish Council wish to give strong support and endorsement of the allocation of Comberton as a Group Village.	Support noted.	
<i>Duxford</i>				
8140 - D H Barford + Co Limited 8326	Object	Objection is lodged in respect of the failure to recognise Duxford as a Minor Rural Centre. The village enjoys good access to secondary school provision, significant local employment opportunities, a primary school, a range of shops including a post office with good public transport (rail link) to Cambridge.	The category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced in recognition of the role some villages, which failed to meet the criteria, have in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. Duxford does not have the range of services and facilities to serve a rural hinterland, a role performed by Sawston.	
10331 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Duxford is a Group Village, and given its characteristics, has not been considered for inclusion within the LDF as a Rural Centre. The potential capacity of this site has not, therefore, been taken into consideration in terms of housing land supply.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Duxford was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population as of mid 2001 was 1,836.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10338 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We object to the omission within the DPD of Duxford as a Minor Rural Centre. We consider that Duxford should be considered as a Rural Centre and if not, a Minor Rural Centre.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Duxford was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population as of mid 2001 was 1,836. The category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced in recognition of the role some villages, which failed to meet the criteria, have in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. Duxford does not have the range of services and facilities to serve a rural hinterland, a role performed by Sawston.	
<i>Elsworth</i>				
10412 - Davison & Co (Barford) Ltd	Object	It is considered that there should be no maximum size of development permitted in Group Villages. There is no justification for limitations on appropriate development in terms of Structure Plan advice. Such a policy approach will undoubtedly result in some locations in the inefficient use of the land, and will cut off a much needed source of affordable housing where larger scale developments could have been brought forward.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
<i>Eltisley</i>				
9409 - Eltisley Parish Council	Support	Eltisley Parish Council support the designation of the village as a group village.	Support noted.	
<i>Fen Ditton</i>				
10776	Object	Fen Ditton is an inappropriate settlement for such a restrictive growth policy, bearing in mind its highly sustainable location in close proximity to Cambridge to which it is well connected by cycle ways and footpaths, in addition to being close to a park and ride facility.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Fen Ditton was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population was around 747. Due to its proximity to Cambridge the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland as was not considered as a Minor Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Fowlmere</i>				
10549	Object	It is not thought that there is any justification for limitations on the number of dwellings which can be built within the Village Framework of Group Villages, especially in terms of Structure Plan advice. It is considered that the facilities available within the village of Fowlmere are such that additional growth in excess of 8 dwellings could be satisfactorily accommodated within the Village. Larger private development schemes could also bring forward the much required affordable housing provision in the village such as Fowlmere.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Fowlmere was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population was around 1,190. Despite the good range of services and facilities at Fowlmere, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to Royston means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland. The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
<i>Foxton</i>				
10589 10583	Object	Objection is raised to the designation of Foxton as a Group Village, especially when a ceiling of up to 8 dwellings only will be permitted within the Village Framework of Group Villages. Such a cap on the scale of development is considered to be not only inappropriate but without justification in terms of Structure Plan advice. Such a policy approach will undoubtedly result, on occasions, in the inefficient use of land and will cut off a much needed source of affordable housing where larger developments could have been brought forward. In addition, a strong objection is raised to Foxton being allocated as a Group Village, bearing in mind its Village Facilities and its sustainable location on the railway line.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Foxton was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population was around 1,161. Despite the good range of services and facilities at Foxton, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to Royston means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland. The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Girton</i>				
10707 10705	Object	Objection is raised to the classification Girton as a Group Village. Owing to its position in relation to Cambridge, with which there is easy public transport and cycle access, it is considered that it is a sustainable location for significant amount of both residential and employment growth.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Girton failed to meet any of the Key Criteria. Due to its proximity to Cambridge the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland as was not considered as a Minor Rural Centre.	
10901 - St John's College	Object	Girton has been unfairly judged as failing to meet the full criteria to justify inclusion as a Rural Centre. However, its close proximity to Cambridge should significantly count towards its advantage over other Rural Centres in terms of sustainability.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Rural Centres Preferred Options Report set out the detail behind the selection of Rural Centres in accordance with the criteria. Girton failed to meet any of the Key Criteria. Due to its proximity to Cambridge the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland as was not considered as a Minor Rural Centre.	
<i>Great Abington</i>				
10903 - Humo Holdings	Object	The settlement of Great and Little Abington is considered to be appropriate for accommodating more than the proposed maximum of 8 dwellings only. This imposition on the maximum number of dwellings permissible is not considered to be justified by any Structure Plan advice or policies, and therefore it is recommended that this limit be deleted. With particular reference to Little and Great Abington, it is considered inappropriate to limit development in this area bearing in mind that planning permission has been given for Granta Park, which is an employment area within walking distance, for almost 70,000sqm of employment floor space. To restrict development in the vicinity to a maximum of 8 dwellings would be contrary to the interests of sustainability.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
<i>Guilden Morden</i>				
9724 - Guilden Morden Parish Council	Support	Guilden Morden Parish Council support the designation of the village as a group village.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Hardwick</i>				
8183 - The Hardwick Group of Residents	Object	Hardwick should be included in Policy ST/3 as a rural centre.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The population in Hardwick is below the 3,000 threshold and therefore it did not meet the criteria to become a Rural Centre.	
<i>Haslingfield</i>				
9780 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	Haslingfield is designated as a Group Village, and is roughly the same size as most other Group Villages. However, we feel that Haslingfield may better fit the profile of an Infill Village. Although our village is slightly bigger, there is very little scope within the village framework for further development. (Group Villages may have development of up to 15 dwellings).	Given the range of facilities and services available in Haslingfield, including a primary school, it is appropriately categorised as a Group Village. Infill Villages are those with a very poor range. Policy ST/5 allows development or redevelopment within the village framework of up to 8 dwellings (15 dwellings in exceptional circumstances). However, this is not a target or requirement.	
