

Appendix 1

Northstowe Area Action Plan

Northstowe Area Action Plan

Public Participation Report

Chapter 2. Towards A Spatial Strategy

NS1 The Site: Option A - Alternative Option

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
 Chapter 2. Towards A Spatial Strategy				
<i>NS1 The Site: Option A - Alternative Option</i>				
1310	Object	We must insist on adequate separation to existing housing/villages PRIOR to deciding. 200m must be the minimum and not discretionary.	Council at its meeting of 22nd July 2004 decided that the extent of 'green separation' should be agreed before publishing site options for public participation. A subsequent report on 'green separation' was considered by the Northstowe Member Steering Group at its meeting on 6th September following an extensive member site visit of the margins of Longstanton and Oakington. As a consequence, members agreed that 200m should be the minimum 'green separation' with more in sensitive locations such as the Conservation Area which extends as far east as Long Lane.	
1290	Object	This option should be restricted to 8,000 homes. With the pressures on the area my concern is that the density, separation etc. of housing is vulnerable to change to allow for further homes to be built. This is completely out of character with the rest of the area and detrimental to Longstanton.	The objection is to more than a development of 8,000 houses on Option A. It is possible that good design and layout during the lifetime of the development may demonstrate that higher densities could be compatible with the emerging character of Northstowe. However, it would be premature before development has even been given planning permission to assume that higher densities would be acceptable. The starting point in the preferred options report is that development will be at an average density of 40 dph.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1200	Object	Too close to Longstanton	Noted. The Structure Plan requires that the new town be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and anticipates that it will be so close that it is necessary to include a requirement that they are kept apart by 'green separation'. Members have considered a report and undertaken a site visit to investigate further the issue of 'green separation' and concluded that 200m should provide adequate separation in the context of the Structure Plan proposal for the new town.	
1265	Object	<p>Northstowe will throw more traffic onto the A14 which cannot cope with its current load. No development of this size should be permitted until the A14 has been upgraded. The guided bus link will make little difference even when it is eventually built.</p> <p>This site includes a conservation area which should be excluded from the proposed development area.</p>	<p>It will need to be a requirement of the Area Action Plan and any subsequent planning permissions that all the infrastructure requirements of Northstowe are known before development commences. Any planning permissions will need to include suitable trigger mechanisms which will govern the development of Northstowe in order to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the infrastructure that each phase of development will require including the upgrade of the A14.</p> <p>None of the Preferred Options included any part of any conservation area within the development area.</p>	Ensure that the policies in the AAP include suitable trigger mechanisms relating development to the provision of necessary services, facilities and infrastructure.
1729	Object	Not enough separation with Oakington. Greater separation would provide a unique opportunity to provide a proper Country Park which would benefit not just the people of Northstowe but also existing residents whose interests are being overlooked.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington and located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. Even with an area of 'green separation' of a minimum of 200 metres it will still be possible to establish a linear County Park which will benefit the residents of Northstowe, Longstanton and Oakington.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1639	Object	This will inevitably lead to inadequate green separation for Longstanton/Oakington.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington and located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The extent of 'green separation' necessary to protect the village character of Longstanton and Oakington has been the subject of a lengthy report and detailed member site visit. 200 metres compares well with such villages as Fen Ditton which are slightly further away from a much larger settlement (Cambridge) and yet successfully maintain their village character. Village character will be much better protected by ensuring that traffic accessing Northstowe does not need to pass through surrounding villages.	
2951 2305 826	Object	200 metres green separation is insufficient and would not provide sufficient mitigation of noise, amenity and visual intrusion.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The Structure Plan envisages that it will be so close to these two villages that it is necessary to specifically require 'green separation' in order to clarify that they will not be part of the new town. The purpose of 'green separation' is to protect village character. It is likely that a relatively small number of properties on the boundary of each village will be in a position where they might be directly affected by Northstowe. Landscape treatment of the 'green separation' will minimise impacts on these properties. Noise is likely to be contained by the buildings in Northstowe and therefore the nature of development on its edges and the location of access roads will be most influential in reducing any noise associated with Northstowe.	No change to the preferred approach on 'green separation'.
