



Appendix C

South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework

Pre-Submission Site Specific Policies DPD Responses to Representations

Special Council 15 November 2005

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Councils' Assessment****Change to Draft DPD*****PART C - SITE SPECIFIC POLICES DPD******SP/1 Housing Allocations in Rural Areas***

8940 (Girton, Beckbrook Equestrian Centre)

Object Beckbrook Equestrian Centre is a 26 acre site located to the East of Oakington Road, Girton between Beck brook ending opposite the Barn Fitness Centre. It is accessed via Oakington Road & Gatehouse Road. The area to the West of Oakington Road is already developed. A development here would add essential housing to the region without adding to the already over congested A14. Being 2-3 miles from Cambridge City centre, it is ideally positioned for the University, Hospital etc & would encourage the use of bicycles.

The site comprises largely green field land between Girton and Oakington. It does not form part of the built up area of Girton. The site is designated as green belt, therefore its allocation for residential development would be inappropriate. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. 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. 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.

10670 - Atkins Property Development Ltd (Barhill, Land West of Bar Hill)
10676 - Atkins Property Development Ltd (Barhill, Land West of Bar Hill)

Object Objection is made to this policy as it does not include reference to 300 dwellings north west of Bar Hill. Add the following wording to SP/1: "Site 1 north west Bar Hill, Site size (ha) 10, Notional allocation 300, Notional density 30." The Structure Plan allows for development within Rural Centres where it can contribute to the social and economic need of those communities. There is no capacity within the currently drawn settlement framework to accommodate new mixed development.

Development of this site would significantly extend the built up area of Bar Hill into the countryside north of the village, beyond the current boundary of the perimeter road. Part of the site is in the zone 2 and zone 3 flood zones, identified by the Environment Agency. As such its allocation would be contrary to the sequential test advocated in PPG25. 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.

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 10788 (Meldreth, Site at Whitecroft Road) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development:Whitcroft Road, Medreth. Housing or employment. land consists of previously unused land and is well connected to the existing village framework. The site is well constrained by existing development and other defensible boundaries (Station Road and the railway line). The site, which partly sits within the village framework, is more closely related to the existing built up area than the open countryside. | As the representation states, the previously developed land part of this site lies within the village framework. The remainder of the site comprises undeveloped land, on the edge of the village, with a countryside character. Its development would effectively extend the village south. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. | |
| 8343 - Barker Parry Town Planning (Willingham, Land north of SP/1f) | Object | Land to the west of High Street/George Street Willingham adjacent to Site 6 should be allocated as a housing site. It displays the same characteristics as the identified site and would make a logical extension to the site. The land is bounded by ditches and hedgerows which create a boundary to development. It also falls without the area of identified flood risk. Access is available and in all other respects the site is unconstrained. | 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. 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. | |
| 8022 (Willingham, Land East of Rampton Road) | Object | Land east of Rampton Road on eastern edge of Willingham. Land comprises approximately 3.33 hectares of under-used nursery land and partly vacant land. Access directly from Rampton Road. The land is available and suitable for early development. The land is not hamstrung by multi-ownership or access problems. The site does not harm the character of the village. The site represents an early opportunity to provide affordable housing, education enhancements, and the provision of recreational open space. | Development of this site would extend the built up area into the countryside east of the village, to the rear of linear development along Rampton Road. 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. 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. | |
| 10275 - Old Road Securities Plc (Linton, Land North of Bartlow Road) | Object | Land north of Bartlow Road, Linton. 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. Additional external growth should be identified at Linton at land north of Bartlow Road and south of Horseheath Road. Development in these locations could be well served by public transport. | Development of this site west of Linton would result in an extension of the village into the countryside. It is a prominent site, and would effectively join the western edge of the village to the A1307. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 10869 (Great Shelford, Land at 12 Cabbage Moor) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land to south of Great Shelford Caravan and Camping Club, Cambridge Road, Great Shelford. Residential development with associated open space. | The site is designated as green belt, and proposed in the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (CSF5) for landscape improvements associated with development on the edge of Cambridge. Its development for housing would reduce the separation of the village to Cambridge, and compromise the purposes of the green belt. It would also extend the linear development along Cambridge Road into the countryside. 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. | |
| 8339 (Duxford, Land off Lacey's Way) | Object | Objection is lodged in respect of the failure to allocate land rear of Greenacres, Duxford for residential development. | This site comprises open fields north of Duxford. Development would extend the built up area of the village into the countryside. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation would not be appropriate for a group 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. | |
| 10481 - Davison & Co (Barford) Ltd (Elsworth, Land between Cambourne and Papworth Everard) | Object | Land north of the A428 Dual Carriageway Cambourne should be designated for development, as detailed on the accompanying plan. In order to secure the range and size of facilities for Cambourne to satisfy the proposed designation as a Rural Centre, it will be necessary to have a considerably greater range of facilities and population size. Without this additional growth, it is unlikely that Cambourne will become sustainable as is necessary to comply with Government objectives. | Development of this scale and in this location would have a significant impact on the landscape and character of the area. It is currently largely open countryside. It is separated from Cambourne by some distance, and by the physical barrier of the A428. 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10817 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Litlington, Land in Litlington PVAA) | Object | Within Litlington there is an ideal opportunity to create a new village green in conjunction with a small area of infill development. At present this is precluded by a PVAA, preventing this very real community benefit from coming forward. Flexibility should therefore be built into the relevant policy or the area should be amended to allow a small area of enabling development. | Not accepted. This site is designated as Protected Village Amenity Area due to the contribution it makes to the character and amenity of the village. Its allocation for development would diminish this role. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. | |
| 10627 (Dry Drayton, Land East of Cotton's Field) | Object | Land east of Cotton's Field, Dry Drayton. It is required that: (i) The site as identified is deleted from its Green Belt designation, and instead is allocated within an amended village framework. The Proposals Map for Dry Drayton (Inset Map 26) should be modified in line with the enclosed plan. (ii) The site be allocated for residential development (up to 8 dwellings as per Policy ST/5) and the remainder of the site area to provide public open space, already identified as deficient in the village in the South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study (2002). | The site is designated as green belt (addressed by separate representation), as such its allocation for residential development would be inappropriate. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation would not be appropriate for a group 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. | |
| 10537 - The W Scambler Trust (Dry Drayton, Land North of Pettitt's Close) | Object | Land north of Pettitt's Close, Dry Drayton. Objection is raised to the inclusion of our client's land within the Green Belt and outside the defined Village Framework of Dry Drayton. The site represents a logical one for residential development, as it adjoins recent residential development both to the south east and south west, and is defined by a footpath connecting to the rest of the Village along the north eastern boundary. The inclusion of this land in the Village Framework would represent a logical rounding off of a development in this vicinity, without detriment to the village form or significant incursion into the Green Belt. It is considered that further limited growth within Dry Drayton would support the local facilities whilst at the same time providing needed affordable housing in the locality. | This site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and its allocation would extend the built up area to the north. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation would not be appropriate for a group 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 11370 (Great Shelford, Powells Garage Woolards Lane) | Object | <p>It should be noted that our client's land, edged red on the attached plan, is currently in employment use.</p> <p>My client has the benefit of an extant planning permission to use the site for the erection of Warden controlled retirement flats on the land. However, this can only be implemented once the lease of the current tenants has expired.</p> <p>At that time, it should be noted that the intention would be to implement a residential or retirement flatted scheme on the land in question.</p> <p>It is, therefore, requested that the potential availability of this land was taken into account the preparation of housing land availability.</p> | <p>The South Cambridgeshire Urban Capacity Study includes an allowance for commercial land coming forward for housing development during the plan period. This acknowledges the fact that there are policy tests, detailed in policy ET/7 of the development control policies DPD, that must be met for the loss of rural employment sites to be permitted. Whether this site meets those tests will be considered through the planning applications process.</p> | |
| 8393 - Mr. D. Barford (Gamlingay, Land East of The Maltings) | Object | <p>Objection is lodged in respect of the failure to allocate land Rear of 47 Church Street, Gamlingay for residential development.</p> | <p>This land comprises green field land on the edge of the village. 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. 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.</p> | |
| 10293 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Duxford, Land South of Rectory Road) | Object | <p>Duxford, land south of Rectory Road.</p> <p>We maintain our objection to the Council's Preferred Options, and object to the Council's DPD which does not allocate our client's site for a residential-led development. We consider that our client's site should be included as a residential-led allocation and identified on the Proposals Map. The 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.</p> | <p>This site is part of the proposed designation of Established Employment Area in the Countryside. Although the site is previously developed, due to its location it does not warrant special consideration for housing development. It is located on the edge of a group village, some distance from Cambridge with limited public transport links. An additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 10424 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd (Cambourne, Proposed extension North of Cambourne) | Object | Proposed extension north of Cambourne. 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. | |
| 10434 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. (Cambourne, Proposed extension North of Cambourne) | Object | Proposed extension north of Cambourne. 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. | The representation proposes a site north of Cambourne for an additional 2500 homes. This development would have a significant impact of the landscape, using a large area of undeveloped, agricultural land. Sufficient housing capacity has been demonstrated to meet the Structure Plan guidelines for development in the rural area, therefore an additional allocation on this scale is not required. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 8017 - Conservators of the River Cam (Cambridge, Land North of the Cam in the district, Fen Road) | Object | Recreational and other pressures for the Cam are growing and foreseeably will continue to grow. The City are to introduce a mooring policy for the Commons, the number of residential houseboats will continue to rise, while other usage will expand. To accommodate the navigational needs, space needs to be found for an off-river mooring site. The Council is asked to recognise this need and to add this site which is ideal in many senses to the Site Specific Policies. Otherwise we foresee that pressure for mooring will spill further into South Cambridgeshire. (Site to be confirmed) | This site is designated as green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. The River Cam is an extremely sensitive location for development, and the designation of green belt in this area is fully justified. There is insufficient detail on any proposals to warrant specific allocation and amendment of the green belt. Any proposals should be considered against the policies of the LDF. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 10767 - Deal Farms Ltd. (Barrington, Land North of Glebe Road) | Object | Land north of Glebe Road, Barrington. Objections are raised to the omission of Land to the north of Glebe Road, Barrington from within the Village Framework and being retained within the designated Cambridge Green Belt. It is considered that residential development on the land could be accommodated without detriment to the village form, as it would represent a rounding-off of the existing development in Barrington and would be adjoined on three sides by existing residential development. Owing to the relationship of the land to the existing built form, there would be no detriment to the openness of the Green Belt should the land be developed. | <p>Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p> <p>The site is grade 2 agricultural land, lower grade land should be sought unless there are overriding sustainability reasons. 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. An allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. Development in this location would have a significant impact on the landscape.</p> | |
| 9382 - The Fairey Family (Linton, Land at The Grip, Hadstock Road) | Object | "The Grip" - Hadstock Road, Linton On the basis of the current strategy it is not thought that these 20,000 dwellings will be achieved. Further allocations are therefore needed so that the development industry can respond to a wider range of opportunities for new development. Our Site will help meet this shortfall. | The land is currently outside the village framework, and contains agricultural buildings. It is not classed as previously developed land. Its development for residential development would have a significant impact on this part of the village, and be very prominent due to the topography. 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. It is separated from the main part of the village by the A1307, and residential development is restricted in this area of the village by policy SP/9. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|-----------------------------|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 10940 (Sawston, Deal Grove) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land at Deal Farm, including nos. 64 and 62 Cambridge Road, Sawston. Residential/Farm buildings. | <p>Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p> <p>Buildings associated with agricultural are not an inappropriate use for the green belt, and these buildings do not form part of the built up character of the village. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. The development of the open part of the site would have a significant impact on the character of the settlement, the openness of the green belt, and the separation of settlements.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|---|--|--|
| 9505 - GO-East | Object | Concern is expressed that the rolling forward of these allocations appears to be inconsistent with the policies of the Core Strategy, and as such, Policy SP/1 may not be in conformity with the Core Strategy. The Council should ensure that they can robustly justify the continuing allocation of these sites relative to sustainability considerations, and particularly relative to any alternative sites might have been brought forward to be considered for allocation in other settlements that are identified in the Core Strategy as being more sustainable i.e. in Rural Centres or Minor Rural Centres. | This point is noted. The allocations are intended to provide a transition towards the Structure Plan / RSS strategy and search sequence for housing development. The Council has undertaken a full review of the remaining Local Plan 2004 housing allocations in order to produce a Housing Trajectory. Approximately half the allocations have the benefit of planning permission, and can be considered as commitments. The trajectory is able to demonstrate progress towards completion, and their continued allocation is unnecessary. Of those remaining, the trajectory demonstrates progress is likely to be made on most within the remaining life of the Local Plan. It has become evident that a number of them are not showing any progress, and cannot be relied upon to meet the housing numbers required by the Structure plan. These are located in group villages, there continued allocation in the hope that they will come forward later in the plan period is not appropriate. Therefore, the Site Specific Policy DPD only allocates two allocations in group villages, both of which now have gained planning permission after the March 2005 monitoring date. the remaining two allocations are in rural and minor rural centres. | Revise the Rural Housing allocations table, and consequential changes to the proposals map and Core Strategy (refer to Special Council Report 15th November 2005). |
| 11478 - 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. | Agreed. | In response to other objections, the Core Strategy is already proposed to be amended 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. |
| 10575 | Object | The policy should be revised to indicate that where reference is made to historic planning permissions rather than allocations, the capacity of sites with planning permissions but which do not reflect current policies in respect of density will be reviewed to accord with these policies. In respect of Site 13, Longstanton: north of Over Road, the position should be revised to indicate: (i) the the permission has been implemented (ii) that the site capacity is expected to be at least 630 dwellings. | Historic allocations which have planning permission are proposed to be deleted from the plans because they are commitments and are no longer 'proposals'. These sites will be shown in the housing land supply/trajectory section of the Annual Monitoring Report. | Delete all allocations which have planning permission. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 11353 (Longstanton, Land between Longstanton and proposed Longstanton Bypass) | Object | <p>Development of the land at Green End Farm represents the sustainable use of a site otherwise isolated between the proposed Longstanton Western Bypass and the remainder of the village, now that the Home Farm development is well under way. It would not serve as a precedent for further outward expansion into open countryside as the Bypass would represent a robust Boundary.</p> <p>Longstanton is already reasonably well-served by public transport and will be even more so with the construction of the Guided Busway. A programme of local road improvements is already in hand and these will provide improved access to Green End avoiding the centre of the village.</p> <p>These features make the site ideal for a high-quality development carefully designed to blend in with established neighbouring properties in a style which respects the character of the area and which would deliver a quantum of much needed affordable housing.</p> | <p>(1) An over-riding policy objective for Longstanton is that the village will be quite separate from Northstowe to the extent that the strategic policy requires that there be 'green separation' between the two settlements with the express purpose of maintaining Longstanton's village character. Further development in the vicinity of Home Farm would not be likely to maintain the village character of Longstanton.</p> <p>(2) Despite its proximity, Longstanton village will not enjoy the same access to the services and facilities of Northstowe as will the residents of the new town. Its suitability for development is rightly considered in the context of the limited services and facilities available within the village.</p> <p>(3) In the context of the relatively modest services and facilities in Longstanton, the development at Home Farm was only allocated and permitted in order to fund a bypass for the village. The development that has been permitted will fund the bypass and no further development is needed for that purpose.</p> <p>(4) The proposed development is very poorly located to be served by the Guided Busway at Northstowe.</p> <p>(5) As part of the planned development of Northstowe, the Cambridge Green Belt is proposed to be extended to encompass Longstanton village. The inclusion of the objection site in the extended green belt will be important to ensuring that Longstanton village is seen in a countryside setting from the bypass.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10738 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc | Object | <p>These objections relate to:</p> <p>(f) Policy SP/1 in respect of the reliance on a range of less sustainable rural allocations than a comprehensive development at Cambourne would provide; and</p> <p>(g) The failure of the Plan to allocate sufficient housing sites/reserve sites in the context of the above to meet the Structure Plan requirement by 2016.</p> | <p>(f) 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).</p> <p>(g) It is not accepted that reserve sites are needed. The sites in villages allocated in Local Plan No.2 which were tested and revised against the requirements of PPG3 have provided for the housebuilding industry to keep pace with demand whilst the Local Development Framework policies and proposals are being prepared. The LDF includes housing trajectories for the development sites in the the Core Strategy and the Area Action Plans which have been prepared in discussion with landowners/developers which demonstrate that the housing targets can be met by 2016 WITHOUT any contribution from development at North West Cambridge. Should any unforeseen circumstances cause any variation from the housing trajectories, once the Area Action Plan for North West Cambridge has been completed, additional housing will begin to come on-stream and will make good those shortfalls. In addition, the 'saved' Structure Plan takes an holistic view of development in the Cambridge Sub-Region by bracketting the housing figures of the City and South Cambridgeshire District Councils. The City Council's Local Plan will be adopted by June 2006 and (subject to market conditions) will result in a significant increase in housing land supply for example in the Cambridge Southern Fringe where Countryside Properties Plc will be developing up to 2,500 dwellings.</p> <p>(h) The Structure Plan requirement for 9600 dwellings in the Rural Area up to 2016 is therefore largely met by existing</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 10849 (Caldecote, Land rear of 104 West Drive) | Object | Land at the rear of 104 West Drive, Caldecote. An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Residential with associated Public Open Space and facilities as required by the Local Planning Authority. Representations are made in respect of the omission of land land to the rear of 104 West Drive, Caldecote from within the Village Framework of Highfields Caldecote. Site formerly comprised part of Grafton Pig Farms. Site also adjoins residential development which has been recently implemented, and from which vehicular access into the land has been retained. | <p>completions and commitments, windfalls within settlements and reviewing the density of development in the remaining area of Cambourne. The allocation of a large area of countryside at Bourn Airfield is not required. Should any shortfalls occur higher up the development sequence it should not be met by allocating additional land in the Rural Area which would have the effect of making the pattern of in South Cambridgeshire less sustainable than proposed in the 'saved' Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and national planning policy set out in PPG3 "Housing".</p> <p>Although the area within the current village framework adjoining the site has recently been developed, development of the site to the rear would result in a significant extension of the village into the countryside to the west of the village. An additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| 10027 - Bayer CropScience Ltd (Hauxton, The Bayer CropScience Ltd Site) | Object | The Bayer CropScience Ltd site should be allocated in the Plan. Policy SPP/1 fails to make an appropriate allocation. The Bayer CropScience Ltd site has acknowledged residential potential, is readily available for redevelopment and should be incorporated in the policy. The policy text should be amended according to the rationale and text set out in the attached covering statement. The company supports the preparation of a planning brief for the Hauxton site and is well advanced in its technical work. | The Bayer CropScience Ltd site at Hauxton is a major employment site close to Hauxton village but located in the countryside which forms an important part of the Cambridge Green Belt on a prominent approach to the city. As a site which until recently was used wholly employment site in the countryside was not sustainable and the underlying objective for any redevelopment must be to make the site more sustainable whilst recognising that redevelopment of just 8 hectares of land cannot result in a wholly sustainable development. The intention is to create a mixed development with a balance on homes and jobs on the site. The actual amount of homes and jobs to be determined as a result of a masterplan or development brief which will take account of such factors as site contamination/remediation, proximity to the floodplain and measures to compensate for the shortcomings of the location for residential development. | <p>Add a new policy SP/2 (and renumber all existing policies accordingly) to read: "Bayer Cropscience, Hauxton (title).</p> <p>Land at BayerCropScience Plc, Hauxton, is allocated for a sustainable mixed use development. Development of the 8.7 hectare site will comprise an even balance between jobs in B1 employment development, and numbers of dwellings, as well as open space and community facilities.</p> <p>The development will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <input type="checkbox"/> The creation of riverside informal openspace linking between the proposed Trumoington Meadows Country Park and Hauxton village, retaining appropriate existing features of ecological interest, and creation of new features that will enhance the site. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Establishing pedestrian and cycle links to the Trumpington West Development, and to the Trumpington Park & Ride. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Establishing pedestrian and cycle links to the village of Hauxton. 4. Contributions to improved public transport provision along the A10 corridor. 5. Finding uses for the Listed Buildings on the site at the Hauxton Mill complex. 6. The remediation of all land contaminated by the former industrial processes. 7. Redevelopment will secure a reduced visual impact of the site on |

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

the openness of the Cambridge Green Belt.