<i>Highfields Caldecote</i>				
10860 10858	Object	The demotion of Highfields Caldecote from a Rural Growth Settlement to a Group Villages in which only groups up to a maximum of 8 dwellings are normally permitted, is considered to be totally inappropriate. Given the infrastructure which is in place to serve the existing residential development, and bearing in mind the proximity of Highfields Caldecote to Cambourne and the resultant benefits from increased public transport, it would be logical to permit a greater scale of growth within this settlement. In addition, it is considered that the form of Caldecote could be easily extended without detriment to the character of the existing settlement.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Highfields Caldecote was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population below the 3,000 threshold. Due to its proximity to Cambourne and Cambridge the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland as was not considered as a Minor Rural Centre. The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
9748 - Caldecote Parish Council	Support	Caldecote Parish Council support the designation of the village as a Group Village.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Longstanton</i>				
8077	Object	Object to the classification of Longstanton as a Group Village and propose instead that it should be designated a Minor Rural Centre under Policy ST/4.	The category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced in recognition of the role some villages, which failed to meet the criteria, have in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. However, it is unlikely that settlements in the vicinity of Northstowe would be able to provide the extensive range of facilities and services that a new town could provide. Therefore Northstowe will be much better placed to provide services and facilities for its immediate hinterland.	
8075	Object	We object to the omission of Longstanton from the list of villages selected as Minor Rural Centres and propose that it should be upgraded from the status of Group Village. The classification of Longstanton as a Group Village may have been appropriate at the time of preparing the existing Local Plan, but since the major development at Home Farm, Longstanton, has now come forward the character of the village is changing rapidly and its population is set to increase by some 50% (LDF Consultation Draft, Recreation Study, Annex 1, and elsewhere), and Minor Rural Centre classification would now be more appropriate.	The category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced in recognition of the role some villages, which failed to meet the criteria, have in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. However, it is unlikely that settlements in the vicinity of Northstowe would be able to provide the extensive range of facilities and services that a new town could provide. Therefore Northstowe will be much better placed to provide services and facilities for its immediate hinterland.	
10582	Object	The classification of Longstanton as a Group Village is objected to because the classification fails to take into account the already committed development in the settlement and the significant changes that will arise from those commitments, the development of Northstowe and the planned investment in the Guided Busway. Longstanton should be re-designated as a Rural Centre because as a result of existing commitments it will meet the criteria for Rural Centres. (See also objection to para. 2.32).	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Longstanton was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population as of mid 2001 was 1,700. Despite the good range of services and facilities at Longstanton, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to the new town of Northstowe and St Ives means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland. The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Meldreth</i>				
10778 10783	Object	The Settlement categories are too prescriptive. Meldreth, with its very close ties to Melbourn and Royston, with access to a railway station and good communication links, together with a balance of services and local employment, should be designated as a Minor Rural Centre as is Melbourn. There are very close ties between the two settlements.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Meldreth was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population was around 1,641. Due to its proximity to Melbourn and Royston the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland as was not considered as a Minor Rural Centre.	
<i>Oakington</i>				
10374	Object	We object to the classification of the village under Policy ST/5. The location of the village vis a vis the rapid transit route and the A14 justify the inclusion of the village under Policy ST/4, a minor service village. That will permit development of other than housing groups notwithstanding that objection to policy ST/5.	Despite the good range of services and facilities at Oakington, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to the new town of Northstowe and St Ives means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	
<i>Over</i>				
8000 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	Group village designation is too restrictive for Over which displays a level of local services and facilities and easy access to external facilities that should enable its consideration as a Minor Rural Centre/Rural Centre. No regard is given to the advantages of being close to the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. The population in Over is below the 3,000 threshold and therefore it did not meet the criteria to become a Rural Centre. The category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced in recognition of the role some villages, which failed to meet the criteria, have in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. However, it is unlikely that settlements in the vicinity of Northstowe would be able to provide the extensive range of facilities and services that a new town could provide. Therefore Northstowe will be much better placed to provide services and facilities for its immediate hinterland.	
10272	Object	The inclusion of Over in the Group Village category is an acceptable approach, but we wish to see the village framework boundary amended to include our client's land off Fen Road within the village framework and object to the proposed housing maximum scheme size limit of 8 dwellings.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It has the characteristics of agricultural uses, and cannot be classified as previously developed land under the definition of PPG3. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10152 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 10165	Support	The inclusion of Over in the Group Village category is an acceptable approach.	Support noted.	