3300	Object	Supporting Option C	Objection noted. Support for option C recorded separately.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3320 1843	Object	200 metres green separation does not preclude the future merging of settlements through future expansion of Northstowe.	In order to ensure that Northstowe remains separate from Longstanton and Oakington, a Green Belt is proposed in all 3 Options to cover the 200 metres of 'green separation'.	
2126	Object	I am concerned about the close proximity and scale of the development to both Oakington and Longstanton. The landscaped barrier is too small and would not offer sufficient noise, amenity and visual demarcation between the existing communities and the New Town.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The Structure Plan envisages that it will be so close to these two villages that it is necessary to specifically require 'green separation' in order to clarify that they will not be part of the new town. The purpose of 'green separation' is to protect village character. It is likely that a relatively small number of properties on the boundary of each village will be in a position where they might be directly affected by Northstowe. Landscape treatment of the 'green separation' will minimise impacts on these properties. Noise is likely to be contained by the buildings in Northstowe and therefore the nature of development on its edges and the location of access roads will be most influential in reducing any noise associated with Northstowe.	
2448	Object	People move to villages out of choice and love for the countryside and the sense of community that a small village offers. They don't want their village to suddenly become a suburb of a busy town as Oakington will inevitably become.	Objection noted. The Structure Plan requires that a new town be built close to Oakington.	
3254	Object	We do not need a development of this size.	Objection noted. The Regional Plan and Structure Plan have identified a need to plan for the growth of the Cambridge Sub-Region in a more sustainable way than in the past. This means taking a sequential approach to development, including a new town of at least 8,000 dwellings at Longstanton/Oakington.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6911	Object	There is no advantage to having the transport artery on the edge of the town - why not use land north of the railway line?	<p>Option A would be best integrated into the proposed express Guided Bus service running along the disused St Ives railway line (by a local loop with a greater frequency of stops through the town) which provides the opportunity to create a sustainable design of new town.</p> <p>In order that Northstowe will be the "sustainable high quality settlement" proposed in the Structure Plan it will be necessary to secure a design and layout which maximises opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use within the town. The County Council as promoters of the Guided Busway has advised that it will seek to minimise the number of stop and crossing of the guideway. The Transport and Works Order proposals include only 1 stop in a location on the 'expressway' which would serve only a small part of the town.</p> <p>In addition, any option which spans the guideway will be less well connected to the main body of the town. Travel within the town will be more circuitous and significantly less convenient. The effects of such severance can be observed on a daily basis in Cambridge where the town is severed by the river and the railway. Not only are its residents inconvenienced by circuitous journeys (which will discourage walking) but the limited number of crossings are notorious congestion points.</p>	
3524	Object	Object - The argument that the site "closely meets the test of being closely located east of Longstanton and north of Oakington" has no real merit, other than to indirectly favour one developer. It appears to be included as a benefit for Site Option A to increase the number of merits as all options meet this subjective criterion.	A perfect fit with this criterion is not possible of a new town of at least 8,000 dwellings is to be developed. Option A is the location which best meets the requirement to be located east of Longstanton and North of Oakington. Both Options B and C add increasing amount of land; land which is north of Longstanton village.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3530	Object	Para 2.5e - Object - "Minimises the amount of best agricultural land" This is not a merit that can be claimed by option A alone as the land covered by all three options is similar in merit. To use this as a 'merit' for option A shows bias.	As Option A is the smallest Option it takes less agricultural land overall. Options B includes an additional 63 hectares of land which is almost entirely grade 2 agricultural land. Option C includes and additional 100 hectares of which about a third is grade 3 and two thirds is grade 2 agricultural land.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2817 998 1777	Object	At least 800 metres green separation is needed for Oakington.	<p>The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington and located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The extent of 'green separation' necessary to protect the village character of Longstanton and Oakington has been the subject of a lengthy report and detailed member site visit. 200 metres compares well with such villages as Fen Ditton which are slightly further away from a much larger settlement (Cambridge) and yet successfully maintain their village character. Village character will be much better protected by ensuring that traffic accessing Northstowe does not need to pass through surrounding villages.