A masterplan will be required for the site. (policy)

The Bayer Cropscience site near Hauxton offers a specific opportunity where a brownfield site is to come available for redevelopment, located near to the edge of Cambridge. The site comprises an intensively developed industrial site, including manufacturing and warehousing. Appropriate redevelopment will comprise a mix of uses, to maximise sustainability. It will enable visual improvement of this prominent site, improving a major approach into Cambridge. It will need to be sensitively designed to take account of its position surrounded by the Green Belt. It is capable of being developed with good links to the Trumpington West development, and Trumpington Park & Ride, as well as the village of Hauxton itself. The site also offers opportunities for improved access to the River Cam. Part of the site lies within the medium risk flood zone, and appropriate mitigation measures will be required.

Proposals for redevelopment of the recreation buildings and waste water treatment facility on the western side of the A10 will be considered in the context of proposals for appropriate development within the green belt. (written justification)

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 8098 - Dencora/Helical Bar (Sawston, Deal Grove) | Object | Sawston is properly identified as a Rural Centre. Its role can be strengthened by the allocation of land for a mixed scheme of housing, employment and open space on its northern side. That would also bring with it the opportunity to construct a local relief road, which has had some support in the past from the local community. | Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. The development of the site would have a significant impact on the character of the settlement, the openness of the green belt, and the separation of settlements. | |
| 8118 - Freshwater Estates Ltd. (Sawston, Land at 41 Mill Lane) | Object | Land at Mill Lane Sawston should be allocated for residential development. Site is surrounded by existing development, no history of flooding, outside green belt, within 650m of secondary school/sports centre. Site is occupied by existing dwelling and outbuildings, and constitutes previously developed land defined in PPG3 and its development is in accordance with policy ST/2 of the draft core strategy. Site is located in settlement with good public transport links, good shopping and other services and good employment opportunities, designated as a rural centre. | The site mainly comprises open fields, as well as some agricultural buildings. The part of the site fronting Mill Road may be considered as previously developed land, as it comprises an existing dwelling. 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10811 - C & A Locke (Whittlesford, Land at Granta Cottage, Mill Lane) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land adjoining Swan's corner, Mill Lane, Whittlesford. Residential land adjacent to Swan's Corner, in Whittlesford is considered appropriate for exclusion from the Green Belt on account of its more direct association with the built form of the existing settlement than to the adjacent countryside. | This site is currently outside the village framework and designated as green belt, although it has recently been enclosed by fencing. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 10902 - St John's College (Girton, Land at the end of Cockerton Road) | Object | In the context of reclassification of Girton to a higher status settlement, the land identified on the plan attached should be allocated for housing. | This site constitutes open land on the edge of the village, currently designated as green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. 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. 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 10567 (Fulbourn, Land at Home End) | Object | Land at Home End, Fulbourn. An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Lane at Home End, Fulbourn. Residential. Objections are raised to the omission of Lane at Home End, Fulbourn from within the Village Framework and also for the proposed designation of Important Countryside Frontage and the designation within the Cambridge Green Belt. The site is suitable for small scale residential development, as it is within the core of the Village and adjoins a residential development both to the north and south and existing development on the opposite side of Home End. | This site is outside the village framework, designated as green belt, and an important countryside frontage. Given these designations it would be inappropriate to allocate for residential development. 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. 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. | |
| 9065 - The Cambourne Consortium (Caxton, Land West of Cambourne) | Object | The Development Control Policies DPD should contain a policy allocating an urban extension to west of Cambourne. The urban extension would form a fourth character area within an enlargement settlement. | This site mainly comprises agricultural land to the east of Lower Cambourne. Its development would significantly increase the footprint of the village, and result in the loss of a significant area of green field land. 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. | |
| 9946 (Fulbourn, Land West of Station Road including proposed Railway Station) | Object | An additional / alternative site is put forward to complement the re-designation of Fulbourn as a Rural Centre. This site would provide for a mixed-use development that would deliver a new railway station, a community centre and affordable homes as well as general open market housing. The development can be brought forward immediately. The site is identified on the accompanying plan. The allocation of this land should be accompanied by its removal from the Cambridge Green Belt, as previously recommended by the appointed Inspector at the Green Belt Inquiry, and subsequently endorsed by the local authority commissioned study undertaken by Colin Buchanan and Partners. As confirmed by these recommendations and study the land does not fulfil any of the identified criteria to justify the continuing retention of the land within the Cambridge Green Belt. This site is no longer, and hasn't been suitable for some time, for farming. | This site is outside the village framework and designated as green belt. 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. 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10375 (Oakington, Land at Water Lane/Kettles Close) | Object | Land at Water Lane / Kettles Close, Oakington. We also recommend the inclusion of an additional housing allocation on our client's land south of water Lane. The site is no different than the allocation of the Council's depot site in terms of size or orientation, and the proposals are attached accordingly for the allocation of this site. At the last Local Plan review, the Inspector clearly indicated that given the lawful use of the site for commercial purposes, consideration should be given to its exclusion from the Green Belt. We note no such consideration has been given, despite the fact that arguments for its exclusion were generally supported by the Inspector and we had anticipated that the consequential amendment would be included in this Local Plan. | This site comprises green field land designated as green belt. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 7878 (Histon, Land adjoining 59 & 61 Cottenham Road) | Object | Land adjoining 59 and 61 Cottenham Road Histon could make a valuable contribution to market and affordable housing in a large village, which is a recognised Centre. Histon has very good services and good public transport. Allocating these sites would be fully in line with the principles of sustainable development. | This site comprises undeveloped land north of the village. The land is designated as green belt, therefore its allocation for housing development would be inappropriate. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. 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. 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| 10626 (Arrington, Land north of Church Farm, Church Lane) | Object | Land at Arrington should be included within the village framework and allocated for residential development. The inclusion of the site represents a logical extension to the village framework. It is pertinent to note that the designation of the Important Countryside frontage was removed at the suggestion of the Local Plan Inspector in 2000, in recognition that the land is in no way connected to the Open Countryside. Sites in smaller villages can benefit the amenity of the village in terms of services and provide much needed affordable housing. | With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. | |
| 8424 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee (Papworth Everard, Land S of North Lodge Drive) | Object | There is a 1.642 hectare site to the south of North Lodge Drive in Papworth Everard that was granted outline planning permission for B1 use in 1998. A January 2004 application to use the site for residential development was approved. A full planning application for housing has recently been submitted by a developer. This site allocation does not appear in the draft LDF under either SP/1 or SP/5. | As the representation states, this site has the benefit of planning permission. Its allocation is unnecessary. | |
| 8115 (Impington, Land South of Clay Close Lane) | Object | Land south of Clay Close Lane Impington. The site is largely surrounded by existing residential development and bounded by Clay Cross Lane. It is within 150m of a secondary school and associated sports centre and within walking distance of the village centre. The site is located within a settlement with good public transport links, shopping, other local services and employment opportunities which is designated as a Rural Centre. The site is within the physical structure of the settlement and fulfils none of the purposes of Green Belts as set out in PPG2. It should be included in the Village Framework and allocated for Residential Development in Policy SP/1. | This site is designated as green belt. Its allocation for development would compromise the purposes of the green belt. Development would be detrimental to the open character of Clay Close lane. 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. | |
| 11471 - 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. | Although details of monitoring are included in the LDF Monitoring Strategy, the need for details to be included in the DPD itself is acknowledged. | Include in the Site Specific Policies DPD, details of monitoring arrangements, including a housing trajectory. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10687 - David Wilson Estates | Object | On the grounds of sustainability, residential allocations should be made in relation to locations which fall above the rural areas in the settlement hierarchy. On this basis, the following notional allocations made at Policy SP/1 should be amended so that non-rural centre settlements only permit scheme sizes of up to 15 dwellings, as follows: Site 4, Waterbeach, Notional allocation 85, Max No. of dwellings allowed -15, Over allocation =70. Site 6, Willingham, 72, -15, =57. Site 7, Bassinbourn, 18, -15, =3. Site 8, Highfields, 76, -15, =61. Site 12 Guilden Morden, 18, -15, =3. Site 14 Meldreth, 29, -15, =14. Site 16 Oakington, 32, -15, =17. Site 22 Heathfield, 37, -15, =22. Total = 247.sp/ | The Local Plan 2004 allocations form a transition towards the Structure Plan 2003 / RSS strategy. The Housing Trajectory (to be included in the Submission DPD) has submitted these allocations to further scrutiny, and is able to demonstrate progress on these allocations and there expected completions date. The majority of these allocations now have planning permission, and for the remaining, progress is being made towards completion. | |
| 10474 - Balsham (Building) Ltd (Balsham, 7 High Street) | Object | Balsham (Building) Ltd, Balsham, 0.8 ha. Possible residential development. | With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 10781 (Meldreth, Site at back of 1 Whitcroft Road) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Whitcroft Road, Medreth. Housing or employment. Land consists of previously unused land and is well connected to the existing village framework. The site is well constrained by existing development and other defensible boundaries (Station Road and the railway line). The site, which partly sits within the village framework, is more closely related to the existing built up area than the open countryside. | Although part of this site is within the village framework, it has a distinct rural character, and its allocation would intensify use of the site, as linear development extending into the countryside. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 10369 (Willingham, Land West of Haden Way) | Object | <p>We feel that a further site for development should be included for residential development on our client's land. This site is equally suitable for development as land allocated to the west of High Street, as the land is already a residential street, serving a substantial amount of development off Hayden Way, and surrounded by further development to the north and a caravan site to the west. It is undoubtedly suitable for development, and we would ask that this be made an additional allocation in the plan to accommodate 30 to 40 houses.</p> | <p>The site mainly comprises open land, and buildings associated with agriculture. Development would effectively extend the built up area of the village further west into the countryside. The site is proposed to be designated as Green Belt in the Pre-Submission LDF. 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. 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.</p> | |
| 10320 - Highways Agency | Object | <p>With regard to the Site Specific Policies, the Highways Agency has concerns about proposed development at Cambridge Northern Fringe, Cambridge Northern Fringe East (Chesterton Sidings), Papworth Everard, Cambridge Airport, and Cambourne all of which could have implications for the trunk road network. We would wish to see evidence that the scale of development proposed could be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the operation of the adjacent trunk roads.</p> | <p>The development plan seeks to reduce the need to travel, and where unavoidable, achieve access by non-car modes. Policy TR/1 will not permit development where additional travel demand is not sufficiently addressed through providing modal choice, and Policy TR/3 is concerned with mitigating traffic impact and requires a Transport Assessment be undertaken for development with 'significant transport implications', in accordance with PPG13. Policy DP/3 criteria 2 is concerned with securing "appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety." Whilst not making explicit mention of the trunk road network, these policies address concerns raised.</p> <p>Historically development which came forward through policies in Local Plan 2004 made provision to mitigate their impacts, for example, development at Cambourne contributed to the dualling of the A428 and Cambridge Northern Fringe provides additional capacity at existing junctions onto the A14. Similarly, the LDF should ensure that future development adequately mitigates its impact. The Highways Agency has been fully engaged in the early work on planning the major developments at Northstowe and Cambridge East with active membership on the Transport Topic Groups. The Highways Authority is also consulted on all planning applications in the vicinity of the trunk road network and if a planning application were considered to jeopardise the trunk road network in any way, could recommend appropriate mitigation or even refusal.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 10680 (Great Wilbraham, Land North of Toft Lane) | Object | By taking the 1st Strip at Toft Lane great Wilbraham out of the green Belt small starter type houses 1/2 bedrooms could be built matching those already built in Toft Lane Nos 15 - 21. | The site comprises an open frontage, designated as green belt. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation would not be appropriate in a group 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. | |
| 10690 - Cambridgeshire Recycling (Gamlingay, Industrial Land SW of Gamlingay) | Object | Land off Potton Road, Gamlingay, should be allocated for a mixed use development, including housing, to help address this shortfall and to maintain and improve the service centre role of this village, as illustrated in the enclosed Design Strategy. The Council has not demonstrated that enough land is genuinely available, through the LDF process, to meet the Structure Plan housing requirement to 2016. | The site comprises scattered development and open fields along Potton Road, south of Gamlingay. It is separated from the built up area of the village, and as such its allocation for development would result in a large development in the countryside. 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. 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. Rural Centres would be examined if allocations were required. | |
| 10590 (Foxton, Land between A10 & Foxton) 10584 (Foxton, Land between A10 & Foxton) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land to the North of Shepreth Rd, Foxton. Residential development with associated public open space and any other facilities required by the Local Planning Authority. | The site comprises of a field that separates the south west of Foxton from the A10. Development on this scale would have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the village, and involve the development of a significant area of green field land. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10591 (Foxton, Land at Beech Tree Farm, South of Shepreth Road) 10586 (Foxton, Land at Beech Tree Farm, South of Shepreth Road) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: land to the south of Shepreth Road, Foxton. Residential development with associated public open space and any other facilities required by the Local Planning Authority | The site comprises agricultural land to the west of the village. Its development would result in an extension of the built up area as ribbon development along Shepreth Road, into open countryside. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 10512 (Swavesey, Proposed recreation ground West of Middlewatch) | Object | Land off Boxworth End, Swavesey. Mixed development including residential/employment/public open space | Although considered separately this site is isolated green field land in the countryside, the representation requests that it be considered as part of a comprehensive development of this area of Swavesey. As a whole this would be a very large increase in the size of the village, and result in the development of a significant area of countryside. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 10504 (Swavesey, Land North of Rose & Crown Road) | Object | Land north of Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey. An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land to the north of Rose and Crown Road, Swavesey. Residential/employment/public open space/structural landscaping and other facilities as required by the LPA. | The site comprises green field land in the countryside west of Swavesey. Development would significantly extend the village along Rose and Crown Road, having a negative impact on the openness of the area. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 8099 - Thriplow Farms Ltd (Thriplow, The Granery, Lodge Road (site 29/07/05)) | Object | Land at The Granery, Lodge Road Thriplow. Thriplow is recognised as a Group Village, reflecting the presence of the primary school, shop, public house, recreation ground and employment. It could absorb and would benefit from some limited additional housing beyond the threshold of up to 15 dwellings. This site, which has brownfield characteristics (albeit predominantly old farm buildings), is not included within the green belt and is shown outside but adjacent to the existing village framework. Its redevelopment for housing would achieve significant visual improvements as well as bringing the benefits of a limited amount of housing to the village. | This site is primarily agricultural buildings, and as such has been designated outside the village framework. Its development for housing would have a potentially negative impact on the rural character of this area of the village. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10612 (Swavesey, Land North of Taylors Lane) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land to the north of Taylors Lane, Swavesey: Residential and associated public open space. It is considered that a comprehensive development within this area, which already has an extant planning permission for the erection of a tennis club and associated courts, would be to the benefit of the village. Part of the land could be developed for residential purposes at the same time as facilitating public access to part of the scheduled Ancient Monument which forms part of this site. It is pertinent to note that Swavesey is identified as currently being short of public open space which this proposal would address. | The site largely comprises open land, with some scattered development. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Development for housing would have a significant impact on the village, extending the built up area to the north into the countryside. There are a number of designations which reduce its suitability for allocation. The southern part of the site is designated as a scheduled ancient monument, and is in a Conservation Area. The northern part of the site is a County Wildlife Site. Much of the site is within the high and medium risk flood zones. PPG25 requires a sequential test, seeking sites with a lower flood risk first. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 10608 - Dixon International Group Ltd (Pampisford, Land North of Brewery Raod) | Object | The Dixon International Group site at Brewery Road, Pampisford, as previously developed land, has qualities suitable to promote it as a housing allocation. Its proximity and close association with Sawston, the largest village identified as a Rural Centre renders it appropriate for consideration. Previously developed land should take precedence over greenfield allocations and the site presents a clear and logical solution to meet the housing land supply targets in the rural area and address the identified shortfall to 2016. | Whilst the site falls within the village framework of Pampisford, development of this site would significantly go beyond the scale permitted in an infill village. An additional allocation on this scale 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. Although close to Sawston, its is still a significant distance from the village centre. It is not accepted that Pampisford should be considered as part of the rural centre of sawston. 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 10749 - Latent Land (Balsham, Land North of High Street) | Object | Land to the rear of 108 High Street, Balsham should be included within the village framework and allocated for residential development. | This is a green field site to the north of the village situated in a conservation area. Its development would form backland development extending the village into the countryside. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. Further allocations are also not required to achieve the anticipated amount of windfall development. | |
| 10531 - Yardline Limited (Pampisford, Land East of High Street) | Object | Land east of High Street, Pampisford. Objections are made to our client's land being excluded from the Village Framework, yet included within the Conservation Area and omitted from the Green Belt designation. There would appear to be no apparent reason for the Village Framework as indicated, which takes no account of access to the parking areas to the rear of properties fronting on to the High Street. The development of the land for residential purposes would enhance the visual amenity of this part of the Conservation Area by the removal of the overgrown scrub and debris. Vehicular access could be obtained from the High Street via that existing and any development on the land would be in keeping with that of surrounding and would not project development into the open countryside. | Although semi enclosed by garden uses, this area of open land remains outside the built up area of the village. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale 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. | |
| 10497 - Mr. B. Baker, Mr. R Mallandine, The W Scrambler Trust (Swavesey, Land between Whitton Close/Rose & Crown Road) | Object | Land between Whitton Close / Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey. An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land to the south of Whitton Close, and north of Rose and Crown Road, Swavesey. Mixed residential/employment/public open space and other facilities. | The site mainly comprises fields to the west of the village. Its development would significantly extend the village into the countryside, and have a significant impact on the character of the village. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10657 (Over, Land East of Recreation Ground) 10662 (Over, Land East of Recreation Ground) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Residential. Objections are raised to the fact Land at the Doles, New Road, Over, has been omitted from the Village Framework for Over and allocated as an extension to the existing recreation ground. It is considered more appropriate for the additional recreational facilities to be located on the outskirts of the Village, whilst facilitating further residential development land more conveniently situated for all facilities. | The site is green field, comprising of pasture adjoining the existing recreation ground. It is well located for the extension of the recreation ground, a use for which it is allocated by policy SP/7. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 10089 - House Builders Federation | Object | It is stated at the beginning that development briefs will be required for all sites prior to a planning application. However, given the limited size of some of the sites listed, this would not seem to be a necessary requirement. | In the interests of good design and high quality development, it is important that housing allocations, as areas of significant change, are supported by a development brief. | |
| 8094 (Little Gransden, Land NW of 20 Primrose Walk) | Object | Land north west of Primrose Walk Little Gransden should be allocated for development. This is a brownfield site, having had several nissen huts and currently has significant areas of concrete and old foundations; it has been used as an occasional tip and is generally an eyesore. The site relates well to the existing development along Primrose Walk. The site would contribute to the policy to maximise development on brownfield sites. It could accommodate 3 affordable and 3 market houses and, at almost 0.2 ha, this would exceed 30 per hectare. | This site is largely overgrown, and evidence of any previous built development is limited. Development would effectively extend the built up area of the village into the countryside. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10507 - The W Scambler Trust (Swavesey, Land South of Whitton Close) 10573 - The W Scambler Trust (Swavesey, Land South of Whitton Close) | Object | Land south of Whitton Close, Swavesey. An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land to the south of Whitton Close, Swavesey. Residential. It is considered that this land represents a logical extension to the Village Framework of the settlement, to which access could be obtained from Whitton Close following the demolition of one property. In addition, the land could form part of a larger rectangular allocation extending to Rose and Crown Road to the south, which could accommodate a mixed development beneficial to Swavesey, without extending the Village Framework to detriment to the setting of the Village. | The site comprises green field land in the countryside adjoining Swavesey. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 10636 - Munro Group Ltd (Waterbeach, Land North of Cambridge Road) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land to the North of Cambridge Road, Waterbeach. Residential. The land represents a logical rounding off of the village framework of Waterbeach given its proximity to Cambridge Road. | This site is designated as green belt (addressed in response to representation 10634), and residential development would be inappropriate. Its development would extend the built up area of the village into the countryside east of the village. 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. 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. Rural Centres would be examined if allocations were required. | |