<i>Papworth Everard</i>				
10410 - Davison & Co (Barford) Ltd	Object	We do not believe it is any justification for limitations on the scale of appropriate development within the Village Frameworks of Group Villages, in terms of Structure Plan advice. Such a policy approach would undoubtedly result in the inefficient use of land and will cut off a much needed source of affordable housing when larger scale developments could have been brought forward. Objection is raised to the identification of Papworth Everard as a settlement which only a maximum number of 8 dwellings be permitted on any one site. It is considered that the services within this settlement could easily accommodate a greater scale of growth.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Papworth Everard was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population as of mid 2001 was 2,012. Despite the good range of services and facilities at Papworth Everard, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to Cambourne means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland. The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
<i>Swavesey</i>				
8141 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	Designate Swavesey a Rural centre. Swavesey has a village college, a primary school and range of shopping facilities, provides local employment opportunities and good access to Cambridge. Although Paragraph 2.32 states that villages situated close to Cambridge and Northstowe have been discounted as the larger town centres will be more effective at serving the immediate rural area, the reference to Northstowe is reliant on this development actually occurring. It will also be a number of years before Northstowe will surpass existing villages in terms of serving the immediate rural area. In the circumstances, this does not justify the exclusion of Swavesey from being designated a Rural or Minor Rural Centre.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Swavesey was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population as of mid 2001 was 2,480. Despite the good range of services and facilities at Swavesey, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to the new town of Northstowe and St Ives means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10617	Object	Swavesey, with its extensive range of services and facilities, not to mention the impending public transport system along the former Cambridge to St Ives railway, is a settlement which could easily accommodate significantly greater number of dwellings. In terms of sustainability, it is considered that Swavesey justifies being allocated as a Minor Growth Settlement.	Despite the good range of services and facilities at Swavesey, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to the new town of Northstowe and St Ives means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland. The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
10370 - J W Burgess & Son	Object	We object to the inclusion of Swavesey in the Rural Strategy Policy ST/5, i.e. a group village. The services in Swavesey, including secondary education, primary school, recreation facilities, shops and services, together with its location on the rapid transit route, on the A14 and close to Buckingway Business Park, all indicate that Swavesey should be higher in the settlement hierarchy, at least Policy ST/4.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Swavesey was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population as of mid 2001 was 2,480. Despite the good range of services and facilities at Swavesey, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to the new town of Northstowe and St Ives means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	
10055 - Bellway Homes	Object	Bellway object to the identification of Swavesey as a group village on the basis that there is a Village College and a significant level of services and facilities in the village.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Swavesey was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population as of mid 2001 was 2,480. Despite the good range of services and facilities at Swavesey, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to the new town of Northstowe and St Ives means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10499 - Mr. B. Baker, Mr. R Mallandine, The W Scambler Trust 10508 - The W Scambler Trust 10574 - The W Scambler Trust 10513 10501	Object	Strong objections are raised to the categorisation of Swavesey as a Group Village in which groups of only up to 8 dwellings will be permitted within the Village Framework. We do not believe there is any justification for limitations on the appropriate development within the frameworks in terms of Structure Plan advice. Such policy approach would undoubtedly result, on occasions, in the inefficient use of land, and will cut off a much needed source of affordable housing where larger scale developments could have been brought forward.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Swavesey was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population as of mid 2001 was 2,480. Despite the good range of services and facilities at Swavesey, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to the new town of Northstowe and St Ives means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland. The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
8142 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	Designate Swavesey a Minor Rural Centre.	The category of Minor Rural Centres has been introduced in recognition of the role some villages, which failed to meet the criteria, have in terms of providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. However, it is unlikely that settlements in the vicinity of Northstowe would be able to provide the extensive range of facilities and services that a new town could provide. Therefore Northstowe will be much better placed to provide services and facilities for its immediate hinterland.	
10361 10350	Object	Swavesey, given its range of services, including a secondary school, and its siting on the rapid transit route between St Ives and Cambridge, provides the village with all the necessary credentials for inclusion in a higher category of growth settlement. We therefore object to the categorisation of Swavesey under Policy ST/5, which will only permit groups of housing, and it should either be included under ST/3 or ST/4.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Swavesey was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population as of mid 2001 was 2,480. Despite the good range of services and facilities at Swavesey, which might have warranted designation as a Minor Rural Centre, the proximity to the new town of Northstowe and St Ives means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10061 10058	Object	The inclusion of Swavesey in the Group Village category is an acceptable approach, but we wish to see the village framework boundary amended to include our client's land within the village framework and object to the proposed housing maximum scheme size limit of 8 dwellings.	The site, comprising a field on the edge of the village, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
<i>3rd Policy Paragraph</i>				
10801 - Jesus College (Cambridge)	Object	Policy ST/5 should provide for greater flexibility in terms of the number of dwellings that a development within the framework of a group village may comprise. It is acknowledged that Policy ST/5 sets an "upper limit" of 15 dwellings in the interests of sustainability. However, it is considered that sustainability objectives should be balanced with guidance contained within PPG3 which encourages the efficient use of brownfield sites.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Rural Centres are the most sustainable settlements and the bulk of the rural housing supply should be within these settlements. Therefore there is no upper limit to the amount of development permitted in this category of settlement. Other categories of settlement are not as sustainable and it is therefore appropriate that development should be restricted to avoid undermining the development strategy.	
<i>ST/6 Infill Villages</i>				
11449 - Weston Colville Parish Council	Object	In Preferred Options report you stated "Modest levels of development which are of a scale appropriate to the size and availability of services in smaller villages will help to sustain local services and facilities without adding unduly to the need to travel". This statement seems to have been withdrawn and we strongly feel it should be reinstated as Council policy.	Paragraph 2.19 of the Preferred Options report referred to modest levels of development in Group Villages. Policy ST/6 permits residential development or redevelopment within village frameworks for not more than 2 dwellings, although in very exceptional circumstances up to 8 dwellings will be permitted. This reflects the unsustainable nature of such settlements, which lack basic services and facilities requiring residents to travel to meet their daily needs, whilst recognising that limited growth is desirable to meet local needs. Larger developments would be contrary to the development strategy for the rural area, focussing most development in the more sustainable Rural Centres.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7930 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	It is important that a reasonable approach is taken when assessing small development proposals in Infill Villages. It is important to permit some growth in rural communities to avoid them becoming moribund with little change in population and a loss of young people and families. The need for such limited development was generally recognised by the murmur of approval from almost everyone in the question time at the conference on Building Sustainable Communities held at Robinson College in spring 2004.	The strategy allocates the single largest proportion of the development (9,600 dwellings), nearly half of the housing requirement of 20,000 dwellings in the period 1999-2016, to the rural area. Development is permitted within the village frameworks of Infill Villages in accordance with Policy ST/6.	