</p> <p>Providing 800 metres separation would mean that Northstowe would barely within Oakington Parish and could not be described as being described as AT Oakington. Furthermore, such a site would use less than 50% of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. Making best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield also point to the development of this land. If there is any doubt, as part of meeting the government's objective to maximise new building on previously developed land, the Structure Plan sets South Cambridgeshire a target of 7,400 houses on previously developed land by 2016. Previously developed sites that are proposed for development in the Structure Plan or are in existing plans and could be developed in the Structure Plan period are Chesterton Sidings (approx 600 houses), Cambridge Airport and Marshall North Works (approx 2,000 houses) and Trumpington (approx 100 houses). Whilst there will be other 'windfall' sites, the Council needs to find 4,700 houses from previously developed sites which include</p>	No change to the preferred approach to 'green separation'.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			Oakington Airfield/Barracks. Not all of the Airfield will need to be built upon as there will be a significant requirement for open space uses such as 'green separation' and a variety of recreation and other uses to serve the town itself. Whilst it may be appropriate to located some of these open uses on the edge of Northstowe (but not within the 'green separation') the over-riding requirement must be that they are located where they will best serve the needs of the future residents of Northstowe.	
3540	Object	Para 2.10a - Object - "A lesser degree of fit..." The November workshop identified that moving the core location of the development would have significant advantages, providing greater separation between Oakington, Longstanton and the new town among others. The criteria that the site must be 'east of Longstanton' is too prescriptive and given too weighty a consideration as a disadvantage against options B&C.	In preparing its plans, the District Council must ensure that the Area Action Plan is in conformity with the Structure Plan - it cannot include such policies that change the policy of the Structure Plan. Amongst other considerations, this is to ensure that the public know that as plan making progresses from the strategic to the detailed that proposals do not change such that they would have objected to them at the Structure Plan level. In this case, the Structure Plan much more specific than is normally the case. The criteria to be 'east of Longstanton' is therefore a criterion along with all the other criteria in policy P9/3 which must be given very weighty consideration.	
3545	Object	Para 2.11b - Object - Perform less well as being East of Longstanton & North of Oakington is subjective. In fact there are merits in using land on both sides of the bus way. The paragraph itself acknowledges that the structure plan accepts this. Much weight is given against this quite specific location 'test' which is biased to option A for no real and significant reason.	Option C which includes land on the northern side of the disused railway performs less well against the Structure Plan requirement. The facts are not subjective - land north of the railway line is north of Longstanton village, more countryside and agricultural land will be taken for development, Northstowe will be much closer to Willingham and Rampton than Option A and as being taken forward by the County Council - it would be less well served by public transport and would be less well connected to the main body of the town.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3562	Object	Para 2.5a - Object - The argument that the site "closely meets the test of being closely located east of Longstanton and north of Oakington" is a marginal merit in comparison to options B & C. The PPG accepts that all options would meet the criteria.	Option B adds about 1,000 houses which would not closely meet the north and east test, and Option C adds about 2,000 houses which would not closely meet the test.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3525 3563	Object	Only the buildings at Oakington Barrack and on the immediately adjoining airfield can be classified as being on previously developed land, the remainder of the airfield has reverted back to green field over 30 years of farming and neglect. All site options should therefore be rated equally.	<p>Incorrect. The definition of previously developed land is set out in PPG3 "Housing". First and foremost, "Previously developed land is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure and associated fixed surface infrastructure. The definition covers the curtilage of the development. (The curtilage is defined as the area of land attached to a building.)" "All of the land within the curtilage of the site will be defined as previously-developed." PPG3 does go on to clarify that "this does not mean that the whole area of the curtilage should be developed" and that it will be for the local planning authority to "make a judgement about how much of the site should be developed bearing in mind other planning considerations such as policies for the protection of open space and playing fields or development in the countryside, how the site relates to the surrounding area, and requirements for on-site open space, buffer strips, landscaped strips etc".