| 9458 - Defence Lands Ops North (Waterbeach Barracks) | Object | Waterbeach Barracks is available for development and has the potential to provide 6,000 residential units, as well as a significant employment contribution of up to 90,000m2 floorspace. Infrastructure provision would include high quality bus and rail based public transport and a mixed-use new settlement of sufficient scale to support a full range of urban facilities, including a secondary school. | Sufficient housing land has been identified through the local development framework to meet the requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003. A new settlement at Waterbeach was not included in the Structure plan, and is not required to achieve the required housing numbers. The need for any future new settlement will be considered through the Regional Spatial strategy. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10846 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Waterbeach, Land between Waterbeach and railway) | Object | Land between Waterbeach and railway, Waterbeach. Waterbeach should be a Rural Centre. Land south of Bannold Road, Waterbeach to the east of the village should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development. The Inset Boundary for the village should follow the line of the railway line. The floodplain map should be re-evaluated. | This site is designated as green belt (addressed in response to representation 10843), and allocation for residential development would be inappropriate. Development would extend the built up area into green field land east of the village. 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. 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. Rural Centres would be examined if allocations were required. The Flood Zone maps are produced by the Environment Agency, who are also responsible for any future updates. | |
| 9379 - The Fairey Family (Linton, Land at Long Lane) | Object | Land at Long Lane, Linton. On the basis of the current strategy it is not thought that these 20,000 dwellings will be achieved. Further allocations are therefore needed so that the development industry can respond to a wider range of opportunities for new development. Our Site will help meet this shortfall. | 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. The site is in the zone 2 and zone 3 flood zones, identified by the Environment Agency. As such its allocation would be contrary to the sequential test advocated in PPG25. Part of the site is within a Conservation Area. It is separated from the main part of the village by the A1307, and residential development is restricted in this area of the village by policy SP/9. | |
| 9380 - The Fairey Family (Linton, Land at Webbs, Balsham Road) | Object | "Webbs" - Balsham Road, Linton On the basis of the current strategy it is not thought that these 20,000 dwellings will be achieved. Further allocations are therefore needed so that the development industry can respond to a wider range of opportunities for new development. Our Site will help meet this shortfall. | Allocation for development on this scale and in this location would have a significant impact on the setting of the village, and be extremely prominent in the landscape. 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10830 (Waterbeach, Land adjacent to Pieces Lane) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land adjacent to Pieces Lane, Waterbeach. Residential. The land represents a logical rounding off of the village framework of Waterbeach by the inclusion of land which is contiguous with existing residential development on three sides. | Half of this site is designated as green belt (addressed in response to representation 10828), and allocation for development would be inappropriate. Development would extend the built up area into green field land east of the village. 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. 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. Rural Centres would be examined if allocations were required. | |
| 10750 - Latent Land (Balsham, Land East of Fox Street) | Object | Land to the east of Fox Road, Balsham should be included within the village framework and allocated for residential development. | The site mainly comprises undeveloped land outside the built up area of the village. Its development would effectively extend the village into the countryside. The affordable housing rural exception site which is included in the site, does not set a precedent for further development, and is an appropriate countryside use. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. Amendments to frameworks are not required to achieve the anticipated windfall rate, as demonstrated by the Urban Capacity Study. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10722 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc (Cambourne, Land East of Cambourne) | Object | These submissions relate to an amendment to the Proposals Map for Cambourne. Details of the proposals for this 'omission site' are contained in the attached brochure. Without the inclusion of the omission site, the Plan fails the test of soundness set out in PPS12 para 4.24 (vii), in terms of the identification of the most appropriate site allocations. | <p>Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required to meet the requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure plan 2003. The requirement for 9600 dwelling in the rural area up to 2016 is largely met by existing completions and commitments, windfalls within settlements, and reviewing the density of the development in the remaining area of Cambourne. The allocation of a large area of land in the countryside is not required.</p> <p>The Council is endeavouring to ensure housing requirements are delivered. Any shortfalls higher up the development sequence should they occur would be identified by monitoring, and future reviews of the LDF. Development would be sought at that level in the sequence to redress this, following the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan.</p> | |
| 10372 - J W Burgess & Son (Swavesey, Dairy Farm Boxworth End) | Object | Dairy farm, Boxworth End Swavesey should be included as a new allocation and an amendment to Proposals Map Inset 96. | <p>The site comprises open pasture, and some farm buildings. The site is designated as an Important Countryside Frontage to reflect the importance of the openness of this frontage to the character of the village. Its development would therefore have a significant detrimental impact. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10890 - Ashdale Land & Property Consultants (Waterbeach, Land North of Poorsfield Road) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Residential. Land to the north of Poorsfield Road, Waterbeach. The land is well located to the existing built-up area of Waterbeach, and will not encroach beyond the westerly extent of the village envelope. Its inclusion within the framework is entirely logical. The site is located outside the Green Belt, the boundary of which would represent a more sensible boundary. The land was recommended for inclusion within the framework by the Local Plan Inspector in 2002. | Harding Close and Vicarage Close were allocated for residential development in the 1982 Waterbeach and Landbeach District Plan. The small parcels of land between them were specifically excluded from development to provide land either side of a network of rural public footpaths which run from Green Side and Cambridge Road to Ely Road. Including these areas within the Village Framework and allowing development would make development very prominent and substantially change the character of this public footpath. 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. 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. Rural Centres would be examined if allocations were required. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 8935 (Oakington, Land behind 64 Water Lane) | Object | It is considered that an additional small allocation should be made at Oakington and that the land to the rear of 64 Water Lane is the most appropriate location for such an allocation. | This site comprising open land does not form part of the built up area of the village. It is designated as green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 9158 - Foregreen Developments Ltd (Waterbeach, Land down Gibson Close) | Object | Land west of Gibson Close, Waterbeach, should be included within the village framework and positively allocated for housing under Policy SP/1. This could be in isolation or in conjunction with adjacent parcels of land, all of which (in common with the subject site) are excluded from the Green Belt. This would accord with the recommendation of the previous Local Plan Inquiry Inspector, whose recommendation was unjustifiably rejected by the Council. | Harding Close and Vicarage Close were allocated for residential development in the 1982 Waterbeach and Landbeach District Plan. The small parcels of land between them were specifically excluded from development to provide land either side of a network of rural public footpaths which run from Green Side and Cambridge Road to Ely Road. Including these areas within the Village Framework and allowing development would make development very prominent and substantially change the character of this public footpath. 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. 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. Rural Centres would be examined if allocations were required. | |
| 10287 - Cambridge Water Company (Fulbourn, Land between Teversham Road and Cow Lane) | Object | On the basis of an under-provision of necessary housing to achieve Structure Plan totals, an allocation for housing in Fulbourn is justified on the identified site. | This site comprises open fields to the north of the village. 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. 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. Rural Centres would be examined if allocations were required. | |
| 10274 - Old Road Securities Plc (Waterbeach, Land at Denny End) | Object | Land at Denny End Road Waterbeach. Waterbeach can accommodate additional growth outside the current settlement limits. Land at Denny End Road, whilst in the Green Belt, provides a sustainable development site being adjacent to existing employment opportunities. | This site west of waterbeach is designated as Green Belt (addressed by response to representation 9923). Its development would merge the village with the industrial estate. 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. 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. Rural Centres would be examined if allocations were required. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10898 - H C Moss (Builders) Ltd (Melbourn, Land at East Farm) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Residential development with associated structural landscaping and facilities as required by the LPA. Land at East Farm, Melbourn. Melbourn is considered to be an extremely sustainable location, not only with regard to existing facilities and services within Melbourn itself, but owing to its close proximity to Royston. Bearing in mind the entirely different character of the site in question from the surrounding agricultural countryside, it is considered appropriate to include it within the Village Framework. | The site comprises an orchard and associated uses south of the village. Residential development would effectively extend the village south into the countryside, utilising predominantly green field land. 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. 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. Rural Centres are higher up the search sequence, and would be examined prior to minor rural centres if allocations were required. | |
| 10642 - Munro Group Ltd (Waterbeach, Land between Bannold Road/Burgess Road) | Object | Land between Bannold Road and Burgess Road, Waterbeach. Residential. The land represents a logical rounding off of the village framework of Waterbeach by the inclusion of land which is contiguous with existing residential development on three sides. It is anticipated that the principal access can be achieved from Bannold Road, a secondary access could connect to Pieces court to the west, and Burgess Road could be used essentially for cycle and pedestrian use. | This site is predominantly designated as green belt (addressed in response to representation 10643), and residential development would be inappropriate. Development would extend the built up area into green field land east of the village. 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. 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. Rural Centres would be examined if allocations were required. | |
| 10923 (Kneesworth, Land North of Kneesworth Site B) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: land to the north of Chestnut Lane Kneesworth. Site would accommodate additional housing land, in a sustainable position in relation to the facilities both within Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, and the nearby centre of Royston. Site could also provide needed public open space together with residential/employment | Allocation for development would result in a significant eastern expansion of the village into the countryside. An additional allocation on this scale 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. The site is grade 2 agricultural land, and therefore lower grade land should be used unless sustainability considerations dictate otherwise. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 10478 - Davison & Co (Barford) Ltd (Papworth Everard, Land North East of Papworth Everard) | Object | Land to the east of Papworth Everard, Residential, open space and other facilities that the Local Planning Authority might require□□ | Site is primarily made up of agricultural land, north of Papworth Everard. It is a prominent site visible from a long distance from the surrounding area. Development in this location would have a significant impact on the landscape. It would result in a large increase in the size of the village, some distance from the existing centre. 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. An allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. | |
| 8783 (Willingham, Land behind 5-23 Green Street) | Object | Our client seeks the residential allocation of land generally south of Priest Lane and east of Green Street, Willingham. The site is well-contained in landscape terms and would present an ideal opportunity to round the village off in this location, whilst offering the potential for perhaps 80-90 new residential units, including much needed affordable housing (which would represent at least 30% of the total number of units). | The site consists of properties fronting Green Street, and green field land in the countryside to the rear. The site as mapped appears to include a number of existing properties, including two listed buildings. The northern part of the site is in a Conservation Area. Without redevelopment of fronting properties, this may be considered as backland development with limited access. 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. An allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a minor rural centre, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at Rural Centres. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 11018 - Trustees of the Estate of the Late D L January (Great Shelford, Land NW of 11 Cambridge Road) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land to the northwest of 11 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford. Residential development. As the site is heavily treed on all sides, it is not seen in relation with the adjoining open countryside from which it is totally different in character. As a consequence, there would appear to be no conflict with the stated aims of the Green Belt if this land was removed and developed for residential purposes. Any development scheme could retain the existing trees in the road frontage as the existing vehicular access could serve the development. | <p>The site is currently green belt, and protected by an Important Countryside Frontage along Cambridge Road. Residential development would reduce the openness of this part of the frontage.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p> <p>Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. 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.</p> | |
| 10486 (Caldecote, Land at 44 East Drive) | Object | Land adjoining 44 East Drive, Caldecote, 0.35ha, An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Residential. | <p>The site is part of the countryside to the east of the village. Access is limited. An allocation on such a minor scale, and in this location, would not be appropriate. 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 10851 (Caldecote, Land rear of 10 West Drive) | Object | Land at the rear of 10 West Drive, Caldecote. An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Residential with associated Public Open Space and facilities as required by the Local Planning Authority. Representations are made in respect of the omission of land land to the rear of land to the rear of 10 West Drive, Caldecote from within the Village Framework of Highfields Caldecote. Site formerly comprised part of Grafton Pig Farms. Site also adjoins residential development which has been recently implemented, and from which vehicular access into the land has been retained. | Although the area within the current village framework adjoining the site has recently been developed, development of the site to the rear would result in a significant extension of the village into the countryside to the west of the village. An additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. | |
| 10799 - Jesus College (Cambridge) (Harston, Beech Farm Church Street) | Object | The Beech Farm site at Harston should be allocated for residential development. It provides the opportunity for sustainable residential development which would result in the removal of a use which is to the detriment of surrounding residential amenity. Planning permission was recently refused for further development at Cambourne. The Beech Farm site provides a sustainable alternative opportunity for the accommodation of this growth. A sustainability appraisal of the site will be carried out for the Council's consideration. | the site comprises a farm in the countryside to the north of the village. Its development could reduce the openness of the frontage of Church Street, and therefore have a negative impact on an Important Countryside Frontage. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 10856 (Caldecote, Land rear of 10 West Drive) | Object | Land at the rear of 10 West Drive, Caldecote. An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Residential with associated Public Open Space and facilities as required by the Local Planning Authority. Representations are made in respect of the omission of land land to the rear of land to the rear of 10 West Drive, Caldecote from within the Village Framework of Highfields Caldecote. Site formerly comprised part of Grafton Pig Farms. Site also adjoins residential development which has been recently implemented, and from which vehicular access into the land has been retained. | Although the area within the current village framework adjoining the site has recently been developed, development of the site to the rear would result in a significant extension of the village into the countryside to the west of the village. An additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 10685 - Atkins Property Development Ltd | Object | No allocations should be made in the Minor Rural Centres or Group Villages as new development should be directed towards the Rural Centres on the grounds of sustainability. On this premise, the following notional allocations made at Policy SP/1 should be changed so that non Rural Centre settlements only allow scheme sizes of up to 15 dwellings. | Existing Local Plan allocations have been scrutinised by an independent Inspector in the context of the then emerging Structure Plan, and the sites included in the adopted Local Plan 2006 were those considered suitable in the transition to the new urban focused development strategy. The majority of these have, or are, coming forward for development, and are considered reasonable to be carried forward to help meet the housing numbers for the period to 2006. | |
| 10854 (Caldecote, Land rear of 104 West Drive) | Object | Land at the rear of 104 West Drive, Caldecote. An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Residential with associated Public Open Space and facilities as required by the Local Planning Authority. Representations are made in respect of the omission of land land to the rear of 104 West Drive, Caldecote from within the Village Framework of Highfields Caldecote. Site formerly comprised part of Grafton Pig Farms. Site also adjoins residential development which has been recently implemented, and from which vehicular access into the land has been retained. | Although the area within the current village framework adjoining the site has recently been developed, development of the site to the rear would result in a significant extension of the village into the countryside to the west of the village. An additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. | |
| 10631 (Arrington, Land north of Church Farm, Church Lane) | Object | Land at Arrington should be included within the village framework and allocated for residential development. The inclusion of the site represents a logical extension to the village framework. It is pertinent to note that the designation of the Important Countryside frontage was removed at the suggestion of the Local Plan Inspector in 2000, in recognition that the land is in no way connected to the Open Countryside. Sites in smaller villages can benefit the amenity of the village in terms of services and provide much needed affordable housing. | An additional allocation on this scale 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. | |
| 10630 (Arrington, Land at Church Farm, Church Lane) | Object | Land at Arrington should be included within the village framework and allocated for residential development. The inclusion of the site represents a logical extension to the village framework. It is pertinent to note that the designation of the Important Countryside frontage was removed at the suggestion of the Local Plan Inspector in 2000, in recognition that the land is in no way connected to the Open Countryside. Sites in smaller villages can benefit the amenity of the village in terms of services and provide much needed affordable housing. | An additional allocation on this scale 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10625 (Arrington, Land at Church Farm, Church Lane) | Object | Land at Arrington should be included within the village framework and allocated for residential development. The inclusion of the site represents a logical extension to the village framework. It is pertinent to note that the designation of the Important Countryside frontage was removed at the suggestion of the Local Plan Inspector in 2000, in recognition that the land is in no way connected to the Open Countryside. Sites in smaller villages can benefit the amenity of the village in terms of services and provide much needed affordable housing. | An additional allocation on this scale 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. | |
| 8941 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc | Object | Wm Morrison is concerned that the Council is proposing a significant amount of development in villages that are at a low level in the settlement hierarchy. A more sustainable option would be to focus development at higher order settlements such as Rural Centres. In particular, we consider that there is a compelling case for directing residential development to Cambourne. | In considering the supply of housing in the rural area, the majority of the 9600 required upto 2016 is made up of completions, existing planning permissions, and windfalls calculated against the proposed settlement strategy. The remaining requirement is met when proposed density policies are applied to Cambourne, and current allocations. Existing Local Plan allocations have been scrutinised by an independent Inspector in the context of the then emerging Structure Plan. and the sites included in the adopted Local Plan 2006 were those considered suitable in the transition to the new urban focused development strategy. The majority of these have, or are, coming forward for development, and are considered reasonable to be carried forward to help meet the housing numbers for the period to 2006, when the Core Strategy will be adopted. "Plan, Monitor, Manage" will keep track of progress and any adjustments can be made to ensure a continuous supply of housing throughout the plan period. | |
| 10276 - Old Road Securities Plc (Linton, Land South of Horseheath Road) | Object | Land south of Horseheath Road, Linton. 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. Additional external growth should be identified at Linton at land north of Bartlow Road and south of Horseheath Road. Development in these locations could be well served by public transport. | Development of this site west of Linton would result in a significant extension of the village into the countryside. It is a prominent site, and would impact the views over a wide area. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 8032 (Weston Green, Mines Farm Chapel Road) | Object | D'Abo Family Trusts own five sites. We have consulted with local Parish Councils and have their support for the proposed developments. We strongly support limited expansion of these villages in order that community services are maintained and improved. Our development plans provide many benefits for local community, including provision of much needed social housing, village shop and post office, new car parking facilities, dedicated playground, new cricket pavilion and more. We would request that we be granted the opportunity to put forward the local case for these developments before proposed LDF Public Enquiry. | Allocation for development of a small group of farm buildings in the countryside would not be appropriate. It would not comply with the search sequence for development in policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. A proposal of this scale is more suited to be judged against development control policies at the planning application stage. | |
| 8163 (West Wrattling, Land North of the Causeway) | Object | West Wrattling, Land north of the Causeway. This site is one third within the village envelope and remaining two thirds outside. Wish to move the boundary to the rear of the site to correspond with boundaries of all the neighbouring properties. Single dwelling to be erected. We have consulted with local Parish Councils and have their support for the proposed developments. We strongly support limited expansion of these villages in order that community services are maintained and improved. Our development plans provide many benefits for local community, including provision of much needed social housing, village shop and post office, new car parking facilities, dedicated playground, new cricket pavilion and more. | Although the frontage of the site lies within the village framework, the majority is outside and comprises green field land. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10891 - Grantchester Townlands Charity (Cambridge, Land at Fulbrooke Road) | Object | Land at Fulbrooke Road, Cambridge. The Green Belt boundary should be varied at Fulbrooke Road, Cambridge, to facilitate a small housing development in a sustainable location. | <p>The site does not warrant exclusion from the green belt, and its development is not needed in order to meet the housing requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure plan 2003. Development of the site would harm the openness of the green belt, and the setting of Cambridge.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p> | |