10736 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	These objections relate to: (d) Policies ST3, ST4, ST5 and ST6 in respect of the criteria for windfall development in the rural areas;	South Cambridgeshire is made up of 101 villages of varying sizes. It is necessary for the Core Strategy to include a policy for the Rural Areas which allows adequate housing provision in each village to meet local needs. The policies in the Core Strategy allow for those needs to be met by windfall development at a level appropriate to the scale and availability of services in each village. The bones of this settlement rural policy were put in place in the 2004 South Cambridgeshire Local Plan which had regard to the policies in the 2003 Cambridgeshire Structure Plan and is consistent with national planning policy set out in PPG3 "Housing".	
10603 10601	Object	We accept that development in infill villages should perhaps be at a lesser scale than elsewhere. However, we do not consider that the 'absolute cap' of 8 dwellings on suitable sites is justified. There will, on occasion, be sites that are capable of accommodating a larger scale of development, which could - in and of themselves - also contribute to the provision of much needed rural affordable housing. In our objections to policy ST/1, we have observed that there is very limited prospects of the District Council achieving anyway near the 20,000 additional dwellings required of the period 1999-2016. Accordingly, more growth should be allocated to the existing settlements within the District.	Policy ST/6 permits residential development or redevelopment within village frameworks for not more than 2 dwellings, although in very exceptional circumstances up to 8 dwellings will be permitted. This reflects the unsustainable nature of such settlements, which lack basic services and facilities requiring residents to travel to meet their daily needs, whilst recognising that limited growth is desirable to meet local needs. Larger developments would be contrary to the development strategy for the rural area, focussing most development in the more sustainable Rural Centres.	
11020 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	A reference to Section 46 agreements, as shown in policy ST/4 appears to be appropriate.	The developer will be required to provide sufficient services, facilities and infrastructure to make the development acceptable in planning terms, in accordance with Policy DP/4. As such, the additional wording is superfluous.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9545 - GO-East	Object	The figure of eight dwellings should not be an absolute limit but an indicative upper level of development that will be dependent on a number of factors in relation to the acceptability of otherwise of individual development proposals.	Policy ST/6 permits residential development or redevelopment within village frameworks for not more than 2 dwellings, although in very exceptional circumstances up to 8 dwellings will be permitted. This reflects the unsustainable nature of such settlements, which lack basic services and facilities requiring residents to travel to meet their daily needs, whilst recognising that limited growth is desirable to meet local needs. Larger developments would be contrary to the development strategy for the rural area, focussing most development in the more sustainable Rural Centres.	
<i>Carlton</i>				
9559 - Little Thurlow Parish Council - Clerk	Support	The most closely adjoining villages to Little Thurlow like Carlton are all classified as 'infill only'. Provided their status does not change, we conclude that there are no adverse consequences for us in traffic flows or the like.	Support noted.	
<i>Caxton</i>				
10770 - Caxton Parish Council	Support	Caxton Parish Council support the designation of Caxton as an infill village.	Support noted.	
<i>Croxton</i>				
8565 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports Policy ST/6 which designates Croxton as an Infill Village.	Support noted.	
<i>Kneesworth</i>				
10927	Object	An objection is raised to the classification of Kneesworth as an Infill Only Village. There is considered to be no policy justification to limit the growth in such villages in accordance with Structure Plan policies and advice. In addition, the separation of the Village of Kneesworth from that of Bassingbourn is academic as the services in these villages have always been shared owing to the close proximity of the two areas. When seen together, Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth has a wide range of services which could support further growth in a sustainable manner. In addition, the proximity of the villages to Royston is also important when considering the sustainability of the settlement(s). It is considered more appropriate that Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth be defined as a Minor Rural Centre.	The two settlements are sufficiently separate to retain their own identities in the settlement hierarchy. Kneesworth lacks basic services and facilities requiring residents to travel to meet their daily needs. Whilst Bassingbourn may provide for some of these, the distance is great enough that the majority of these trips will be by car. The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the adopted Structure Plan. Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as the population, excluding the population resident at Bassingbourn Barracks, was around 2,600. It is possible that Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth has a range of services and facilities which might merit its inclusion as a Minor Rural Centre, particularly given that there is a village college in the village. However, it is considered that the proximity to Royston means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Pampisford</i>				
10533 - Yardline Limited	Support	It is noted that Pampisford is identified as an Infill Village where up to a group of 8 dwellings may be permitted if it would result in positive overall benefit to the village.	Support noted.	
<i>Papworth St Agnes</i>				
9134 - Papworth Saint Agnes Parish Meeting	Support	The designation of Papworth St Agnes as an in-fill village is strongly supported with residential development and redevelopment being restricted to sites within the village framework. With Papworth St Agnes being such a small village, in practice this means that the opportunities for development within the village framework are negligible.	Support noted.	
<i>Shepreth</i>				
7827 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Shepreth, Land North of Meldreth Road)	Object	Land north of Meldreth Road, Shepreth. Shepreth should be upgraded to a Group Village. Objection is made to the failure to include the land bordered by the railway line, to the north, John Breay Close to the west and Meldreth Road to the south within the inset boundary of Shepreth village.	Shepreth does not meet the requirements of a group village. Specifically it does not have a Primary School.	