</p> <p>In the case of Oakington Airfield, it is identified in the Structure Plan as a location for a new town where the best use is to be made of previously developed land. As recommended in PPG3, even for Northstowe this will not mean development right up to the boundary of the curtilage. There will be 'green separation', buffer areas, on-site open space, playing fields etc. All of which is consistent with the objectives of PPG3 which need to be interpreted by the Council in the context of the Structure Plan proposal for a new town at this location. For the avoidance of doubt, the Government Office representatives at the Examination In Public into the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan advised the Panel that the whole of the curtilage of at Oakington Airfield/Barracks would fall within PPG3's definition of Previously</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3526 3564	Object	Land assembly is a poor argument in support of early site delivery.	Developed Land. That advice was confirmed in July 2004 at the time of the Council meeting to authorise publication of the Preferred Options Reports. Land assembly is a material consideration, particularly in this case where the Regional Planning Guidance and the Structure Plan propose that development of the new town should commence in 2006. It is understood that the land included in Option A and land between this site and the A14 is in the control of a single consortium of landowners/developers. Whilst other land could be incorporated into this consortium that would be a commercial consideration for the consortium partners and is outside the control of any local planning authority unless it chose to exercise its powers of compulsory purchase.	
3549 3531 3566	Object	All options will have an adverse visual impact on the countryside. Option A will have the worst impact on the countryside for Longstanton and Oakington.	All options will have an adverse impact on the countryside but that is an inevitable consequence of building a new town and the strategic need for such a development has already been considered during the preparation of the Regional Planning Guidance and the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. The Structure Plan clearly envisages that Northstowe will have a greater impact on the countryside at Longstanton and Oakington as it proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and will make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield which extends to the edge of Oakington village and very close to the edge of Longstanton village.	
3533 3567	Object	All sites (A, B and C) will make best use of existing site features.	Agreed, making best use of the existing site features in Option A is common to all three options.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3541 3571	Object	The Guided Bus can be routed according to the population distribution and design of the town.	The County Council has secured funding and is in the process of delivering an express Guided Busway using the disused St Ives railway line. The St Ives railway line alignment has now been scrutinised at a Transport and Works Order Inquiry which did not consider any other route alignments. The proposed service which will operate on the disused St Ives railway line will be a high speed service with few stops in order to offer a speed of service which will be attractive to users. Between St Ives and Cambridge there will be just 4 stops. The County Council advises that it would make the service unattractive to users from villages and towns along the remainder of the route to run the service at slower speeds and more than doubling the number of stops by taking the main service through Northstowe. The County Council proposal is that the rapid transit link through Northstowe will be by means of a separate public transport loop which will pass through the centre of Northstowe.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3542 3572	Object	All towns have major roads and railways passing through them and they are not considered as disadvantages by 'severing' neighbourhoods.	All towns do indeed have roads and railways passing through them and they do create disadvantages by severing communities one from another. In order that Northstowe will be the "sustainable high quality settlement" proposed in the Structure Plan it will be necessary to secure a design and layout which maximises opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use within the town. The County Council as promoters of the Guided Busway has advised that it will seek to minimise crossing of the guideway. Any option which spans the guideway will be less well connected to the main body of the town. Travel within the town will be more circuitous and significantly less convenient. The effects of such severance can be observed on a daily basis in Cambridge where the town is severed by the river and the railway. Not only are its residents inconvenienced by circuitous journeys (which will discourage walking) but the limited number of crossings are notorious congestion points.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3546 3529 3577 3565	Object	Site A is the least well served by the "Guided Bus" as it only skirts the site whereas for Options B and C it would run through the town.	The County Council has secured funding and is in the process of delivering an express Guided Busway using the disused St Ives railway line. The St Ives railway line alignment has now been scrutinised at a Transport and Works Order Inquiry which did not consider any other route alignments. The proposed service which will operate on the disused St Ives railway line will be a high speed service with few stops in order to offer a speed of service which will be attractive to users. Between St Ives and Cambridge there will be just 4 stops. The County Council advises that it would make the service unattractive to users from villages and towns along the remainder of the route to run the service at slower speeds and more than doubling the number of stops by taking the main service through Northstowe. The County Council proposal is that the rapid transit link through Northstowe will be by means of a separate public transport loop which will pass through the centre of Northstowe.	