| 10364 (Swavesey, Land South of Mill Way) 10359 (Swavesey, Land South of Mill Way) | Object | Swavesey, Land south of Mill Lane. Land is identified for allocation. Such allocation would be in line with the inclusion of Swavesey under either Policy ST/3 or ST/4, with suitable alteration made to the housing capacity of Policy ST/4 to accommodate at least 50 dwellings. | <p>Development would extend the village into the countryside to the north. Although there is some development on the site it is largely open in character. Development would have a negative impact on the open character of the Taylors lane area. Access potential appears limited given the nature of Taylors Lane, and existing development in Whitegate close. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10730 (Stow-cum-Quy, Land off Church Road) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land off Church Road, Stow-Cum-Quy. The site does not project into the open countryside, nor would it be very visible owing to the fact that there is residential development on two sides of the site. The significant hedge between the Church and no. 15 Church Road, effectively restricts views across our client's land from the defined 'Important Countryside Frontage'. The site could be developed without material visual detriment to the area. There is a strong case for including the site based on the site's proximity to Cambridge (with good cycle links) and the park and ride. | The site is green field land, currently designated as green belt. Its development would merge the village with an area of dispersed development to the south. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale 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. | |
| 10774 (Fen Ditton, Land off Horningsea Road) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land between no. 28 and 12 Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton. Residential. Bearing in mind the sustainability of the settlement in relation to Cambridge, to which it is very accessible by foot, bicycle and the nearby park and ride, it is considered that it is an ideal settlement in which to incorporate further sustainable development. The site comprises a gap in an otherwise built up frontage which is bounded by a broken down post and wire fence which has no associated planting. | The site is green field land, currently designated as green belt, outside the village framework to the north of the village. Development would have a negative impact on the openness of Horningsea Road, extending the built up area into the countryside. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 7974 - Stamford Homes Limited (Over, Land between New Road & Station Road) | Object | Land at the junction of New Road/Station Road Over, there is an paucity of opportunities within the village framework to meet the housing need. A site is identified for limited expansion. | This site is green field land adjoining the recreation ground. Development would effectively extend the built up area of the village to the west, and have a significant impact on the openness of that part of Over. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 10545 (Bassingbourn, Land South of the cemetery, The Causeway) | Object | Land to the south of the Causeway, Bassingbourn. It is considered that the land should be located within the village framework, which would represent a logical extension of the village boundary. The land is ideally suited for residential or employment development. Employment land would help balance additional residential development and help create a more sustainable community. The village has a good range of local facilities including a primary school and village college, and is located just 4km from Royston. The land at north Brook Road, if accessed from Poplar Farm Close, would ensure that the important Countryside frontage is not affected. The site is located in a very sustainable location. | This site is green field land between the village frameworks of Bassingbourn and Kneesworth. Development would effectively merge the two villages, and have a detrimental impact on the character of the area. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for an infill or group 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. | |
| 10411 - Davison & Co (Barford) Ltd (Elsworth, Land North and West of Elsworth School) | Object | Our client's land at Elsworth is capable of accommodating more than 8 dwellings without detriment to the Village character. In addition, it would bring forward the much needed affordable housing. | The site partly consists of allotments, and is partially within a Conservation Area. It consists of land that has not previously been developed, in the countryside east of Elsworth, to the rear of the primary school. Development could have a detrimental impact of the character of this part of the village. 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. An allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. | |
| 8162 (Weston Green, Mines Farm Chapel Road) | Object | This is a set of redundant farm buildings spread over approximately .5 acre of land with access onto the road connecting Weston Green with West Wrattling. The intention would be to add to these buildings and convert into a single residential dwelling. We have consulted with local Parish Councils and have their support for the proposed developments. We strongly support limited expansion of these villages in order that community services are maintained and improved. Our development plans provide many benefits for local community, including provision of much needed social housing, village shop and post office, new car parking facilities, dedicated playground, new cricket pavilion and more. | The specific allocation of this redundant agricultural building in the countryside would not be appropriate. The Development Control Policies DPD includes policies to test proposals for this site against. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 8793 - D H Barford + Co Limited (Hardwick, Land near 279-345 St Neots Rd) | Object | Objection is lodged in respect of the failure to allocate land off St Neots Road Hardwick (Nos 279-345) for residential development. | This site lies outside, the village framework of a group village. It comprises of the properties and rear gardens of linear development along St.Neots Road, and land to the rear. 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. An allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. | |
| 8020 (Weston Green, Land North of Mill Hill) | Object | Weston Green, Land north of Mill Hill. 8 new market houses of different sizes, 8 social housing/shared ownership units, a new expanded car park for the Reading Room, a new playground and a new cricket pavilion to replace the current one. We have consulted with local Parish Councils and have their support for the proposed developments. We strongly support limited expansion of these villages in order that community services are maintained and improved. Our development plans provide many benefits for local community, including provision of much needed social housing, village shop and post office, new car parking facilities, dedicated playground, new cricket pavilion and more. | This site comprises green field land outside the village framework. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale 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. | |
| 8160 (West Wratting, Land north of the common) | Object | The Common, West Wratting. 6 houses for sale and 6 social/shared ownership units and a village shop with residential accommodation above. We have consulted with local Parish Councils and have their support for the proposed developments. We strongly support limited expansion of these villages in order that community services are maintained and improved. Our development plans provide many benefits for local community, including provision of much needed social housing, village shop and post office, new car parking facilities, dedicated playground, new cricket pavilion and more. | The site comprises mainly green field land on the edge of the village. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 7828 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Shepreth, Land North of Meldreth Road) | Object | Land in Shepreth bordered by the railway line to the north, John Breay Close to the west and Meldreth Road to the south be included in the village envelope and identified for housing. | With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale 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. | |
| 10819 - Messrs J and P Dossett (Barton, Land North of Kings Close) | Object | Land off King's Grove, Barton should be excluded from the Cambridge Green Belt and allocated for residential development. Owing to the proximity to Cambridge, the land is considered to be highly sustainable, well related to the existing village and with an adequate vehicular access. | 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. An allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Development in this location would have a significant impact on the landscape. The site is on the edge of the village, and in the green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 10924 (Kneesworth, Land North of Kneesworth Site A) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land to the North of Nightingale Avenue Kneesworth. Site would accommodate additional housing land, in a sustainable position in relation to the facilities both within Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, and the nearby centre of Royston. | Allocation for development would result in a northern expansion of the village along the A1198, reducing the gap between the village and the barracks. An additional allocation on this scale 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. The site is grade 2 agricultural land, and therefore lower grade land should be used unless sustainability considerations dictate otherwise. | |
| 10805 - Lighthouse Developments (Steeple Morden, Land North of Bogs Gap Lane) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Housing. Land North of Bogs Gap Lane, Steeple Morden represents a logical extension to the village framework as there are already residential properties on the land; it is well surrounded by mature hedges and trees around the site; and the site relates to the built-up village. | With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 8095 (Little Gransden, Land behind 11-47 Primrose Hill) | Object | The land behind 11 - 47 Primrose Hill Little Gransden relates well to the built-up framework. While greenfield development is not envisaged for this village within the DPDs this site is away from the important areas where a Conservation Area may be designated and away from the SSSIs, archaeological sites and the important countryside frontages. It would be appropriate to identify this land as the area which should provide for additional development for the village. | This representation relates to green field land outside the village framework. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale 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. Development of this site would have a significant impact on the village, effectively merging it with Great Gransden. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10448 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd (Histon, Land between Mill Lane and Impington Lane) 10458 - Centex Strategic Land (Histon, Land between Mill Lane and Impington Lane) | Object | Land between Mill Lane and Impington Lane, Histon. 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. | The site mainly comprises agricultural land, and some extended gardens. The site includes the allocation SP1/a. The majority of the site is designated as green belt. Its development for housing would compromise the purposes of the green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. 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. A development of 450 houses may also have significant implications for junctions on the B1049, where traffic capacity is already a concern. | |
| 10543 (Bassingbourn, Land North of Brook Road, West of North End) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development:land to north of Brook Road, West of North End, Bassingbourn, Residential. It is considered that the land should be located within the village framework, which would represent a logical extension of the village boundary. The site is well related to the village centre and local facilities. The village has a good range of local facilities including a primary school and village college, and is located just 4km from Royston. The land at north Brook Road, if accessed from Poplar Farm Close, would ensure that the Important Countryside Frontage is not affected. The site is located in a very sustainable location. | This site has been designated an important countryside frontage, due to the role the openness of the frontage plays in bringing the countryside into the heart of the village. The allocation for development of this green field land would harm the character of this area of the village. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10554 (Fulbourn, Land either side of Hinds Loder (Track)) | Object | Land either side of Hinds Loder (track), Fulbourn. An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Lane off Balsham Road, Fulbourn, Residential and associated Public Open Space and facilities as required by the Local Planning Authority. Objections are made to the fact that the Village Framework of Fulbourn has not been extended so as to facilitate significant further growth, appropriate to the sustainable position of Fulbourn not only in relation to Cambridge but to local services and facilities. It is considered this decision is contrary to the recommendations of Central Government with regards to the sustainability of future development, as promoted in both the RPG and the adopted Structure Plan. | This site is designated as green belt and allocation for residential development would be inappropriate. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. This site is separated from the village frameowrk of Fulbourn, and its allocation would result in development in the countryside. 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. 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. Rural Centres would be examined if allocations were required. | |
| 10835 (Waterbeach, Land at Rosalind Franklin House, Bannold Road) | Object | Land adjacent to Bannold Road Waterbeach should be included within the village framework. It is just as suitable for residential development as proposed allocation SP/1D. The site is surrounded by development. Its development would relate well to the existing ribbon of development along Bannold Road. | A corridor of open land between the barracks and the village was noted a discernible feature by the inspectors Report into Local Plan 2004, different from the existing allocation. This site is less appropriate for development as it would have a greater impact on the separation. The Local Plan 2004 allocations form a transition towards the Structure Plan 2003 strategy. The Housing Trajectory (to be included in the Submission DPD) is able to demonstrate progress on these allocations and there expected completions date. 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. 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 10521 - Mrs A J Johnson and Mr B Moore (Great Shelford, Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way) 10990 (Great Shelford, Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way) | Object | SP/1 Housing Allocations in Rural Areas Land to north of Mingle Lane Great Shelford should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development. | The site comprises primarily agricultural land, and a cemetery, north of stapleford. The site is designated as green belt, and proposed in the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (CSF5) for landscape improvements associated with development on the edge of Cambridge. Its development for housing would reduce the separation of the village to Cambridge, and compromise the purposes of the green belt. It would have a significant impact on the character of the area, and this part of the village. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. 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. | |
| 10967 - Mrs A J Johnson and Mr B Moore 11021 - Trustees of the Estate of the Late D L January 10992 | Object | Despite Great Shelford being identified as a Rural Growth Centre, Policy SP1 allocates no additional housing sites within the settlement. This is considered illogical given the considerable number of additional houses to be provided, and the fact that Great Shelford must be one of the most sustainable locations for further development in the District. It is, therefore, recommended that the Village Framework should be amended and further residential land included. | 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. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10969 - Mrs A J Johnson and Mr B Moore (Great Shelford, Land East of Hinton Way) 10519 (Great Shelford, Land behind 34-60 Hinton Way) 10955 (Great Shelford, Land East of Hinton Way) | Object | The Village Framework should be amended and further residential land included. Land to the east of Hinton Way Great Shelford is considered to be most appropriate for residential development, as it is very well related to the existing settlement form adjoining existing development on three sides. | 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. The site is designated as green belt, and proposed in the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (CSF5) for landscape improvements associated with development on the edge of Cambridge. Its development for housing would reduce the separation of the village to Cambridge, and compromise the purposes of the green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 8370 (Great Shelford, Land between Stonehill Road and Westfield Road) | Object | Land to the rear of 109-131 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford. An additional site allocation on The site has an area of approximately 3.8 hectares. The site is well located to existing services a Cambridge Road is well served by public transport. The site is totally surrounded by existing development. This fact means that the development of the site for residential purposes will not have a major impact upon the surrounding countryside. | <p>This site is currently designated as green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p> <p>Additionally, sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required.</p> | |
| 10638 - Spicers Ltd (Sawston, Land West of Whitefield Way) | Object | Sawston, land west of Whitefield way. Given the identified shortfall of 5,516 dwellings within the plan area in the plan period to 2016, we recommend that a further site at Sawston should be identified for housing under Policy SP/1. | <p>The site is designated as green belt. Its development for housing would compromise the purposes of the green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. 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.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 8579 - The Fairey Family (Linton, Land at Chalklands, Kynes Meadow) | Object | "Chalklands" - Kynes Meadow, Linton. On the basis of the current strategy it is not thought that these 20,000 dwellings will be achieved. Further allocations are therefore needed so that the development industry can respond to a wider range of opportunities for new development. Our Site will help meet this shortfall. | <p>The southern half of this site has been utilised as an exception site for affordable housing. As such it would be inappropriate to include within the village framework.</p> <p>Considering the allocation of the northern part of the site alone, 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required.</p> | |
| 8089 (Longstanton, Green End Farm Over Road) | Object | We object to the omission of land at Green End, Over Road, Longstanton, from the list of allocated rural area housing development sites. | <p>The site primarily comprises agricultural land, and farm buildings. Its development would extend the built up area of the village further west, past Over Road. The Site is designated as green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. 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.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10548 (Fowlmere, Land between Cambridge Road & Thriplow Road) | Object | Land between Cambridge Road & Thriplow Road, Fowlmere. An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land at Triangle Farm, Fowlmere. Residential. The land, which is adjoined on two sides by residential development and by existing roads on three sides, is considered to be well related to the existing village form. In addition, it is pertinent to note that the land is excluded from the Green Belt designation. Accordingly, it is recommended that it would be appropriate for residential development, which would facilitate the provision of both private and affordable housing within the village. | The site comprises of an open field east of the village. Development would extend the village into the countryside, utilising green field land. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. | |
| 9381 - The Fairey Family (Linton, Land at Orbells, Horseheath Road) | Object | "Orbells" - Horseheath Road, Linton On the basis of the current strategy it is not thought that these 20,000 dwellings will be achieved. Further allocations are therefore needed so that the development industry can respond to a wider range of opportunities for new development. Our Site will help meet this shortfall. | Development on this scale and in this location would have a significant impact on the setting of the village, and be extremely prominent in the landscape. 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. | |
| 8181 - The Hardwick Group of Residents (Hardwick, Land on St Neots Road West of Hardwick) | Object | Land at St.Neots Road Hardwick. The village of Hardwick has a wide range of facilities including shopping and a school. As such it is a satisfactory location for further housing growth in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. It is located on the edge of the settlement close to Cambridge with good transport links by modes other than the motor vehicle. The site would not result in coalescence with Highfields Caldecote, since the recent planning permission for redevelopment of the Enterprise Cafe site lies further to the west than our clients' site, development of which would merely round off development in the settlement. The site should be added to the housing allocations since it provides a sustainable development opportunity on the edge of the settlement close to Cambridge. | This site lies outside, and is separated from, the village framework of a group village. It comprises of rear gardens of linear development along St.Neots Road. 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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. An allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Development in this location would have a significant impact on the landscape. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10907 - Humo Holdings (Great Abington, Land at Strawberry Farm) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land at Strawberry Farm, Pampisford Road, Great Abington. Residential. | The site is part of the former land settlement association site, and current uses are a dwelling with associated agricultural character uses. As such the majority of the site is not considered as previously developed land. The result of development would be to extend the village into the countryside south of Pampisford Road. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the countryside are not required. An allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group 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. | |
| 8137 (Linton, Land at Station Road) | Object | Land at Station Road Linton. Policy SP/1 makes no allocations whatsoever in Linton which is designated a Minor Rural Centre. The site should be allocated for residential development. Scheme includes the provision of a pedestrian bridge over A1307. The site is previously developed land and entirely surrounded by existing development. The site is located within a settlement with good public transport links, local shopping, other services and good employment opportunities. | The area south of the A505 is severed from the main village, limiting its suitability for residential development. This is reflected in policy SP/9. It is unlikely this could be overcome effectively even with provision of a footbridge. With regard to allocating the site, there is no need to allocate further sites in minor rural centres, given the results of the urban capacity study, existing commitments, and other sites identified in the Local Development Framework. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 7826 (Hauxton, Land North and South of High Street) | Object | Land north and south of The High Street Hauxton should be allocated for housing. The land south of the High Street can also provide a landscape belt to reduce noise disturbance from the M11 and contribute towards a new village hall. Objection is therefore raised to the non inclusion of these areas of land within the village inset boundary. | <p>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 and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations are not required. An allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Development in this location would have a significant impact on the landscape.</p> <p>The site is on the edge of the village, and the larger part of the site is in the green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|----------------------------|
| 10988 (Great Shelford, Land at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way) | Object | Land to the east of Hinton Way, North of Mingle Lane and Gog Magog Way, Great Shelford/Stapleford should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development. | The site is designated as green belt, and proposed in the Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (CSF5) for landscape improvements associated with development on the edge of Cambridge. Its development for housing would reduce the separation of the village to Cambridge, and compromise the purposes of the green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. 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. | |
| <i>I.</i> | | | | |
| 11116 - Environment Agency | Support | We acknowledge that this is an existing (residue) allocation. There is a history of flooding in the area and a Flood Risk Assasment (FRA) which will be required for the site in accordance with NE/13. This may prove that the site notional allocation of 57 dwellings may not be achievable. Appropriate level for level, volume for volume floodplain compensation will be required.f | It is acknowledged that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required for the site. The notional allocation reflects capacity at the notional density. The actual number achievable may vary. | |
| 9640 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils | Support | Impington - North of Impington Lane.Should be explicit that site access must be via Ambrose Way, rather than any other alternative. The site should be described as East of Glebe Way | Support noted. Currently the only access available is from Ambrose Way. A specific requirement is not needed or appropriate. | |