<i>Stow-cum-Quy</i>				
10723	Object	The status of Stow Cum Quay as an infill village need to be reconsidered in light of the excellent cycle links to the city centre, and its sustainable location. Further development will facilitate the provision of further services and enable more affordable housing to be provided.	Stow-cum-Quy lacks basic services and facilities requiring residents to travel to meet their daily needs. Whilst it has good cycle links to Cambridge, cycling only accounts for a small proportion of trips and many would be made by car. It would therefore not be sustainable to add further development to such a village when PPG3 and 13 require development to be located such to reduce the need to travel.	
<i>Weston Colville</i>				
11447 - Weston Colville Parish Council	Object	Weston Colville & Weston Green are shown as two separate villages whereas they should be a single village of Weston Colville.	Agreed.	Amend proposals map, to show Weston Green as part of the Weston Colville inset number.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11451 - Weston Colville Parish Council	Object	Weston Colville has quite a demand for low cost housing (as demonstrated by SCDC surveys). It is unrealistic to think that this can be provided without supporting free market housing.	The development control policies DPD includes a policy on exception sites, allowing sites of 100% affordable housing outside village frameworks. The affordable housing policies also require 50 % affordable housing on sites of two dwellings or more. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation would not be appropriate for an infill village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. An additional allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study, existing commitments and the remaining development at Cambourne that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
11450 - Weston Colville Parish Council	Object	All villages need to be sustained otherwise they will lose the remaining services which they currently have, thus causing the problems which your policy is seeking to avoid. We believe modest levels of development in Weston Colville are required over the next 10/15 years in order to retain the facilities we have. If these are lost more journeys will be generated than those created by limiting building.	Whilst the importance of retention of village services and facilities is acknowledged in the Development Control Policies DPD, it is unlikely that small amounts of development would have a significant impact on the retention of village services. The Core Strategy DPD does allow infill development within the existing area of the village. With regard to specific allocations for development, an additional allocation would not be appropriate for an infill village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study, existing commitments and the remaining development at Cambourne that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
9560 - Little Thurlow Parish Council - Clerk	Support	The most closely adjoining villages to Little Thurlow like Weston Colville are all classified as 'in fill only'. Provided their status does not change, we conclude that there are no adverse consequences for us in traffic flows or the like.	Support noted.	
<i>Weston Green</i>				
11448 - Weston Colville Parish Council	Object	Weston Colville & Weston Green are shown as two separate villages whereas they should be a single village of Weston Colville.	Agreed.	Amend proposals map, to show Weston Green as part of the Weston Colville inset number.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 3</i>				
8091	Support	The proposal to allow developments of up to 8 houses on the reuse of a brownfield site in Infill Villages is supported. Such development can allow modest growth in rural communities, which should not be required to fossilise with no development on the grounds that access is mainly by private motor car, in the absence of a meaningful public transport service.	Support noted. Policy ST/6 permits residential development or redevelopment within village frameworks for not more than 2 dwellings, although in very exceptional circumstances up to 8 dwellings will be permitted. This reflects the unsustainable nature of such settlements, which lack basic services and facilities requiring residents to travel to meet their daily needs, whilst recognising that limited growth is desirable to meet local needs.	
<i>ST/7 Phasing of Housing Land</i>				
10039 - House Builders Federation	Object	Reference is made as to the fact that phasing will be set out in Area Action Plans and associated Supplementary Planning Documents. The HBF recognises that phasing for major sites is usually necessary. However, it is concerned that if phasing is delegated down to SPD documents to deal with, there could be considerable uncertainty for developers and investors. Furthermore, given that SPD documents will not be subject to independent public examination (which DPD documents will) there would be limited opportunity to challenge their content. Consequently, the HBF questions whether under the new planning system SPD's are the appropriate mechanism for dealing with matters of phasing.	Detailed phasing of the major development locations will be dealt with through the relevant Area Action Plan. This approach is in accordance with PPS12, which requires that detail be included in Supplementary Planning Documents.	
10282 - Stannifer	Object	Policy ST/7 does not provide a realistic mechanism to ensure that housing is phased in accordance with Structure Plan requirements. Although the Structure Plan has only recently been adopted, it is clear already that the proposed phasing of development is not being achieved. The DPD need to be more proactive in ensuring that sites are delivered early or a wider range of potential sites are proposed to encourage completion and to ensure that adequate housing supply is achieved.	The Council is working towards delivering the development strategy outlined in Policy ST/1. This will be monitored and if it becomes evident that this is not being delivered, Policy ST/8 requires that the relevant policy be reviewed. The Council is working closely with the developers, the County Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons to bring forward development on the strategic sites at the earliest opportunity.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9546 - GO-East	Object	Consideration should be given to what more can be said about the anticipated start and delivery of the main sites and how these might be phased. The relationship of the proposed SPD with the Core Strategy and other DPDs needs to be clarified as normally we would expect to see phasing policies included as part of the development plan.	The Core Strategy contains a policy on the phasing of housing development and identifies the need for an SPD to provide more detail. It is considered that this is the most appropriate mechanism for phasing which will be dependent on a wide variety of factors, including full knowledge of any requirements on the development and the inter-relationship between numbers of housing and supporting infrastructure and the need for flexibility to respond to changes, such as in the market. That said, the Core Strategy and other DPDs will include a new Phasing and Delivery section explaining the various mechanisms in place and proposed for delivering the development strategy and which will include a housing trajectory which will make certain assumptions on potential phasing and delivery of the major developments.	Include new chapter 3 Phasing and Delivery, to include a housing trajectory.