3547 3578	Object	Suggestion that Options B and C would mean no separation for Willingham and Rampton is misleading, in fact in all three options those two villages have greater separation than Longstanton and Oakington.	The reference in the Preferred Options Report does not say that there would be no separation for Willingham and Rampton. Instead it records the fact that the Stakeholder Workshop in Autumn 2003 wanted to ensure that 'green separation' for these 2 villages was also secured. Option B provides the same separation as Option A. Whilst Option C would provide less separation for these 2 villages than Option A, it would still provide more separation than for Longstanton and Oakington. That is considered to be consistent with the Structure Plan policy which takes precedence and which locates the new town at Longstanton/Oakington rather than Longstanton/Oakington/Willingham/Rampton.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3550 3537 3579 3569	Object	Existing boundary features will be superseded by green separation and new boundary features will be created.	New boundary features, particularly tree planting on the scale necessary to create new screening for a new town will take many years to be effective. Early integration will be achieved by containing the new town within existing boundary features and supplementing those features with additional planting etc.	
3746 - GO-East	Object	NS1, 2 & 3: The Site Options Summary Given the need to increase housing supply in the Cambridge Sub-region and that this will be the largest and most sustainable settlement in South Cambridgeshire we consider that any approach to site boundaries should maximise provision of housing from Northstowe in line with National and Regional guidance, weighed against the need to develop a balanced and integrated community. Based on the balance of these considerations we support Site Option B as set out in NS2.	The Government Offices' response needs to be considered very carefully as it is responsible for ensuring that the Government's Sustainable Communities Plan is delivered. Clearly, the Government Office is not simply asking for the largest settlement regardless of the sustainability considerations otherwise it would prefer Option C. The advantages of the additional dwellings which would be secured under Option B as opposed to Option A need to be balanced against the increased impact on Longstanton village, the wider countryside to the west of Longstanton, the loss of additional grade 2 agricultural, the additional infrastructure cost of extending the B1050 Longstanton bypass and the benefits to the overall sustainability of Northstowe and its immediately neighbouring villages e.g. secondary school provision.	
3687 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Object.	Objection noted.	
5608	Object	Para 2.5 Is the wording correct? It states the option is located north of the St Ives railway line. Surely this should read south and west of the railway line?	Correction noted.	
5610	Object	Flooding is a concern for Rampton.	Concern noted. Ensuring that surface water is attenuated on site will be a requirement of the plan and planning permission.	Ensure that surface water attenuation on site is a requirement of the plan and planning permission.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4395 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	It has the disadvantage of only contributing around 8 000 dwellings to the Cambridge Sub Region.	This objection from the County Council needs to be considered in the context of its own Structure Plan. A new town of 8,000 dwellings does meet the Structure Plan policy requirement - any development up to 10,000 dwellings also meets that requirement. In deciding what size the town should be within that range the District Council needs to be guided by considerations concerning the most sustainable development and which can meet the other Structure Plan policies as well as national planning considerations.	