| 10654 - Unwins Properties | Support | Support the inclusion of Site 1 - Land north of Impington Lane, Impington as a housing allocation under Policy SP/1. The site will be developed for housing 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. 9592 | Support | As a County Councillor for Sawston, I support the allocation of Land at Portobello Road, Sawston for housing. I recognise that there may be issues regarding work that has to be done on the land and also regarding the access via Common Lane onto the High Street. I believe these issues can be addressed through remedial action and careful planning. | Although support for development of this site is noted, this site has shown little sign of coming forward for housing development since its allocation in the Local Plan 2004. The multiple land ownership, problematic access, and location of listed buildings have proved difficult to overcome. Research in preparation of the Housing Trajectory for the submission DPD have confirmed the difficulties. It should not be relied upon to provide housing towards the 9600 dwellings total required in rural areas up to 2016. Due to the designation of Sawston as a Rural Centre, there is still the possibility of it coming forward as a windfall development over the plan period, as it is situated within the village framework. | Amend policy SP/1: Delete allocation Sawston: Land at Portobello Road. |
| 4. 9917 - Old Road Securities Plc | Support | Support is given to the identification of land north of Bannold Road, Waterbeach. The site has a resolution to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S.106 planning obligation for residential development. | Support noted. | |
| 5. 10693 (Willingham, Berrycroft Stores, Berrycroft) | Support | The housing allocation ST/1e is supported. There is a Committee resolution to approve the renewal of planning permission on this land subject to the applicant entering into a new Section 106 Agreement. This is being negotiated at the present time. | Although support for development of this site is noted, this site allocation in the Local Plan 2004 is proposed to be deleted. It is located as part of a strategy forming a transition towards the structure plan 2003 strategy. The housing trajectory (to be prepared for the submission DPD) indicates progress is likely to be made towards a planning application and subsequent development during the remaining lifetime of the Local Plan 2004. | |
| 7. 8178 - Messrs Mailer & Sharp (Bassingbourn, Land behind Manor Farm) | Object | Land behind Manor Farm, Bassingbourn. Whilst we have no objection in principle to the allocation of site (SP/1 g), that site is no better related than our clients' site to facilities at Bassingbourn. Our clients' site should be included within the housing allocations in Policy SP/1. | This site allocation from the Local Plan 2004 is proposed to be deleted. It is located as part of a strategy forming a transition towards the structure plan 2003 strategy. The housing trajectory (to be prepared for the submission DPD) indicates progress is unlikely to be made in the near future, and its contribution towards housing numbers cannot be relied upon. An additional allocation in Bassingbourn is not required, and would not comply with the Structure Plan / RSS search sequence. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| 8. 11115 - Environment Agency | Support | In view of the geology of the local area, soakaways are unlikely to be satisfactory. A scheme for surface water disposal, incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) will be required for the site. This is in accordance with NE/13 & NE/14. An FRA will be required to be submitted as part of any subsequent planning application. This must address surface water drainage from the site. | Although support for development of this site is noted, this site allocation in the Local Plan 2004 is proposed to be deleted. It is located as part of a strategy forming a transition towards the structure plan 2003 strategy. The housing trajectory (to be prepared for the submission DPD) indicates progress is unlikely to be made in the near future, and its contribution towards housing numbers cannot be relied upon. | |
| 12. 9733 - Guilden Morden Parish Council | Support | Guilden Morden Parish Council support the roll forward from the 2004 adopted Local Plan for the allocation of 0.5 ha. of land at Church Lane for a notional allocation of up to 16 affordable dwellings subject to a S106 agreement being negotiated to include parish benefit (1st criteria for allocation being strong connection with Guilden Morden). | Although support for development of this site is noted, this site allocation in the Local Plan 2004 is proposed to be deleted. It is located as part of a strategy forming a transition towards the structure plan 2003 strategy. The housing trajectory (to be prepared for the submission DPD) indicates progress is likely to be made towards a planning application and subsequent development during the remaining lifetime of the Local Plan 2004. | |
| 18. 8422 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Object | This information is obsolete. The construction of the 135 dwellings on this site at South Park is well underway and many of the properties are already occupied. | The figure reflects the number of dwellings that had planning permission at 2004. This table is proposed to be amended to only reflect allocations carried forward, and not those that have planning permission, under construction or completed. | Update Table in SP/1 to reflect situation at end of March 2005. |
| 19. 8494 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Object | This information is obsolete. This development of 21 (not 11) dwellings off Hayman's Way in Papworth Everard is now nearing completion. | The figure reflects the site capacity at 2004, based on a density of 30 dwellings per hectare. This table is proposed to be updated, and will include only those allocations proposed to be carried forward, and not those that are already a commitment, having gained planning permission or being under construction. | Update Table in SP/1 to reflect situation at end of March 2005. |
| 8421 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Object | This information is obsolescent. The construction of the 135 dwellings on this site is well underway and many of the houses are already occupied. | The figure reflects the number of dwellings that had planning permission at 2004. This table is proposed to be amended to only reflect allocations carried forward, and not those that have planning permission, under construction or completed. | Update Table in SP/1 to reflect situation at end of March 2005. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|--|
| <i>20.</i> | | | | |
| 8493 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Object | The Developable Site Size (11.98 ha) is incorrect. As a result the Notional Allocation (359) is also incorrect. [The Notional Density is dealt with in another representation]. This site as previously designated was due to provide a minimum of 259 dwellings in a developable area of 10.36ha. The increased area together with the associated increase in density would add another 100 dwellings at this location. There is no question of Papworth Everard Parish Council accepting the imposition of this increase in size of the developable area to 11.98 ha. | Agreed. The expansion at Papworth Everard is intended to secure a more balanced community, improved services and facilities to serve the expanded community and a bypass for the village. Development of 1,000 dwellings has been determined to be the amount of development which will secure those benefits and all of the development and necessary planning obligation contributions are now committed. As a consequence of densities that are higher than originally considered appropriate, the amount of development to be accommodated on the last site is less than originally allocated. That matter was agreed at the last Local Plan Inquiry which considered the planning policies for Papworth Everard. There has been no change in circumstances since that Local Plan Inspector's report was received in January 2002. Making best use of the land that is to be developed means that the net developable area will be 10.36 ha and may be less if higher densities are considered appropriate to make best use of the land that is developed. That site now has planning permission and should now be deleted from the plan which deals only with 'proposals'. In this case the allocation is retained purely for technical reasons as this planning permission post dates March 2005, the most recent date for which comprehensive information is available for housing commitments. The allocation will be deleted before the plan is adopted in 2007. | Policy SP/1 has been amended to refer to a net developable area of 10.36 ha. |
| 11118 - Environment Agency | Support | A strategic drainage system will be required for the whole of the site. Piecemeal surface water drainage systems will be appropriate. A scheme for surface water disposal, incorporating SuDS will be required for the whole site. This is in accordance with NE/13 & NE/14. | Concerns can be addressed through the development control process. | |
| <i>18, 19, & 20.</i> | | | | |
| 8497 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Object | We strongly object to the limitations of this policy and SP/13 as it would allow new development to proceed ad infinitum without a bypass ever being constructed. See Local Plan 2004 village policies paragraph 78.15 and P5 of the non-technical summary to the draft Sustainability Report. Traffic flows through the village are already in excess of 12000 vehicles per day and we are long past the point where no more residential approvals should be granted for Papworth Everard until full funding for the bypass has been obtained and construction started. A related policy is required in this LDF. | The Department of Transport has agreed funding for the bypass. They state that construction is imminent and the scheme is expected to be completed by December 2006. A modification to the plan is therefore not required. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| <i>SP/2 Cambridge Northern Fringe West</i> | | | | |
| 10321 - Highways Agency | Object | With regard to the Site Specific Policies, the Highways Agency has concerns about proposed development at Cambridge Northern Fringe, Cambridge Northern fringe East (Chesterton Sidings), Papworth Everard, Cambridge Airport, and Cambourne all of which could have implications for the trunk road network. We would wish to see evidence that the scale of development proposed could be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the operation of the adjacent trunk roads. | <p>The development plan seeks to reduce the need to travel, and where unavoidable, achieve access by non-car modes. Policy TR/1 will not permit development where additional travel demand is not sufficiently addressed through providing modal choice, and Policy TR/3 is concerned with mitigating traffic impact and requires a Transport Assessment be undertaken for development with 'significant transport implications', in accordance with PPG13. Policy DP/3 criteria 2 is concerned with securing "appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety." Whilst not making explicit mention of the trunk road network, these policies address concerns raised.</p> <p>Historically development which came forward through policies in Local Plan 2004 made provision to mitigate their impacts, for example, development at Cambourne contributed to the dualling of the A428 and Cambridge Northern Fringe provides additional capacity at existing junctions onto the A14. Similarly, the LDF should ensure that future development adequately mitigates its impact. The Highways Agency has been fully engaged in the early work on planning the major developments at Northstowe and Cambridge East with active membership on the Transport Topic Groups. The Highways Authority is also consulted on all planning applications in the vicinity of the trunk road network and if a planning application were considered to jeopardise the trunk road network in any way, could recommend appropriate mitigation or even refusal.</p> | |
| <i>SP/3 Chesterton Sidings</i> | | | | |
| 8113 - Cambridge City Council Property & Building Services (Cambridge, Land north of Fen Road) | Object | Land north of Fen Road, Cambridge. A representation was made during the previous round of public consultation that land on Fen Road, Chesterton is suitable for housing development. This was not addressed in your response. We propose this land should be included within an extended area covered by Policy SP/3 re-titled Chesterton Sidings and Chesterton Fen, and the text of the policy amended accordingly to make it clear that this site would be suitable for residential development. | The objection site is the only area of land in Chesterton Fen within South Cambridgeshire which does not lie within the Cambridge Green Belt. It is not so well related to the rest of Cambridge that it should be allocated for general purposes housing. It was however allocated in the 2004 Local Plan as part of a wider area for development of gypsy and traveller sites to meet local needs. That policy has been 'saved' and will remain in force until a Gypsy and Travellers DPD is prepared. | No change. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| 9383 - Anglian Water Services Ltd | Object | Anglian Water Services objects to this Policy. The relocation of Milton Wastewater Treatment Works is essential to the development on the Chesterton Sidings site. Residential development of the Chesterton Sidings land would be completely inappropriate unless Milton Wastewater Treatment Works is relocated as part of the development of the whole of the Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) area. Adoption of this policy would be in direct contravention of Policies DP/2 and NE/19. | Disagree. If an acceptable scheme can be developed on this site without the Waste Water Treatment Works being redeveloped, it should not be ruled out by the policy. | |
| 9367 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited | Object | Whilst Network Rail accept the need to plan development at Chesterton Sidings to allow for the potential future development of adjoining land, it is important that a further master planning exercise is not allowed to hamper the delivery of significant residential development on this key brownfield site. | It is agreed that a change to the first paragraph of the policy is required to better reflect paragraph 11.8, that development may take place if the Waste Water Treatment Works does not relocate, if an acceptable scheme can be created. | Amend first paragraph of POLICY SP/3 Chesterton Sidings: 'Land at Chesterton Sidings is allocated for a sustainable mixed-use development, as part of a distinctive new urban neighbourhood for Cambridge covering the whole of the cross-boundary area. A Masterplan will required, which must demonstrate how the Sidings can be developed as both a standalone development and one which can be integrated into the development of this wider area.' |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10322 - Highways Agency | Object | With regard to the Site Specific Policies, the Highways Agency has concerns about proposed development at Cambridge Northern Fringe, Cambridge Northern fringe East (Chesterton Sidings), Papworth Everard, Cambridge Airport, and Cambourne all of which could have implications for the trunk road network. We would wish to see evidence that the scale of development proposed could be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the operation of the adjacent trunk roads. | <p>The development plan seeks to reduce the need to travel, and where unavoidable, achieve access by non-car modes. Policy TR/1 will not permit development where additional travel demand is not sufficiently addressed through providing modal choice, and Policy TR/3 is concerned with mitigating traffic impact and requires a Transport Assessment be undertaken for development with 'significant transport implications', in accordance with PPG13. Policy DP/3 criteria 2 is concerned with securing "appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety." Whilst not making explicit mention of the trunk road network, these policies address concerns raised.</p> <p>Historically development which came forward through policies in Local Plan 2004 made provision to mitigate their impacts, for example, development at Cambourne contributed to the dualling of the A428 and Cambridge Northern Fringe provides additional capacity at existing junctions onto the A14. Similarly, the LDF should ensure that future development adequately mitigates its impact. The Highways Agency has been fully engaged in the early work on planning the major developments at Northstowe and Cambridge East with active membership on the Transport Topic Groups. The Highways Authority is also consulted on all planning applications in the vicinity of the trunk road network and if a planning application were considered to jeopardise the trunk road network in any way, could recommend appropriate mitigation or even refusal.</p> | |
| 8174 - Cambridge City Council (Chesterton Fen) | Object | <p>Land at Chesterton Fen.</p> <p>The proposed development of the Chesterton Sidings and the new railway station on the Cambridge to Ely Line provides a unique opportunity to regenerate the Fen Road area, improving its accessibility and through introducing higher value land uses. Accordingly the site boundary should be extended to the River Cam and the policy amended as follows:</p> <p>Title: change to Chesterton Sidings and Chesterton Fen. Include references to Chesterton Fen in the policy and supporting text. Include reference to employment and leisure uses as well as residential. Be more definite that Chesterton Fen can provide for open space needs.</p> | <p>Chesterton Fen is a relatively isolated area close to the city boundary which provides a home for a large number of 'urban fringe' uses which are often 'bad neighbours' including scrap yards, low tech employment, gypsy and traveller sites, and static caravan parks. There are no other such sites close to Cambridge and no proposals in the Cambridge Local Plan for alternative sites.</p> | No change. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 9377 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited | Object | The policy should be reworded to make clear that the interchange facility is not to be fully funded by the proposed mixed-use development at Chesterton Sidings itself. This is in line with Paragraph B25of Circular 05/2005 (Planning Obligations) which requires local authorities to include as much information as possible within their published documents in the Local Development Framework. | Not accepted. Policy SP/3 does not imply it will be fully funded by the sidings development alone. Policy SP/15 of the Site Specific Policies DPD makes clear that financial contributions will be secured at an appropriate level towards the railway station. | |
| 11112 - Environment Agency | Support | The site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3. The capacity of the site for housing will depend on the findings of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which will be required for the site. This is in accordance with NE/13. Appropriate level for level, volume for volume floodplain compensation will be required. The site is believed to be contaminated due to previous uses. A scheme for the investigation and remediation of contaminated land will be required in accordance with NE/13. | Support noted. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment of this site has been undertaken in consultation with the Environment Agency. That study forecasts that the conditions which caused Chesterton Sidings to have flooded in the past will not recur and that redevelopment proposals appear sound. Policy NE/13 will require that prospective developers of this site undertake a detailed Flood Risk Assessment before planning permission is granted. | No change. |
| 9375 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited | Support | Network Rail supports the allocation of land at Chesterton Sidings for a sustainable mixed-use development. | Support noted. | |
| <i>Policy Paragraph 2</i> | | | | |
| 7807 - The camToo Project | Object | This description should include reference to The camToo Project which will indeed enable a "major transport interchange" to be developed in conjunction with the proposed Chesterton Station by putting in on a through route for guided buses from where-ever they originate (Cambourne, Northstowe, Cottenham, the A10 corridor north of Cambridge etc.) The closure of Fen Road level crossing will increase the benefits of the proposed station to rail operators. The project will also provide improved access to Chesterton Fen and a new cycle route over the Cam. | The CamToo Project proposal which would be relevant to development at Chesterton Sidings is the proposal for a bus route across Ditton Meadows connecting to Newmarket Road. Such a route would run entirely within Cambridge City and was considered and rejected at part of the preparation the Local Transport Plan. | No change. |
| <i>Policy Paragraph 4</i> | | | | |
| 7810 - The camToo Project | Support | As mentioned in other representations, The camToo Project will provide improved, safer, road access to Chesterton Fen plus a cycleway across the river Cam to the Ditton Fields area of Cambridge. | Support noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| <i>11.7</i> | | | | |
| 7809 - The camToo Project | Object | Development of this area should not start until there is a high quality transport link to Cambridge City centre. This will be provided by The camToo Project | Whilst the provision of high quality public transport links to Cambridge city centre will be important for the redevelopment of the Cambridge STW, development at Chesterton Sidings will not be on such a scale that it should not be permitted without such links. Public transport services will nevertheless be required for the development and provision can be secured through discussions with the bus operators at the planning application stage. | No change. |
| <i>11.8</i> | | | | |
| 7808 - The camToo Project | Object | Removal of the sewage works should be connected with the development of the sidings. The camToo Project, by providing overbridge road access to Chesterton Fen opens up the opportunity for relocation of the sewage works between the railway line and river Cam north of the A14. | Only if it can be demonstrated that the Cambridge STW would be a 'bad neighbour' should its removal be a pre-requisite to the redevelopment of Chesterton Sidings. At present it is to be proven whether the STW would be a 'bad neighbour' to this site as Chesterton Sidings is not located downwind from the STW, the prevailing wind direction being from the south west. When the Council recently took action against Anglia Water concerning the nuisance from the STW, Cambridge City Council declined to be a co-sponsor owing to the lack of complaints from resident and businesses within Cambridge. | No change. |
| 9376 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited | Support | Network Rail welcomes the Council's recognition that the relocation/ redevelopment of the adjoining Cambridge Sewage Treatment Works is not a precondition for the redevelopment of any land in South Cambridgeshire and that Chesterton Sidings is available for redevelopment in the short term. | Support noted. | |
| <i>SP/4 Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses</i> | | | | |
| 11028 - Laing Rail | Object | More car parking facilities are needed to support the Foxton Station in order to: - Support the capacity improvements envisaged by the Thames Link 2000 project. - Ensure that rail plays a meaningful role in transporting those living and working in the area. - Be consistent with published LTP policy statements in support of increasing capacity for passenger rail services. See separate representations proposing potential sites. | There is a planning policy tension with railway stations such as that at Foxton in the Cambridge Sub Region. The planning strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is to accommodate growth associated with the economy of the sub-region and not to encourage long distance commuting. That is the underlying principle behind the strategy of focussing development close to Cambridge and to support that development with public transport and other transport systems which are not attractive to out-of-county commuters to such destinations as London. Whilst rail can be used for local journeys, the train operating companies are increasingly seeking to grow their longer distance business. This proposal from Laing Rail at Foxton will make this station and the surrounding villages more attractive to London bound commuters, contrary to the planning strategy. | No change. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| 10546 (Bassingbourn, Land South of the cemetery, The Causeway) | Object | Land to the south of the Causeway, Bassingbourn. It is considered that the land should be located within the village framework, which would represent a logical extension of the village boundary. The land is ideally suited for residential or employment development. Employment land would help balance additional residential development and help create a more sustainable community. The village has a good range of local facilities including a primary school and village college, and is located just 4km from Royston. The land at north Brook Road, if accessed from Poplar Farm Close, would ensure that the important Countryside frontage is not affected. The site is located in a very sustainable location. | This site lies outside, the village framework of a group, and an infill, village. It comprises of a field between Bassingbourn and Kneesworth. Development of the site would merge these two villages, and have an adverse impact on the character of the area. Its allocation for employment development would be contrary to the search sequence of policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, and Policy E3 of the Draft East of England Plan. Additional employment land allocations are not required in order to meet the land supply requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. | |
| 11026 - Laing Rail (Foxton, Land North of A10) | Object | Site north of the A10 Foxton is currently green field, with a frontage to the railway line and the A10. Our proposal would comprise construction of a new access onto the A10 (probably a roundabout), landscaped passenger car park, a new station building with sufficient retail space to support passengers' requirements and fully DDA compliant 12 carriage length platforms. The location of the site is such that it would not disturb local businesses, could be accessed safely by bus, cycling and walking as well as by car and would cause negligible disturbance to local residents. | This land is in agricultural use, and its development would have a significant impact on the landscape. Development of such a large car park would encourage long distance commuting out of the District. | |
| 8982 - Carisbrooke Alliance (Swavesey, Land at Buckingham Business Park, Huntingdon Road) | Object | Land at Buckingham Business Park, Huntingdon Road, Swavesey. Carisbrooke seek an easterly extension to the allocated site at Buckingham Business Park onto land approximating 2.05 hectares in extent. This would be a sustainable development option and the site could be fully contained by new peripheral landscape planting. This would also assist in providing a greater range of employment options for new and expanding businesses. | This site adjoins the existing Buckingham Business Park. It comprises green field land, outside village frameworks. A further allocation for employment development would be contrary to the search sequence of policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, and Policy E3 of the Draft East of England Plan. Additional employment land allocations are not required in order to meet the land supply requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 9508 - GO-East | Object | We note that the summary of assessment contained in the Annex to Draft Final Sustainability Report for the two sites indicates that neither site 'is particularly well served by transport routes other than public roads' PPG4, PPS6 and PPG13 indicate that developments that are likely to generate demand for travel to and from a development should be located so as to maximise opportunities for travel to and from the sites by means other than the private car. The Council, in allocating these sites, should be able to demonstrate that the allocations are appropriate in terms of sustainability considerations and that sequentially preferable sites in accordance with National Policy requirements are not available. | A number of employment allocations have been established through previous local plans. They offer opportunities to provide local employment opportunities, contributing to reducing commuting into Cambridge and making areas of the District less dormitory. Where there is a realistic prospect of them coming forward they are rolled forward in the Local Development Framework to complete the Local Plan 2004 employment strategy. Planning permission has been granted on both sites (partially on the pampisford site). The Longstanton site adjoins the home farm development, a substantial housing area which is under construction. Development of the employment site will increase the sustainability of this area providing local jobs and reducing the need to travel. The Pampisford allocation is on the boundary of Sawston, a rural centre, and a significant element of the site is previously developed land. It is well related to the bus Citi7 route that travels through Sawston from Cambridge, along London Road. | |