8890 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	There would not appear to be a need to phase development at Northstowe in the manner suggested in this policy. Such a restriction on development would be detrimental to the Structure Plan target of 6,000 dwellings to be delivered at Northstowe by 2016. Reference to the new town in this policy should be deleted.	Policy ST/7 does not place any restrictions on the level of development which could come forward at Northstowe.	
9018 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	This paragraph makes reference to the need to ensure a continuous supply of land to maintain housing development to meet housing targets. This paragraph does not draw attention to the need to start developments as soon as possible, urgently to meet housing needs and targets.	The Housing Trajectory (to be included in the Submission DPD) shows anticipated annual delivery rates, to ensure a continuous supply across the plan period. The Area Action Plans provide the detailed phasing and steps being taken for the delivery of the major development locations.	
8387 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The phasing of housing land should be kept under continuous review. If it is likely that insufficient land will come forward in the early years of the plan then additional land should be made available to meet the housing requirement.	Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period.	
8891 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	Were land supply to significantly exceed estimated rates it would be inappropriate to refuse detailed or reserved matters applications for the new town. This should be made clear in the supporting text. The proposed change will help meet test of soundness ix and viii set out in paragraph 4.24 of PPS12.	Northstowe is a strategic development which is required to provide 6,000 dwellings before 2016. It is likely that if over-provision became a concern any review would firstly consider the lower element of the development strategy, to readjust delivery rates.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8558 - The Fairey Family 8778 9075 - Foregreen Developments Ltd	Object	On behalf of our client, we would suggest that phasing does not really have a role in the LDF, bearing in mind that we do not consider there to be any legitimate expectation of the Council achieving 20,000 dwelling completions in the period to 2016. We would suggest that the policy be deleted.	Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that policies in local plans and Supplementary Planning Guidance set out detailed phasing of housing provision. Draft RSS 14 Policy H3 states that "local authorities should keep under review the phasing and release of housing sites in line with government guidance." Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period.	
10014 - Laing Homes North Thames	Object	We believe that a caveat should be included in this policy to acknowledge that other smaller sites in or on the edge of rural centres could contribute to housing land supply in the event of the major strategic sites not coming forward for development or being seriously delayed.	The Council is working towards delivering the development strategy outlined in Policy ST/1. This will be monitored and if it becomes evident that this is not being delivered, Policy ST/8 requires that the relevant policy be reviewed. However, it would not be appropriate to include in the policy the assumption that development Will be accommodated in the villages as this would not accord with the development strategy.	
9369 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Object	The wording of the policy is ambiguous as it is not clear what constitutes a "major development" and how these will be phased. The policy should be revised to reflect that the planned urban extension at Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) is readily available to meet short-term need and is committed under the current Local Plan.	Major developments refers to the urban extensions to Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe, but this could be clearer. The phasing of these sites is dealt with through the Area Action Plans for each area. Paragraph 2.10 refers to the Cambridge Northern Fringe East site and that it will be brought forward for development at the earliest opportunity.	Amend first sentence to read: "Urban extensions to Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe will be phased to ensure a continuous supply of housing land throughout the plan period, to minimise the duration of the disruption of the development process and to concentrate resources on a limited number of sites at any point in time to best deliver sustainable developments."
9238 - Defence Lands Ops North (Waterbeach Barracks)	Object	Due to the possibility that the Cambridge Extensions may fail to come forward within the plan period, on behalf of Defence Estates (DE) the following paragraph is recommended for inclusion as part of the text:- 'Due to the possibility that sites may not come forward within this plan period, the availability of alternative sites within the Sub-Region, outside of Cambridge City's boundaries, has been recognised. Waterbeach Barracks is capable of accommodating 6,000 - 10,000 houses'.	Development of a new settlement at Waterbeach Barracks is not included in the Structure Plan or Draft RSS14, as it is not required in order to meet the housing requirements in South Cambridgeshire up to 2016 that the LDF is planning for. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10729 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Ltd is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. As a consequence, Policy ST/7 needs to be amended as follows : 1st and 2nd lines) "and at the new towns of Northstowe and Hanley Grange will be phased .....".	The development strategy in the LDF plans for development to 2016 in accordance with the adopted and saved Structure Plan 2003. The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS14), which incorporates growth in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough corridor, covers a longer period to 2021, and is beyond the scope of this LDF.	
10210 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	The University is concerned that there should be no delay in bringing forward land for development on the North West Cambridge site so that it can start to deliver the housing required to meet identified needs over the Plan period. We will therefore seek to have the housing on the North West Cambridge site shown as being delivered from the start of the Plan period.	The Council has agreed to amend the Local Development Scheme to bring forward the programme for the Cambridge North West AAP, and for it to be a joint AAP with Cambridge City Council. It is clearly not possible to include it in the first tranche of documents which are well advanced. However, the timetable for the AAP will seek to bring it forward as quickly as practicable. the land in this sector in South Cambridgeshire currently lies within the Green Belt. It is not possible or appropriate for the Core Strategy to seek to anticipate the outcome of the AAP which will address issues including land which could be released from the Green Belt and nature and distribution of uses. However, the AAP timetable will allow for development to come forward about a year after the first tranche of DPDs, which will not significantly delay delivery.	
9120 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships request flexibility in phasing and not limit number of sites in Northstowe where development is taking place.	Policy ST/7 does not place any restrictions on the level of development which could come forward at Northstowe.	
9929 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	It is important that emphasis is given to maintaining a continuous supply of residential land and that delivery is carefully monitored and corrective action taken if production should fall short of targets.	Support noted.	
10209 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University supports the intention of Policy ST/7 in respect of the phasing of Housing land and that the details of that Phasing should be set out in Area Action Plans.	Support noted.	