4726 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	The disadvantage of a meagre 200m separation from Oakington needs to be recognised and new para 2.6(b) created to correct this omission with the words "minimisation of the green separation from the village of Oakington".	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton and Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. In order to develop a new town of 8,000 to 10,000 homes the Structure Plan expects that it will be so close to these two villages that it should specify the need for 'green separation'. That 'green separation' is intended to protect village character and in order that the new town should meet the rest of the Structure Plan policy requirements should be no more than needed for that purpose. Following consideration of a lengthy report and site visit, the Council concluded at the time that the Preferred Options Report was published that no more than 200 metres was required provided that that 'green separation' was properly treated.	
6922 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Justification for including land beyond the railway line are very much too greatly biased by political interests, spin and dogma, plus the commercial interests of one prospective developer.	The consideration raised in this objection had no bearing on the advice given to Council nor to the decisions taken by members.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1240 6914 6919 2156 6924	Object	A14, infrastructure and flooding need to be resolved before building commences.	Agreed. It will need to be a requirement of the Area Action Plan and any subsequent planning permissions that all the infrastructure requirements of Northstowe are known before development commences. Any planning permissions will need to include suitable trigger mechanisms which will govern the development of Northstowe in order to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the infrastructure that each phase of development will require. The A14 upgrade, road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14 and surface water attenuation will be crucial to delivery of a satisfactory development. Some development may be able to proceed before the A14 upgrade is completed as it will take more than a year after development commences before houses will be available for occupation and completion rates will take a year or two to get up to full speed. However, there will need to be certainty about the start/completion of the A14 upgrade.	Ensure that the phasing policies of the AAP and the subsequent planning permission includes a suitable trigger mechanism to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the provision of infrastructure, including the upgrade of the A14, road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14, and surface water attenuation.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4888	Object	<p>NS1 & Para 2.5 (a-b) contrary to Structure Plan Policy P9/3. Outside Barracks and Airfield, and Longstanton Village Framework where development is not permitted in Local Plan 2004. Separation not sufficient to avoid losing character of Longstanton.</p> <p>(c) land outside barracks is in multiple ownership</p> <p>(d) guided bus is not flexible enough</p> <p>(e) not taken into account amount of agricultural land needed for new town and access roads</p> <p>(f) concrete most of countryside around Longstanton and will be seen from miles away</p> <p>(g) would be environmental disaster affecting whole area</p> <p>(h-i) does not take into account expansion (Map 7) Para 2.6 why destroy valuable countryside created by MOD on Oakington Airfield?</p>	<p>The objection criticises the assessment of Option A that has been included in the Preferred Options Report:</p> <p>(a+b) The Structure Plan requires that a new town of at least 8,000 dwellings is developed at Longstanton/Oakington. Whilst this will include the land at Oakington Airfield/Barracks it will require other land which meets the Structure Plan location tests. This will include land other land which is designated as countryside in the present South Cambridgeshire Local Plan.</p> <p>(c) Land outside Oakington Airfield is in multiple ownership, but it has been demonstrated to the Council that consortia of developers have control of enough land to deliver a new town of at least 8,000 houses.</p> <p>(d) The Guided Bus is the most flexible form of public transport that could serve Northstowe using the disused St Ives railway line. Conventional rail would be limited to the railway and a lesser frequency of stops within Cambridge.</p> <p>(e) Minimising the loss of agricultural land, particularly the highest grades, will be a material consideration in deciding upon the site for Northstowe.</p> <p>(f) As the Structure Plan requires Northstowe to be located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, it can be screened in wider views from the south and west by those 2 villages.</p> <p>(g) Option A would minimise the visual impact of Northstowe but there would still be impact in the wider landscape, particularly from the east.</p> <p>(h+i) Paragraph 2.5 is an assessment of Option A, Map 7 is a composite map showing the 'green</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