| 10782 (Meldreth, Site at back of 1 Whitcroft Road) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Whitcroft Road, Medreth. Housing or employment. Land consists of previously unused land and is well connected to the existing village framework. The site is well constrained by existing development and other defensible boundaries (Station Road and the railway line). The site, which partly sits within the village framework, is more closely related to the existing built up area than the open countryside. | Although this site currently comprises employment uses, it has a rural character. Its allocation for employment development would be contrary to the search sequence of policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, and Policy E3 of the Draft East of England Plan. Additional employment land allocations are not required in order to meet the land supply requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, outside the Strategic Employment sites as part of the new mixed developments on the edge of Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe. | |
| 10704 (Girton, Land North of Girton Farm, Oakington Road) 10699 (Girton, Land North of Girton Farm, Oakington Road) | Object | Land north of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton. Land at Girton should be removed from the Green Belt owing to its existing built form and part of site north of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton should be allocated for further employment development in this sustainable location. Girton is considered to be an extremely sustainable location bearing in mind its proximity to Cambridge by both public transport and cycle routes, and the diversification of the employment base in this location is considered to be beneficial to the area. | This site is designated as Green belt, its allocation for employment would therefore be inappropriate. Its allocation for employment development would be contrary to the search sequence of policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, and Policy E3 of the Draft East of England Plan. Additional employment land allocations are not required in order to meet the land supply requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, outside the Strategic Employment sites as part of the new mixed developments on the edge of Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe. | |
| 8748 - Capital & Counties (Fulbourn, Land West of Ida Darwin Hospital) | Object | Our clients land at Fulbourn Old Drift should be allocated for B1 employment development. | This site is designated as green belt, and a major developed site. This places a restriction on inappropriate development, and restricts infilling development. Its allocation for employment development would be inappropriate, as it would reduce the openness of this part of the green belt. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| 9333 - Vantico Ltd (Duxford, Land below Major Employment Area) | Object | Land below Major Employment Area, Duxford. We seek an extension to the allocation under Policy SP/4 of the employment area at Vantico's site at Duxford, referred to in Policy ET/4. This would be a sustainable location for further needed employment development, and would add to the range of sites where new jobs could be created, and existing jobs relocated to. | Whilst a change to bring part of this site into the Employment Area is proposed as a result of separate representations, the allocation of an area of undeveloped land south of the existing area is not justified. Its allocation for employment development would be contrary to the search sequence of policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, and Policy E3 of the Draft East of England Plan. Additional employment land allocations are not required in order to meet the land supply requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, outside the Strategic Employment sites as part of the new mixed developments on the edge of Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe. | |
| 8184 - The Hardwick Group of Residents (Hardwick, Land on St Neots Road West of Hardwick) | Object | Site at St. Neots Road Hardwick comprises garden land etc on the edge of the settlement at Hardwick and, bearing in mind the lack of employment opportunities in such a large settlement allocation of the site for employment purposes would provide a better balance between housing and jobs. The site is well located to provide a "cluster" development because of its close proximity to Cambridge on a good transport link. | This site lies outside, and is separated from, the village framework of a group village. It comprises of rear gardens of linear development along St. Neots Road. Its allocation for employment development would be contrary to the search sequence of policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. Additional employment land allocations are not required in order to meet the land supply requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. | |
| 10048 - Bayer CropScience Ltd (Hauxton, The Bayer CropScience Ltd Site) | Object | The Bayer CropScience Ltd site at Hauxton is likely to contain an employment element as part of a mixed-use redevelopment. The size of the employment component cannot be established at this time pending further technical work to determine the net area for development after evaluating among other matters, flood risk, and ground contamination. The site should be added to the table and a brief description included as a footnote regarding the position reached prior to agreeing the text of the deposit LDD's. | The redevelopment of Bayer CropScience Ltd site at Hauxton for a mixed use employment/residential development has been put forward in response to representations from the company. The size of the employment component indeed cannot be established at this time pending further technical work to determine the net area for development after evaluating among other matters, flood risk, and ground contamination. As the site is currently in employment use and the redevelopment is likely to result in no more and possibly less employment than at the height of the former use, an unqualified allocation in policy SP/4 is not appropriate. The site specific policy for the mixed use development will include a requirement for employment to be within the B1 use class to be compatible with residential development on the remainder of the site. | Amend policy SP/4 by adding a third entry to the table as follows: "3. The former Bayer CropScience site at Hauxton as part of a mixed-use redevelopment, Total Site Size to be specified following the preparation of a master plan or development brief. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| 11027 - Laing Rail (Foxton, Land South of A10) | Object | The rear portion of the industrial area south of the A10 Foxton is allocated for station parking. The advantages of this location are that existing platforms could be extended to the full 12 carriage length with a platform face to the proposed car park, access from the A10 would be at an established location by the filling station, and station facilities would be contained at the existing location thereby dispelling any local fears that an improved local railway station would be a catalyst for other development. We acknowledge that residential properties situated between the railway and industrial buildings would be affected by this proposal. | There is a planning policy tension with railway stations such as that at Foxton in the Cambridge Sub Region. The planning strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is to accommodate growth associated with the economy of the sub-region and not to encourage long distance commuting. That is the underlying principle behind the strategy of focussing development close to Cambridge and to support that development with public transport and other transport systems which are not attractive to out-of-county commuters to such destinations as London. Whilst rail can be used for local journeys, the train operating companies are increasingly seeking to grow their longer distance business. This proposal from Laing Rail at Foxton will make this station and the surrounding villages more attractive to London bound commuters, contrary to the planning strategy. | No change. |
| 10789 (Meldreth, Site at Whitecroft Road) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Whitcroft Road, Meldreth. Housing or employment. Land consists of previously unused land and is well connected to the existing village framework. The site is well constrained by existing development and other defensible boundaries (Station Road and the railway line). The site, which partly sits within the village framework, is more closely related to the existing built up area than the open countryside. | This site lies partly within the framework, but also includes an area of open land outside the village framework. Its development would extend the built up area of the village south, into the countryside. Its allocation for employment development would be contrary to the search sequence of policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, and Policy E3 of the Draft East of England Plan. Additional employment land allocations are not required in order to meet the land supply requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, outside the Strategic Employment sites as part of the new mixed developments on the edge of Cambridge and the new town of Northstowe. | |
| <i>Sub Paragraph 1.</i> | | | | |
| 9510 - GO-East 9509 - GO-East | Object | | Agreed. The objective of the proposed employment allocation at Longstanton is to create an overall mix to the expansion of the village to provide sufficient with an equal number of houses and jobs being created. 12,500 sq.m of B1 floorspace will create in the region of 500 jobs at 1 job for every 25sq.m of floorspace (the density at the Cambridge Science Park). This amount of floorspace will require 416 car parking spaces which will occupy approximately 8,500 sq m of land. The allocation will require an additional land take of approximately 25% of the site in order to provide adequate on-site and strategic landscaping on this new village edge. | (1) Amend the proposed site area in table to read 3.0 ha instead of 4.8ha. (2) Amend policy SP/4 (1) to read: "Longstanton, Hattons Road: The site is allocated for 12,500 sq.m of gross internal floor area of Research and Development use. Development of the site will be dependent upon the provision of a development related bypass secured through a legal agreement. The agreement will ensure that no floor area will be occupied before the bypass, including all necessary junctions and road links to the existing network are complete. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 2. 11117 - Environment Agency | Support | This site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3. An FRA will be required in accordance with NE/13. Appropriate level for level, volume for volume floodplain compensation will be required. The site is over a former landfill site and appropriate landfill gas investigations and mitigation will be required for any future development. The site may be contaminated due to previous uses. A scheme for the investigation and remediation of contaminated land will be required in accordance with NE/13. | Noted. Concerns can be addressed through the planning application process. | |
| <i>SP/5 Allocations for Class B1 and B2 Employment Uses</i> | | | | |
| 10671 - Atkins Property Development Ltd (Barhill, Land West of Bar Hill) | Object | Land west of Bar Hill. Policy fails to include a proposed allocation at north west Bar Hill for 5.7ha of mixed employment land (to come forward as part of a mixed development proposal including housing, open space and recreation facilities). (see separate objection to SP/1). | This site lies outside the village framework of Bar Hill. It comprises agricultural land north of the village, thus its development would result in an extension of the village into the countryside, beyond the perimeter road. Additional employment land allocations are not required in order to meet the land supply requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. Bar Hill has a ratio of 1.12 jobs to economically active people, indicating that it already has good employment provision. A housing allocation has not been made as a result of representations on policy SP/1, therefore an employment allocation related to this is not required. | |
| 10794 (Cottenham, Land at Beach Road) | Object | An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Dataracks, Beach Road, Cottenham. Much of the existing employment land, particular B2 uses, within established village frameworks are poorly related and incompatible with nearby residential accommodation. The extension of this well screened site (which will not impact on the amenity of the countryside) may free up land for housing in the existing settlements. | This site lies 500m south of Cottenham, in the countryside. It comprises of green field land, to the rear of an industrial building. Its allocation for employment development would be contrary to the search sequence of policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, and Policy E3 of the Draft East of England Plan. Additional employment land allocations are not required in order to meet the land supply requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. | |
| 8021 (Weston Colville, Land at Weston Colville Hall, Church End) | Object | Land at Weston Colville Hall, Church End Weston Colville. D'Abo family Trust owns site which contains attractive barns redundant for current agricultural use. The redevelopment plan for site is to convert barns and put a new build laboratory in place of an existing workshop - providing considerable local employment. The site is ideally geographically located for purpose being close to A11, Granta Park, Babraham and Hinxtton. The development is unique and will provide space on flexible terms to start-up scientific and bio-tech companies. DTI /EEDA will have involvement in project. We have found from feasibility study research there is considerable demand for these facilities. | This site lies some distance from the village framework of an infill village. It comprises of farm buildings. Its allocation for employment development would be contrary to the search sequence of policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, and Policy E3 of the Draft East of England Plan. Additional employment land allocations are not required in order to meet the land supply requirements of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. The conversion and replacement of buildings in the countryside for employment are dealt with by policies in the Development Control Policies DPD. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| <i>Policy Paragraph 1</i> | | | | |
| 8320 - D H Barford + Co Limited 8605 - John Gloag | Object | Objection is lodged in respect of the specific limitation for Class B1 and B2 uses on the identified sites. To ensure flexibility in meeting commercial demand and possibly the needs of existing local businesses, the Policy should be varied to also allow scope for Class B8 uses. This would add to the range of local employment opportunities and will also be consistent with Policy ET/1. | Agreed. | Amend 1st paragraph of policy SP/5: The following sites are allocated for employment development for uses within the classes B1, B2, B8 of the Town & Country (use classes amendment) order 2005 (offices, Research and Development, light industry, general industry, AND STORAGE USES). |
| <i>I.</i> | | | | |
| 8600 - John Gloag | Support | The allocation of the land is supported. This will secure well related development that is accessible from the village. Access and strategic planting details have all been agreed. | Support noted. | |
| <i>SP/6 West of St.Mary's Church, Gamlingay</i> | | | | |
| 8625 - John Gloag | Object | The land is Sensitive situated within the Gamlingay Conservation Area and the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and setting of nearby listed properties, as well as harm to the amenity of nearby properties. | The proposed cemetery site adjoins but is not located within the Gamlingay Conservation Area. Any potential adverse impact on the listed buildings closet to the proposed cemetery can be mitigated through landscaping and locating such uses as car parks away from those boundaries. | Amend policy SP/6 to read: "A site of 1 hectare west of St Mary's church, Gamlingay is allocated for use as a graveyard. Planning permission will be subject to landscaping conditions ensuring that the use of the land does not have an adverse impact on nearby listed buildings." |
| 8430 - Gamlingay Parish Council | Support | Land EAST of St Mary's Church- The Council strongly supports the need for this site to come forward as the new Gamlingay Cemetery. The site, known as St Mary's Field, offers an ideal location close to the church, the existing cemetery and centre of the village. The Parish Council are willing to make further representations regarding this proposal at the appropriate time. The Council will continue with its public participation exercise incorporating this into the Parish Plan. | Support noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|---|--|
| <i>SP/7 Allocations for Open Space</i> | | | | |
| 9644 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Impington, Land East of Resreation Ground) | Object | Land adjoining the existing Histon & Impington Recreation Ground should be allocated to provide for the expansion of formal public recreation facilities to meet a shortfall identified in the Recreation Study. | The Recreation Study 2005 does identify Histon and Impington as having a particular deficit of outdoor sport and children's play space. This site would allow the existing recreation ground to be expanded, enabling shared use of changing and ancillary facilities. This land is in the green belt, and any associated development would have to be appropriate. There is also a memorial stone on the site that will require appropriate protection. | Add to Policy SP/7: West of Recreation Ground, New Road, Impington 5.7ha. (development must provide appropriate protection for the Memorial Stone) |
| 11443 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Histon, Land at Barrowcroft (Gunns Lane)) 9649 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Histon, Chivers Barrell Field (Manor Park)) 11444 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Impington, proposed recreation land east of Mill Lane) | Object | In recognition of the shortage of recreation land within Histon & Impington, these areas of land should be allocated for recreational use which would mean that residents would not need to cross major roads within the village at: (1) East of Mill Lane. (2) "Chivers Barrell Field" (Manor Park) (3) Land at Barrowcroft (Gunns Lane) | The Recreation Study 2005 does identify Histon and Impington as having a particular deficit of outdoor sport and children's play space. The land east of Mill Lane and at Barrowcroft is in the green belt, and any associated development would have to be appropriate. The Parish Council will now need to take the results of the 2005 Recreation Study and develop a detailed recreation strategy for the village in support of the allocations that it has requested which meets the needs of each part of the village, particularly for the local provision of children's play. | Allocate the following areas of land for recreation use: (1) East of Mill Lane. (2) "Chivers Barrell Field" (Manor Park) (3) Land at Barrowcroft (Gunns Lane) |
| 10686 - Atkins Property Development Ltd (Barhill, Land West of Bar Hill) | Object | Land west of Bar Hill. There is a severe shortage of sports pitches and play space provision at Bar Hill. Proposals for a mixed development proposal at north west Bar Hill provide 6.4ha sports pitches and 1.5ha community facilities. This proposal should be included at Policy SP/7. There is in addition 5.3ha of public open space as part of the Masterplan proposals. | Whilst it is acknowledged that Bar Hill has deficiencies in terms of playspace provision compared to the standards proposed in the Development Control Policies DPD, the site detailed is not proposed to be allocated for development, consequently the area within this of associated open space should not be included in the allocations for open space policy. | |
| 9312 - Sport England East | Support | Policy SP/7 is supported as it identifies sites for extensions to recreation grounds and school playing fields in response to the conclusions of the Council's Recreation Study. This is considered to be an appropriate response to addressing the land use implications of the study's conclusions and will secure the sites for the uses proposed which should protect the sites from alternative developments which may prejudice the potential for local deficiencies in recreation provision from being met. | Support for the allocations in Policy SP/7 noted. | |
| 9643 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils | Support | Histon & Impington Recreation Ground must be protected for community use. | Support for protection of recreation grounds noted. This is addressed by policy SF/11 of the Development Control Policies DPD. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| <i>1.</i> | | | | |
| 10655 (Over, Land East of Recreation Ground) 10660 (Over, Land East of Recreation Ground) | Object | Objections are raised to the fact Land at the Doles, New Road, Over, has been omitted from the Village Framework for Over and allocated as an extension to the existing recreation ground. It is considered more appropriate for the additional recreational facilities to be located on the outskirts of the Village, whilst facilitating further residential development land more conveniently situated for all facilities. | <p>The South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study 2005 indicated that over does not meet the minimum standard for outdoor play space detailed in the Development Control Policies DPD. The sites continued allocation of Land in Over to meet this shortfall is therefore justified.</p> <p>The site is an ideal location for an extension to the existing recreation ground, providing benefits of utilising existing ancillary facilities. It is surrounded on three sides by existing development, and is accessible to the village. It has the informal support of the Parish Council.</p> <p>Additional residential allocations outside village frameworks are not required. Over is designated a group village, therefore an additional allocation would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, and Policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan.</p> | |
| <i>2.</i> | | | | |
| 9593 | Support | As a County Councillor for Stapleford, I support policy SP/7 (2) in relation to the extension to the recreation ground in Stapleford. | Support noted. | |
| <i>SP/8 Character of Village Centres</i> | | | | |
| 9515 - GO-East | Object | This policy in effect appears to seek to apply a limit to the growth of the centres of the villages that are identified in Policy ST/3 in the Core Strategy as Rural Centres. The supporting paragraph appears to indicate that a key reason for the policy is 'problems of car parking and congestion' along with the objective of preserving the character of the centres of the villages. The policy itself, however, relates only to matters of the character of the centres and therefore seems inconsistent with the reason given in the supporting text. Additionally, if the main issues for the villages relate to their character, then the matters set out Policy SP/8 might be more appropriately covered in a generic development control policy relating to design. | It is agreed that the policy considerations are adequately covered by development principles policies, particularly those relating to design. The policy should be deleted. | Delete Policy SP/8, and paragraph 11.12. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|--|
| 9514 - GO-East | Object | Consideration should be given as to whether this policy is consistent with the designation of the villages as Rural Centres, which supports in a positive way the development of the centres of those villages in line with their role and function within the hierarchy of centres. We question therefore whether the policy could be reframed in a more positive way or whether it is unnecessary by virtue of the matters being covered elsewhere in other policies, and should therefore be deleted. | It is agreed that the policy considerations are adequately covered by development principles policies, particularly those relating to design. The policy should be deleted. | Delete Policy SP/8, and paragraph 11.12. |
| <i>I.</i> | | | | |
| 9595 | Support | As a County Councillor for Great Shelford I support policy SP/8 (1) regarding the High Street / Woollards Lane area of Great Shelford. | Support noted, however following representations, the policy considerations are considered to be adequately covered by development principles policies, particularly those relating to design. The policy is proposed to be deleted. | |
| <i>SP/9 Linton Special Policy Area</i> | | | | |
| 8129 (Linton, Land at Station Road) | Object | Land at Station Road, Linton. Policy SP/9 precludes development south of the A1307 mainly because of the severance caused by the road and absence of good connection to the village centre. Scheme for residential development of the Objection site includes the provision of a pedestrian bridge over the A1307. When this is done the distance to the main area of services in the village will be far closer, within easy walking distance, than a number of existing outlying residential areas in Linton. | <p>The area south of the A505 is severed from the main village, limiting its suitability for residential development. This is reflected in policy SP/9. It is unlikely this could be overcome effectively even with provision of a footbridge.</p> <p>With regard to allocating the site, there is no need to allocate further sites in minor rural centres, given the results of the urban capacity study and existing commitments. Allocation would not conform to the site sequence detailed in Structure Plan Policy P1/1, and Draft East of England Plan Policy CRS1.</p> | |
| 8749 - The Fairey Family | Object | We act for the Fairey family who own land at and around Linton. We object to Policy SP/9 which is an unnecessary additional policy which seeks to afford protection to the area concerned. There are other measures open to the Council to protect land from development, if that is their intention. This policy in our estimation is superfluous and should be omitted. | The area south of the A505 is severed from the main village, limiting its suitability for residential development. This is reflected in policy SP/9. Given the characteristics of the area the policy is justified. | |
| 9910 - Old Road Securities Plc | Support | Support is given to this policy. Development can be accommodated in Linton (at Bartlow Road and Horseheath Road) without requiring additional development south of the A1307 by-pass at Linton. | Support for the policy noted. A response to the specific site referred to is dealt with in response to other representations. | |