<i>2.37</i>				
9368 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Support	Network Rail welcomes the phasing mechanism set out in paragraph 2.37 that encourages Local Plan allocations to be developed at an early date to meet needs to 2006.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2.39</i>				
10041 - House Builders Federation	Object	Reference is made as to the fact that phasing will be set out in Area Action Plans and associated Supplementary Planning Documents. The HBF recognises that phasing for major sites is usually necessary. However, it is concerned that if phasing is delegated down to SPD documents to deal with, there could be considerable uncertainty for developers and investors. Furthermore, given that SPD documents will not be subject to independent public examination (which DPD documents will) there would be limited opportunity to challenge their content. Consequently, the HBF questions whether under the new planning system SPD's are the appropriate mechanism for dealing with matters of phasing.	Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. Paragraphs 2.8 - 2.29 provides an indication of whether development sites are likely to be brought forward earlier or later within the plan period. The detailed phasing for each of the major development locations is included in their respective Area Action Plans. It would be unnecessary duplication to include such detail within the Core Strategy. The SPD will amplify Policy ST/7 providing more detail, in accordance with PPS12.	
8389 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Phasing of development is a matter of importance, and it should be dealt with in the Core Strategy Development Plan Document rather than relegated to a SPD.	Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. Paragraphs 2.8 - 2.29 provides an indication of whether development sites are likely to be brought forward earlier or later within the plan period. The detailed phasing for each of the major development locations is included in their respective Area Action Plans. It would be unnecessary duplication to include such detail within the Core Strategy. The SPD will amplify Policy ST/7 providing more detail, in accordance with PPS12.	
<i>2.41</i>				
9028 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	It is agreed that the new settlement at Northstowe should seek to utilise land as efficiently as possible. However, seeking to restrict the density of employment in the new settlement to such an extent, and so early on in the planning process, without making reference to any supporting evidence or studies is premature. The amount of land used for employment at Northstowe should be taken into account but other factors, such as demand, viability, choice of employment sites and the character of surrounding areas should also be considered prior to a decision being made about employment density.	Not accepted. Paragraph 2.41 emphasises the fact that achieving the required jobs is the most important factor for the major new developments. This may not require the full 50 hectares envisaged by the Structure Plan. It is acknowledged that viability, mix, and demand must be considered in order to achieve the required number of jobs, but paragraph 2.41 is still sound. Further detail on implementation is also provided in the Area Action Plans.	
8909 - Carisbrooke Alliance	Support	Carisbrooke support the principle of developing employment sites at a more efficient density than has been the case historically. Such an approach has already been applied to some extent on the company's business park at Buckinghamway, alongside the A14 at Swavesey. There remains scope for further, more dense commercial development on that site.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>2.43</i>				
10743 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Ltd is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. As a consequence, paragraph 2.43 needs amending as follows : (first two lines) "Area Action Plans for Northstowe, Hanley Grange and urban extensions of Cambridge will detail..."	A new settlement at Hanley Grange has not been allocated in the Local Development Framework. A consequential change to this paragraph is therefore not required.	
9032 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	The second sentence of Paragraph 2.43 places emphasis upon providing sufficient jobs on the least amount of land. As previously indicated, whilst the amount of land used for employment should be taken into account, there are also other factors that need to be considered. In particular, demand, viability and a mix of employment sites are important to ensure that employment and jobs are actually created allowing a more sustainable new settlement. Proposed Amendment - Delete second sentence of Paragraph 2.43 and add first sentence to the end of Paragraph 2.41 (following suggested amendment to Paragraph 2.41).	Not accepted. Paragraph 2.43 emphasises the fact that achieving the required jobs is the most important factor for the major new developments. This may not require the full 50 hectares envisaged by the Structure Plan. It is acknowledged that viability, mix, and demand must be considered, but paragraph 2.43 is still sound. Further detail on implementation is also provided in the Area Action Plans.	
<i>2.44</i>				
10709 10708	Object	In the interests of sustainability, it is considered that more employment land should be made available within the settlements across the District, rather than concentrating it in the major settlements. This would meet the need as stated in paragraph 2.40, of providing a variety of sites to meet differing needs. To restrict all new development to larger sites in major settlements would not meet this stated aim.	Consideration of employment land supply indicates sufficient commitments to meet the requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, in addition to that required as part of the major new developments. Additional land allocations in villages are not required, although appropriate land may still come forward as windfall, subject to land supply considerations.	
8185 - The Hardwick Group of Residents	Object	Paragraph 2.44 suggests that all employment sites allocated in the existing Local Plan will be developed in the short term. We consider this is unlikely in respect of allocations which have already been outstanding for a number of years.	The employment allocations detailed in the Site Specific Policies DPD have made progress towards development. The majority have the benefit of planning permission. The only one with a significant area of land that has yet to gain permission is at Papworth Everard, and remains an important site in order to improve the jobs homes balance of the village following significant growth.	
<i>ST/8 Plan Monitor Manage</i>				
8390 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	A sixth criterion should be added: if no previously developed land is available, then a review of land included in the Green Belt should be brought forward.	The criteria in the policy are general enough to include this potential policy response.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11024 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	This should explicitly refer to the need to monitor the overall relationship between housing/ dwellings/ households/ population/ labour supply as against jobs/employment/working population.	This has been addressed by the Local Development Framework Monitoring Strategy. Further detail in the policy is not required.	