		<p>separation' & landscape buffers for all 3 options. They would only be 'expansion areas' if Option A is not the preferred option.</p> <p>Using the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield as the basis for the new town (which this objector considers can accommodate the whole of the new town) means that parts of the former military training area will be built upon.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3560 2084 1360 5536	Object	<p>Support Fairfield proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public transport should run through the middle of the town. 2. The St Ives railway line should not be used as a town boundary. 3. Crossing the railway line would allow greater separation for Longstanton and Oakington. 4. Land north of the railway is environmentally less attractive than to the south. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The County Council has secured funding and is in the process of delivering an express Guided Busway using the disused St Ives railway line. The service which will operate on the disused St Ives railway line will be a high speed service with few stops in order to offer a speed of service which will be attractive to users. Between St Ives and Cambridge there will be just 4 stops. The County Council advises that it would make the service unattractive to users from villages and towns along the remainder of the route to run the service at slower speeds and more than doubling the number of stops by taking the main service through Northstowe. The County Council proposal is that the rapid transit link through Northstowe will be by means of a separate public transport loop which will pass through the centre of Northstowe. 2. The present disused railway is a very clearly defined feature in the landscape which will become even more pronounced once it has been replaced by the Guided Busway. With the exception of Stanton Mere Way, beyond the railway line there are no significant landscape features before reaching the villages of Willingham and Rampton. Impact on the wider landscape and neighbouring communities are two considerations which will have a bearing on the site choice and ultimate size of Northstowe. The Structure Plan quite clearly proposes a location which will have a significant impact on Longstanton and Oakington by proposing that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington. In the expectation that the potential impact on these 2 villages could be considerable, the authors of the Structure Plan considered it necessary to propose that there will still need to be a gap between Longstanton and Oakington villages and the new town - the 'green 	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
		<p>separation'.</p> <p>3. The Structure Plan is quite specific in proposing a site: (a) AT Longstanton/Oakington, (b) located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, (c) located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield and (d) can be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway line. In order to meet those objectives, particularly to make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, the town will be located close to those 2 villages - that is why the Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington rather than midway between Longstanton/Oakington/Willingham and Rampton. The Fairfield proposal is as close to Willingham and Rampton as it is to Oakington. It is barely within Oakington Parish and could not be described as being described as AT Oakington. Furthermore, it uses less than 50% of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield.</p> <p>4. The Structure Plan locational criteria point to a location which is close to Longstanton and Oakington villages. The requirement to make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield also point to the development of this land. If there is any doubt, as part of meeting the government's objective to maximise new building on previously developed land, the Structure Plan sets South Cambridgeshire a target of 7,400 houses on previously developed land by 2016. Previously developed sites that are proposed for development in the Structure Plan or are in existing plans and could be developed in the Structure Plan period are Chesterton Sidings (approx 600</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			houses), Cambridge Airport and Marshall North Works (approx 2,000 houses)and Trumpington (approx 100 houses). Whilst there will be other 'windfall' sites, the Council needs to find 4,700 houses from previously developed sites which include Oakington Airfield/Barracks. Any landscaping that the Ministry of Defence has established for its own training purposes can provide the basis for landscape, open space and recreation within and adjoining Northstowe, e.g. as part of the 'green separation'.	
6921 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Whilst it may be true there are no aquifers in the locality, it is important to note there are springs, the precise location and capabilities of which are unknown. This needs to be carefully evaluated to avoid possible drainage problems.	Presence of springs noted. It will be important to ensure that the drainage investigations take account of their presence.	Ensure that the policies in the AAP and any subsequent planning permissions include a requirement to fully investigate ground water conditions at Northstowe.
3233 - Oakington Riding School 6907	Object	Infrastructure is inadequate for this number of houses even with A14 improvements.	It is not intended that Northstowe will rely upon existing infrastructure. A whole new infrastructure is required for the development of this new town. That infrastructure will include new/improved road access to the A14. Northstowe was chosen as a site in part because of the government's planned improvements to the A14 which will provide at least two carriageways of additional capacity north and south of Bar Hill (parallel local roads south of Bar Hill and three land dual carriageway northwards). In order to ensure that sufficient capacity will be provided, the planning application for Northstowe will have to include a Traffic Impact Statement which forecasts the traffic flows from the new town and demonstrates that the traffic capacity exists or is planned.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6908	Object	It's all very well mitigating the flood risk, however there are no guarantees that the development will not add to the risk.	Planning policy for Northstowe and the planning permission which will subsequently granted will require surface water mitigation measures, including maintenance to ensure that the Environment Agency's requirements for flood risk are met in full.	Ensure that the policies and planning permission for Northstowe require long term surface water mitigation and maintenance.