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Councils' Assessment

Change to Draft DPD

SP/10 Former Land Settlement Association Estates

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| 9520 - GO-East 8366 | Object | | Agreed. A replacement policy SP/10 and written justification is proposed. | <p>Change policy SP/10 and the written justification to read: "Within the former Land Settlement Association site at Fen Drayton, where it can be demonstrated that buildings are no longer needed for agricultural purposes, planning permission for change of use or redevelopment of existing buildings will be permitted for on site experimental or other ground-breaking forms of sustainable living provided that development would not occupy a larger footprint than existing buildings. (policy)</p> <p>The Land Settlement Association's activities at Fen Drayton are an earlier example of an attempt to achieve a more sustainable form of living but with the passage of time this has not proved to be an enduring model. The current legacy of the experiment is a network of small land holdings, a wide variety of land uses including some disuse, and a patchwork of buildings of variable quality. It is difficult to see how this area can be returned to a pattern of land use or a landscape character in any way akin to the surrounding fenland countryside. In view of the area's history and its current appearance, form and character this policy will allow it to evolve as a positive experimental test-bed for new forms of sustainable living.</p> <p>A requirement of sustainable living at Fen Drayton will be a development which is carbon neutral. Prospective developers will be required to submit a 'carbon neutral energy statement' with their planning applications which will demonstrate how the construction and use of the development will ensure that its occupants will not cause any net increase in carbon emissions when compared to a greenfield site.</p> |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| 10905 - Humo Holdings (Great Abington, Land at Strawberry Farm) 9580 | Object | | Policy SP/10 is proposed to be deleted as the policy proposes that only countryside uses will be permitted within the former LSA areas and is therefore no different from all other areas of countryside in South Cambridgeshire. | Required measures will include: ensuring the development is highly energy efficiency in terms of design, construction and subsequent use; utilises locally generated renewable energy; has high levels of recycling and has a long-term goal of ensuring no waste is sent to landfill by providing facilities to recycle, compost and convert waste to energy; introduces measures to restrict car use and promote sustainable forms of travel and commuting." (written justification) |
| <i>SP/11 Papworth Everard Village Development</i> | | | | |
| 10650 - Varrier Jones Foundation | Object | There is a need to maintain the housing and employment balance in Papworth Everard by allowing a degree of flexibility for the redevelopment potential of Site 1 - Papworth Hospital site. This could be achieved by deleting the words "based primarily on employment, but potentially incorporating housing development". Replace this wording with "Maintaining the housing and employment balance of the village". Consequently, delete point 2 from Site 1 - Policy SP/11, given its suggested elevation to main policy text. Similarly, remove the same wording from paragraph 11.16 of the plan. | Disagree. The emphasis on employment on the hospital site is important in order to maintain the housing and employment balance of the village. Given the scale of housing development that has taken place in the village, and the potential additional housing at Papworth Everard West Central, it is vital that a significant element of employment is achieved. | |
| 8432 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Object | We strongly object to the omission of the Adopted Local Plan 2004 policy Papworth Everard 2 that followed from the recognition by the Local Plan Inspector in 2001/2002 that Papworth Everard is a special case, and that for outstanding areas of development an 'average density of 25 dwellings per hectare will be achieved, although a range of densities above and below that will be sought'. It was noted 'although 25 dph is still lower than the density range sought by PPG3 all major parties at the Inquiry are in agreement on this point, which he supports.' | The lower density requirement in Papworth Everard detailed in Local Plan 2004, was originally envisaged to reflect the character of development along Ermine Street and Barons Way. Good urban design in the village and the district has demonstrated character can be protected at higher densities. Structure Plan 2003 Policy P5/3 makes clear the need for increased densities across the area in order to maximise the efficiency in the use of sites. It states that densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare will not be acceptable. Operating a lower density requirement at Papworth Everard would be inconsistent with this policy, and can no longer be justified. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10324 - Highways Agency | Object | With regard to the Site Specific Policies, the Highways Agency has concerns about proposed development at Cambridge Northern Fringe, Cambridge Northern fringe East (Chesterton Sidings), Papworth Everard, Cambridge Airport, and Cambourne all of which could have implications for the trunk road network. We would wish to see evidence that the scale of development proposed could be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the operation of the adjacent trunk roads. | <p>The development plan seeks to reduce the need to travel, and where unavoidable, achieve access by non-car modes. Policy TR/1 will not permit development where additional travel demand is not sufficiently addressed through providing modal choice, and Policy TR/3 is concerned with mitigating traffic impact and requires a Transport Assessment be undertaken for development with 'significant transport implications', in accordance with PPG13. Policy DP/3 criteria 2 is concerned with securing "appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety." Whilst not making explicit mention of the trunk road network, these policies address concerns raised.</p> <p>Historically development which came forward through policies in Local Plan 2004 made provision to mitigate their impacts, for example, development at Cambourne contributed to the dualling of the A428 and Cambridge Northern Fringe provides additional capacity at existing junctions onto the A14. Similarly, the LDF should ensure that future development adequately mitigates its impact. The Highways Agency has been fully engaged in the early work on planning the major developments at Northstowe and Cambridge East with active membership on the Transport Topic Groups. The Highways Authority is also consulted on all planning applications in the vicinity of the trunk road network and if a planning application were considered to jeopardise the trunk road network in any way, could recommend appropriate mitigation or even refusal.</p> | |
| 8415 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Object | The boundaries indicated on the proposals map are incorrect. | Disagree. The site does include a wider area than that proposed by this representation. This allows the site, through a development brief, to be considered comprehensively, rather than small sections only linked by a footpath. It is acknowledged that there may be buildings within this boundary that are retained in their current uses. | |
| 10265 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge | Support | Addenbrooke's 2020 vision, in which the University is a partner, provides for the development of a new Papworth Hospital on the Addenbrooke's campus. The new hospital will provide a purpose built cardiothoracic hospital and research institute that will create a powerful force in clinical practice, research and education. The University welcomes the inclusion in the LDF of a site specific policy that acknowledges this proposed re-location and addresses the redevelopment of the Papworth Hospital site at Papworth Everard. | Support for inclusion of a policy noted. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|---|
| 8307 - Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust | Support | The draft policy has been prepared following extensive discussions with the Trust, key stakeholders and other relevant parties. The policy is considered to be sound and includes a clear mechanism for implementation, ie preparation of a brief for the site. The Trust are willing to take part in the independent examination of the policy. | Support for the proposed policy noted. | |
| <i>Policy Paragraph 2</i> | | | | |
| 8411 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Support | In the event that there is no alternative to redeveloping the Papworth Hospital site we support this policy as stated. If this policy is altered prior to submission to the Secretary of State, or prior to final approval, the Parish Council wish to be consulted. | Support for policy noted. Additional consultation will take place when the plan is submitted to the secretary of state, anticipated in January 2006. | |
| <i>Policy Paragraph 4</i> | | | | |
| 9909 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Object | The policy correctly describes this site as being for mixed use. We object to the wording 'primarily for housing, but incorporating SOME employment and community uses' as a significant part of the site currently provides valuable local employment and community facilities. The policy needs to be less specific in order to facilitate the inclusion of more than 'some' employment should the opportunity arise. It is more appropriate to say 'Redevelopment will provide mixed development for housing, employment and community uses'. | It is agreed that the balance of housing, employment and community uses, can be further explored further through preparation of a supplementary planning document. | Amend First Paragraph of SP/11 Site 2 - Papworth Everard West Central to read: "Redevelopment will be based on a mixed use development aimed at the continued invigoration of the village centre with community uses, employment and housing development." |
| <i>11.16</i> | | | | |
| 8410 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Object | In the second sentence the phrase '... maintain the housing and employment balance of the village' is not precise enough. A measure of how such balance will be quantified ahead of any relevant planning decisions needs to be agreed and published. Currently the village has about 2000 residents of whom 300 are employed at Papworth Hospital. | The objective in employment terms will be to secure an equivalent amount of employment as currently exists on the hospital site, not just the number of village residents who are currently employed at the hospital. Any planning application for the redevelopment of the hospital site will be required to provide this information in order to satisfy criteria (2) of policy SP/11. | No change. |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|---|
| <i>11.17</i> | | | | |
| 8418 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Object | It is incorrect to state that the site 'currently includes mainly accommodation relating to the hospital'. Currently the Papworth West Central area comprises two churches that are approaching the end of their structural life, office and commercial accommodation, and residential property that includes sheltered housing for the disabled and two nurses homes. Any redevelopment would be based on mixed use as stated in the policy for Site 2. It would not be 'primarily based on residential development'. The boundaries indicated on the associated proposals map are incorrect. | (a) Factual correction noted and revised approach agreed. (b) A consequential amendment to policy SP/11 "Site 2 - Papworth Everard West Central" is also required to emphasise that the mixed use development will not be based on employment and community uses as well as housing. | (a) Amend paragraph 11.17 to read: "Further redevelopment at what has become known as Papworth West Central Area which may also provide opportunities for redevelopment of previously developed land. The area comprises two churches which are approaching the end of their structural life, office and commercial accommodation, and residential property that includes sheltered housing for the disabled and two nurses homes. Located at the heart of the expanded village any redevelopment will be based on a mixed use development aimed at the continued invigoration of the village centre with community uses, employment and housing development." (b) Amend the paragraph under the policy SP/11 "Site 2 - Papworth Everard West Central" heading to read: "Redevelopment will be based on a mixed use development aimed at the continued invigoration of the village centre with community uses, employment and housing development." |
| <i>SP/12 Duxford Imperial War Museum</i> | | | | |
| 8313 - Imperial War Museum | Object | It is proposed that a Supplementary Planning Document, i.e. a Brief, is prepared to provide further detailed guidance. This would include guidance on the disposition of museum and possible non-museum land uses within the site; identification of key buildings and their setting; further description of the relationship to Heathfield village; and a more detailed explanation of the application of the criteria within the amended policy. | Conservation area designation and appraisal has been scheduled in the Local Development Scheme, scheduled for consultation in April 2007. This will include guidance relating to the character and appropriate development. This Supplementary Planning Document will be consistent with the policies in the Site Specific Policies DPD, including policy SP/12. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 8312 - Imperial War Museum | Object | <p>The policy as it is currently worded lacks flexibility, amend wording as follows:</p> <p>"The Imperial War Museum site at Duxford Airfield will be treated as a special case primarily as a museum which is a major tourist/recreation facility. Proposals will be considered with regard to the particular needs and opportunities of the site, and the following specific criteria:</p> <p>1) Any Museum proposal must be associated with continued use as a Museum of modern conflict; 2) The District Council will require additional details concerning scale, form and design to accompany any applications; 3) Details of projected increases in aircraft noise will be required with all proposals which would lead to increased flying activity; 4) Any proposals involving the re-use of surplus buildings and land within the site for non-Museum uses must preserve or enhance its character, heritage and appearance, and contribute to the vitality and viability of Heathfield village through providing an appropriate mix of uses.</p> <p>Further guidance will be detailed in a Supplementary Planning Document."</p> | <p>Not accepted. The policy is designed to acknowledge the importance of the Imperial War Museum, and provide a policy context for dealing with planning applications in relation to it. The historic importance of the former airbase warrants a special degree of protection. English Heritage have recently completed a thematic survey of all the buildings on the site. This highlighted its importance, and the need to maintain the site as a group of buildings.</p> <p>The change proposed in the representation would appear to apply greater control to other museum uses than any other type of use. It also appears to seek to permit uses not related to the museum. Such a policy could have a detrimental impact on the site, and have other implications including traffic issues on the A505.</p> | |
| <i>SP/13 New Road Infrastructure</i> | | | | |
| 10288 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge | Object | <p>This policy makes no reference to the CHUMMS related road schemes nor to the need to safeguard land for CHUMMS related road projects. The University considers that some reference to these schemes ought to be included in the Core Strategy and on the Proposals Maps. (A copy of the University's comments on the Highways Agency's recent proposals is attached for information.)</p> | <p>Policy SP/13 safeguards land for the local road infrastructure projects contained in the adopted Structure Plan and / or Local Transport Plan. The A14 proposals resulting from CHUMMS are the remit of the Highways Agency and are outside the scope of the LDF. To include reference to the CHUMMS A14 proposals would be contrary to PPS12. There is no definitive route to include on the Proposals Map and the Highways Agency are automatically consulted on all development proposals in the vicinity of the A14 (or other trunk road).</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| 9599 | Object | Policy SP/13 is about safeguarding land for the provision of road improvements and for a bridge to replace the Foxton Level Crossing. The bridge will lead to shorter journey times on the A10. Southern Fringe developments (and possible development of the Bayer Cropscience site) are likely to lead to increased traffic movements on the A10 south of Cambridge. All this points to the need for relieving the traffic problems in Harston. The Local Development Framework needs to give appropriate attention to the traffic problems experienced in Harston. Serious thought should therefore be given to how these problems can be reduced. A bypass has recently been constructed at Fordham in East Cambridgeshire where traffic flows are surely lower than through Harston. | Policy SP/13 details the road infrastructure projects contained in the adopted Structure Plan and / or Local Transport Plan, in order to safeguard land from other development. The replacement to the Foxton level crossing is contained in Structure Plan Policy P8/10. However, the Provisional Local Transport Plan no longer includes it. Therefore, it would be appropriate to remove the proposal from Policy SP/13. | Delete bullet point 2 and reference to Foxton Level Crossing in paragraph 11.20. |
| <i>11.20</i> | | | | |
| 8500 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee | Object | We strongly object to the limitations of this policy for Papworth Everard which when combined with the housing policy in SP/1 would allow new development to proceed ad infinitum without a bypass ever being constructed. | The Department of Transport has agreed funding for the bypass. They state that construction is imminent and the scheme is expected to be completed by December 2006. | |
| <i>SP/14 Rapid Transit</i> | | | | |
| 8005 - Stamford Homes Limited | Support | The policy is supported given the greater sustainability it provides for the village of Over and the potential for new development to be allocated to the village. | Support noted. | |
| <i>11.22</i> | | | | |