10257	Object	This policy does not explain what the triggers will be for action to be taken, on under-achievement as well as over-achievement of the LDF policies and allocations, in particular in relation to new housing and employment. Government Good Practice Guidance on monitoring the delivery of housing advises that policies should be precise and measurable. This Policy should therefore be amended to state that if, in any year housing provision, in terms of completions, significantly exceeds or falls below the adopted structure plan average rate of provision, a review of the housing land supply situation and local market conditions will be carried out to establish the reasons for this and appropriate measures will be taken to address the situation.	Further detail in the policy is not required. The LDF Annual Monitoring Report will include information on housing land supply and progress towards targets. The Council is also now required to produce a Housing Trajectory, to demonstrate how housing land will come forward to meet the targets on an annual basis. This will provide a more accurate mechanism for testing delivery, that will provide the level of detail sought by this representation.	
9542 - GO-East	Object	Overall, we welcome the core strategy as being a clear, concise and spatial strategy but the submission DPD should include a clearer and more robust monitoring and implementation framework.	It is agreed that the submission Core Strategy will include a new phasing and delivery chapter which addresses the mechanisms for delivering the development strategy, including the role of Cambridgeshire Horizons as the delivery vehicle. It will include a housing trajectory which will estimate the potential implementation of development. It will also include a new monitoring chapter which draws from the Monitoring Strategy and includes indicators against which the Council's Annual Monitoring Report will test the implementation of the LDF, as required under the new plan making system.	Include new chapter 3 Phasing and Delivery, incorporating the existing section Phasing of Housing Land, comprising Policy ST/7 and it's supporting text which should be moved from Chapter 2. Include new chapter 4 Monitoring to incorporate Policy ST/8 and supporting text and amplified to include a range of indicators drawn from the Monitoring Strategy and provide supporting text.
9628 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	The Policy should be explicit about frequency of reviews, publication and establish transparency of techniques.	Paragraph 2.46 states that monitoring and review will take place on an annual basis. This will be in the form of an annual monitoring report. Further details on the information to be collected and how it will be used can be found in the accompanying monitoring strategy.	
9934 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	There should be an emphasis on maintaining a 5 year supply of housing in line with the government's emerging policy approach advocated in 'Planning for Housing Provision' (ODPM, 2005). The policy should be strengthened to incorporate a 5 year criterion and to introduce a presumption in favour of residential development if construction falls behind schedule.	'Planning for Housing Provision' is only a consultation draft at the moment. The housing trajectory will provide a clear indication of the housing land supply for the next 5 years and beyond. It's delivery will be monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10696 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	This policy does not explain what the triggers will be for action to be taken, on under-achievement as well as over-achievement of the LDF policies and allocations, in particular in relation to new housing and employment. Government Good Practice Guidance on monitoring the delivery of housing advises that policies should be precise and measurable. This policy should therefore be amended to state that if, in any year housing provision, in terms of completions, significantly exceeds or falls below the adopted Structure Plan average rate of provision, a review of the housing land supply situation and local market conditions will be carried out to establish the reasons for this and appropriate measures will be taken to address the situation.	The Housing Trajectory will provide a useful mechanism for testing anticipated delivery rates of the Area Action Plans and allocations in the LDF. The first paragraph of Policy ST/8 addresses under-achievement, whilst the last paragraph addresses over-achievement. The Annual Monitoring Report will include commentary on delivery rates, and / or circumstances affecting delivery.	
9530 - GO-East	Object	We welcome the fact that you have produced a monitoring strategy in respect of the LDF as a whole. We consider, however, that each DPD should include its own monitoring strategy as part of the overall implementation framework and that, accordingly, the submission DPDs will need to incorporate and develop the relevant parts of the current separate monitoring document.	It is agreed that each submission DPD should include relevant elements of the Monitoring Strategy including targets and indicators.	Include relevant elements of the Monitoring Strategy, including targets and indicators, in each DPD.
10167 - East of England Regional Assembly	Support	The Assembly endorses the policy approach of ensuring that essential infrastructure is provided at the right time to support development, rather than "lag" behind it. The Plan, Monitor and Manage approach is supported.	Support noted.	
<b>2.46</b>				
11023 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Need to include reference to need for annual monitoring to cover effectiveness of mitigation policies in preventing environmental impacts e.g. on wildlife, surrounding countryside, designated sites.	Agree.	Amend first sentence of paragraph 2.46 to read: "In order to assess the effectiveness of the policies in the delivery of development and protection of the environment, it is important that continuous monitoring and review of policies in the LDF is undertaken."
8391 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Support	LPA should be proactive in its approach to ensuring sufficient supply of housing land is available within the Plan period.	Support noted.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
2.47 10300 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We support the principle of Paragraph 2.47 which refers to the requirement that between 1999-2016 at least 37% of new dwellings will either be located on previously developed land or utilise existing buildings. However, we note reference to the Sustainability Appraisal that the 'limited stock of brownfield land means new development will inevitably result in the loss of high quality agricultural land'. This suggests that there may be a shortfall in meeting the 37% policy requirement given the limited stock of brownfield land. There would still be a substantial shortfall in achieving the Government's target of 60%. We consider that the Council should be looking to maximise all opportunities to bring forward previously development brownfield sites for development.	Structure Plan Policy P5/2 sets an overall target for at least 50% of new dwellings to be located on previously developed land or utilise existing buildings. A specific target of 37% was established for South Cambridgeshire to reflect the nature of the district and the growth that must be accommodated. Higher targets in other districts counter this. Policy SS4 of RSS14 applies the same principle, requiring 60% across the region as a whole and paragraph 4.23 recognises that the proportion achieved varies in different parts of the region. The target of 37% will be achieved through the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the delivery of urban extensions to Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe. The development strategy also permits the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks in accordance with Policies ST/3-ST/6.	