| 7804 - The camToo Project | Object | There is no reference to stage 2 of the RTS as described in the bid by Cambridgeshire County Council for government funding. This stage 2 should follow the camToo route thereby serving the proposed Chesterton Station. Current proposals by the County Council will not put the station on a through route for road based public transport. | Policy SP/14 safeguards land for the Rapid Transit scheme contained in the adopted Structure Plan and Local Transport Plan. Figure 11.5 (and Figure 11.11 in respect of Chesterton Interchange) in the Provisional LTP shows the route of the Guided Busway, and those parts within South Cambs are safeguarded accordingly. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|----------------------------------|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| <i>SP/16 Rail Freight</i> | | | | |
| 8195 - Lovejoy | Support | Policy SP/16 identifies one of the sites to be protected for rail freight use as sidings at Duxford. This policy, and the reference to Duxford, is supported. Hexcel Composites Ltd manufactures composite materials, primarily for use in aircraft construction, on an Established Employment Area in the Countryside at Ickleton Road, Duxford. The site is shared with other uses and users, and identified in Policy ET/4 (site 8 - Vantico, south of Duxford). Hexcel have advanced separate representations in respect of Policy ET/4, which accord with the objective of safeguarding the sidings at Duxford. | Support for the safeguarding of rail freight facilities and sidings noted. | |
| 9682 - Foxton Parish Council | Support | Support policy SP/16. | Support for the safeguarding of rail freight facilities and sidings noted. | |
| <i>SP/18 Cambourne</i> | | | | |
| 8080 - Swavesey IDB | Object | The increased number of houses in Cambourne will lead to an increased volume of treated effluent discharging from Uttons Drove Sewage Treatment Works into the Swavesey Drain system. This will contribute to further flooding in the Board's area unless a more appropriate point of discharge is found. | Anglia Water is investigating how best to treat additional effluent emanating from Cambourne and Northstowe. The expansion of the Uttons Drove STW is one of the options which if chosen would trigger planning obligations towards the costs of upgrading both the STW and if there is inadequate capacity, the surface water drainage system receiving treated waste water. Those matters are capable of being addressed without any change to policy SP/18 "Cambourne". | No change. |
| 11227 - Cambourne Parish Council | Object | Whilst understanding the necessity of increasing the density in SP/18 to reflect PPG3 and policy HG/1 we would seek clarification on the density being applied as highlighted in our response to ST/1. Cambourne Parish Council agrees that the approved Masterplan and design guide requires revising. Any additional dwellings will require improvements in infrastructure and transport (especially public transport) to ensure the sustainability of development in Cambourne. In revising the Masterplan consideration should be given to the conditions to the approval of planning permission if Cambourne Enhanced had given as these are relevant to any sizable development in Cambourne. | As stated in the policy, additional growth will require a section 106 agreement, to secure additional facilities and development contributions required as a result. As the representation correctly states, potential requirements for an enlarged Cambourne were explored through the Cambourne Enhanced Inquiry. They may be relevant, but issues will need to be explored further through the review of the master plan, and future planning applications. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|---|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10681 - Atkins Property Development Ltd | Object | In light of the recent Appeal Inspector's / Secretary of State's dismissal of "Cambourne Enhanced" the policy as worded presumes much. Site specific allocations must be considered as part of the LDF process as recommended by the Secretary of State. Thus, there is a need to delete the policy and related policies SP/19 and SP/20. | The plan proposes to increase development in the remaining phases of Cambourne to the Government's minimum recommended density, and higher in the most accessible locations. This is consistent with policy HG/1 in the Deelopment Control Policies DPD. Cambourne will be one of the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire. A very thorough assessment has been undertaken of the services and facilities that are available in the villages and Cambourne scores well. There is a planned strategy for securing the services, facilities and infrastructure at Cambourne which will be enhanced by requiring the additional development to contribute towards the additional needs of the larger community. It is also consistent with the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, which proposes that the potential for further development at Cambourne be investigated. | |
| 10326 - Highways Agency | Object | With regard to the Site Specific Policies, the Highways Agency has concerns about proposed development at Cambridge Northern Fringe, Cambridge Northern fringe East (Chesterton Sidings), Papworth Everard, Cambridge Airport, and Cambourne all of which could have implications for the trunk road network. We would wish to see evidence that the scale of development proposed could be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the operation of the adjacent trunk roads. | <p>The development plan seeks to reduce the need to travel, and where unavoidable, achieve access by non-car modes. Policy TR/1 will not permit development where additional travel demand is not sufficiently addressed through providing modal choice, and Policy TR/3 is concerned with mitigating traffic impact and requires a Transport Assessment be undertaken for development with 'significant transport implications', in accordance with PPG13. Policy DP/3 criteria 2 is concerned with securing "appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety." Whilst not making explicit mention of the trunk road network, these policies address concerns raised.</p> <p>Historically development which came forward through policies in Local Plan 2004 made provision to mitigate their impacts, for example, development at Cambourne contributed to the dualling of the A428 and Cambridge Northern Fringe provides additional capacity at existing junctions onto the A14. Similarly, the LDF should ensure that future development adequately mitigates its impact. The Highways Agency has been fully engaged in the early work on planning the major developments at Northstowe and Cambridge East with active membership on the Transport Topic Groups. The Highways Authority is also consulted on all planning applications in the vicinity of the trunk road network and if a planning application were considered to jeopardise the trunk road network in any way, could recommend appropriate mitigation or even refusal.</p> | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|---|
| <i>11.29</i> | | | | |
| 8772 - The Cambourne Consortium | Object | Paragraph 11.29 should be amended to read after ' village framework' line 6: It is however not the role of the DPD to determine precisely the number of additional dwellings. Rather the Master Plan exercise to be undertaken in response to Policy SP/18 and Policy HG1 will determine the opportunity to increase housing provision. The paragraph 11.29 inappropriately casts a limit on the anticipated expansion of dwellings at Cambourne contrary to the provisions of Policy ST/3 which sets no limit on individual scheme size. | The additional 700 dwellings is based on notional densities, based on the methodology utilised in the South Cambridgeshire Urban Capacity Study. It is correct that this number will be further explored through the design process. | Add to paragraph 11.29, after the 4th sentence: IT IS HOWEVER NOT THE ROLE OF THE DPD TO DETERMINE PRECISELY THE NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL DWELLINGS. RATHER THE MASTER PLAN EXERCISE TO BE UNDERTAKEN IN RESPONSE TO POLICY SP/18 AND POLICY HG1 WILL DETERMINE THE OPPORTUNITY TO INCREASE HOUSING PROVISION. |
| <i>SP/19 Cambourne Approved Masterplan and Design Guide</i> | | | | |
| 10484 - Davison & Co (Barford) Ltd (Elsworth, Land between Cambourne and Papworth Everard) | Object | In order to ensure the range of facilities, and size of population to support a sustainable settlement allocated as a Rural Centre, it will be necessary for the development at Cambourne to extend beyond the original Master Plan area. In particular, our client's land to the north of the A428 is considered an appropriate site for this extension. | Not accepted. This substantial site is green field, and some distance away from the proposed village framework of Cambourne. Development of this site would be contrary to the development sequence detailed in Structure Plan Policy P1/1. Its allocation would result in a substantial over provision for housing in the plan. The Core Strategy DPD details housing land supply, and how Structure Plan requirements will be met in the plan period. An additional development on this scale is not required. The planned level of services and facilities at Cambourne are anticipated to be sufficient to meet the rural centres tests utilised in the Local Development Framework. Additional growth on this scale would not be required to achieve this goal. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 10682 - Atkins Property Development Ltd | Object | In light of the recent Appeal Inspector's / Secretary of State's dismissal of "Cambourne Enhanced" the policy as worded presumes much. Site specific allocations must be considered as part of the LDF process as recommended by the Secretary of State. Thus, there is a need to delete the policy and related policies SP/19 and SP/20. | The plan proposes to increase development in the remaining phases of Cambourne to the Government's minimum recommended density, and higher in the most accessible locations. This is consistent with policy HG/1 in the Deelopment Control Policies DPD. Cambourne will be one of the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire. A very thorough assessment has been undertaken of the services and facilities that are available in the villages and Cambourne scores well. There is a planned strategy for securing the services, facilities and infrastructure at Cambourne which will be enhanced by requiring the additional development to contribute towards the additional needs of the larger community. It is also consistent with the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, which proposes that the potential for further development at Cambourne be investigated. | |
| 11221 - Cambourne Parish Council | Object | Cambourne Parish Council views with concern further intensification of the density of dwellings in Cambourne. If development does occur there should be specific level of growth with a revised masterplan incorporating sufficient safeguards to ensure the sustainability of Cambourne. These should include public transport, youth provision etc. The economic vitality of Cambourne should be enhanced by the LDF and its policies. | It is agreed that the revised Masterplan will need to explore issues of infrastructure, services and facilities. They will also need to be addressed through future planning applications. This is adequatly covered by policy SP/18 and paragraph 11.29. | |
| 9152 - The Cambourne Consortium (Caxton, Land West of Cambourne) | Object | 4.3□SUMMARY The Proposals Map should identify land to the west of Cambourne as a safeguarded urban extension to Cambourne - to meet future development needs possibly arising from the failure of Northstowe to deliver the required levels of housing or to meet future development needs in response to the emerging RSS14. | The Site Specific Policies DPD proposes to increase development in the remaining phases of Cambourne to the Government's minimum recommended density, and higher in the most accessible locations. This is consistent with policy HG/1 in the Development Control Policies DPD. Developing a substantial area of green field land adjacent to the village framework of Cambourne would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. The Core Strategy DPD details housing land supply, and how Structure Plan requirements will be met in the plan period. An additional development on this scale is not required. The deliverability of Northstowe is addressed by the Core Strategy DPD and the Area Action Plan. it is anticipated that sufficient numbers of dwellings will be delivered to meet the Structure plan housing land supply requirements. The Local Development Framework will be subject to annual monitoring reports. These will include housing land supply considerations, and should the situation dictate, further reviews of the Local Development Framework can be made. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|
| <i>SP/20 Cambourne School Lane Special Policy Area</i> | | | | |
| 8773 - The Cambourne Consortium | Object | Policy SP/20 should be amended to read as follows: 'The layout of residential development within the Cambourne School Lane Special Policy Area should maintain the separate character areas of Great and Lower Cambourne'. | Due to the nature of the site, forming a green wedge between Greater and Lower Cambourne, incorporating the Eco-Park to the north and Country Park to the south, it is considered vital to the character of separation between the village elements. Placing a low limit on the density of development in the area is considered an effective means of controlling development on the site to ensure it meets these aims. | |
| 10683 - Atkins Property Development Ltd | Object | In light of the recent Appeal Inspector's / Secretary of State's dismissal of "Cambourne Enhanced" the policy as worded presumes much. Site specific allocations must be considered as part of the LDF process as recommended by the Secretary of State. Thus, there is a need to delete the policy and related policies SP/19 and SP/20. | The plan proposes to increase development in the remaining phases of Cambourne to the Government's minimum recommended density, and higher in the most accessible locations. This is consistent with policy HG/1 in the Deelopment Control Policies DPD. Cambourne will be one of the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire. A very thorough assessment has been undertaken of the services and facilities that are available in the villages and Cambourne scores well. There is a planned strategy for securing the services, facilities and infrastructure at Cambourne which will be enhanced by requiring the additional development to contribute towards the additional needs of the larger community. It is also consistent with the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, which proposes that the potential for further development at Cambourne be investigated. | |

| <i>Representations</i> | <i>Nature</i> | <i>Representation Summary</i> | <i>Councils' Assessment</i> | <i>Change to Draft DPD</i> |
|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| <i>SP/21 Green Separation from Longstanton</i> | | | | |
| 9522 - GO-East 9460 - English Partnerships 9232 - English Partnerships 9461 - English Partnerships 8959 - The Fairfield Partnership 9069 - The Fairfield Partnership 8966 - The Fairfield Partnership 8962 - The Fairfield Partnership 9441 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd. 9111 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd. 9442 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd. | Object | (a) It is inappropriate to include this, or any of the site specific policies in the Core StrategyDPD. Guidance in PPS12 clearly advises that the core strategy document should set out a spatial vision and strategic objectives for an area. The Policy has no direct relationship with any other policy in this section of the DPD and is out of context. (b) Policy SP/21 repeats text in Policy NS/6 of the Northstowe AAP, as does the supporting paragraphs in 11.33 to 11.38. There is no need for this policy to be included in the Site Specific Policies DPD and should be deleted. (c) For sustainability reasons, public access between Northstowe and Longstanton across the green separation should be permitted. (d) Urban open space uses should be permitted in the Green Separation. (e) Green Spearation will be required for Willingham and Rampton. | (a) Core Strategy, Development Control Policies and Site Specific Allocations are 3 separate DPDs which were bound together for the purposes of public participation (to be helpful to those being consulted and to save on printing costs). They will be printed separated when they are submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2006. (b) The Site Specific DPD includes policies for green separation at Northstowe as a result of Council's decision that any part of the green separation which included policies related to the adjoining village should be shown in the Village Inset. In this case the Conservation areas at Longstanton St Michaels include part of the countryside setting of this part of the village (notably the setting of Longstanton All Saints church) and accordingly are included in the Longstanton Inset. (c) A proposed amendment to the policy is recommended to make the policy specific to the Conservation Areas ontianed within the Longstanton Inset. The remainder of the Green Separation is included within the Northstowe Area Action Plan, including additional areas of Green Separation adjoining these two Conservation Areas. | Amend policy heading and policy SP/21 to read "Policy SP/21: Conservation Areas and Green Separation at Longstanton", "Countryside within the 2 Conservation Areas at Longstanton St Michaels will be included in its entirety within the Green Separation between Longstanton and Northstowe. Public access to these areas of countryside will be controlled to protect the setting of the village. Urban uses, including open space uses such as playing fields, allotments or cemeteries will not be permitted. The open aspect of the fields affording views of All Saints Church will be maintained, elsewhere the landscape character of a series of hedged paddocks, small copses and tree belts will be maintained and enhanced." Amend the Longstanton Inset Map to show the extent of the revised Longstanton St Michaels Conservation Area. |
| <i>11.34</i> | | | | |
| 9006 - The Fairfield Partnership | Object | A minimum of 200m Green Separation will not be sufficient to provide effect visual separation when taking into account the village character and the individual landscape character of Oakington and Longstanton. Increasing the depth of Green Separation will provide more effective separation through greater distance and through the use of a variety of landscape treatments. Proposed Amendment: The second sentence of the paragraph should be amended to read 'A minimum of 400m between'. | This representation is identical to this objector's representation on policy SP/21 "Green Separation from Longstanton" which is considered under that policy reference. | No Change. |