6912	Object	To retain the village character in surrounding villages, at least 400+ metres of separation space is required, something that is not possible with such a large number of houses in such a small space.	By proposing a new town of 8,000 to 10,000 homes AT Longstanton/Oakington which makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, the Structure Plan proposes a very major change to the countryside setting of these two villages. The issues is how close to these two villages can Northstowe be located and have them retain their village character. The report to the Northstowe Member Steering Group and members subsequent site visit demonstrated that this could be achieved by a distance of a 200 metres. This will need to be reinforced by locating low intensity uses on the edge of Northstowe, including housing and by locating access roads away from the edges of Northstowe and way from Longstanton and Oakington.	
2062 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 6913 - The Fairfield Partnership 6909 3539 2952 3570 6910	Object	Not enough green separation to retain identity of village and feeling of surrounding countryside.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington and located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The extent of 'green separation' necessary to protect the village character of Longstanton and Oakington has been the subject of a lengthy report and detailed member site visit. 200 metres compares well with such villages as Fen Ditton which are slightly further away from a much larger settlement (Cambridge) and yet successfully maintain their village character. Village character will be much better protected by ensuring that traffic accessing Northstowe does not need to pass through surrounding villages.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6916 1012	Object	Site A is too small, include land north of railway line as well.	<p>The estimates of the amount of development that can be accommodated on Option A demonstrate that at an average density of 40 dph that approximately 8,000 dwellings can be accommodated with sufficient green separation and open spaces. Members of the Northstowe Steering Group carried out an extensive site visit of the margins on Longstanton and Oakington to satisfy themselves how much land would be needed to provide 'green separation' yet still allow for Northstowe to be located at Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. Whilst 40dph as a density for development in a village might be out of character, such densities in a town would not be particularly high. Indeed, based on research of locally available examples, the Structure Plan proposes that a density of 40 dph should be the minimum and that "in planned new communities, and in locations with access to high quality public transport services, significantly higher densities should be sought". In the context of Northstowe as a small market town, an average density which is higher than 40 dph may be appropriate to allow for higher densities in the town and local centres. At such town scales of density it is possible to provide sufficient open spaces within the town which can be supplemented by providing improved access to the countryside which because of its compact size will be close to all parts of Northstowe.</p> <p>It would only be necessary to include a site which crosses the railway line if a site for substantially more than 8,000 dwellings is required. The ultimate size of Northstowe will be governed by a number of issues including the optimum size of the secondary school to serve the town. The largest</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			<p>sized school that the County Council as education authority would support is a 10-11 form entry school which equates to a catchment population from 10,000 dwellings. If Northstowe is self contained for secondary education, then it could be a 10,000 dwelling settlement. However, if children from some of the closest villages were to attend the school in preference to more distant schools, then on education grounds alone, a site for 8,000 dwellings may be the largest that should be supported.</p>	
6917	Object	Please find room in your hearts for separation for RAMPTON DRIFT.	<p>By proposing a new town of 8,000 to 10,000 homes AT Longstanton and Oakington which makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, it is inevitable that Rampton Drift which is located to the east of the present Barracks complex will effectively be located within or on the edge of the town. Nevertheless, it is possible to provide landscape buffering to ensure that Rampton Drift continues to be an individual community in its own right.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2769 - Longstanton Action Group 5296 - The Fairfield Partnership 2930 6915 6920 2142 1231 1418 934 1215 6918 1140 1381 6431 5129 5117	Object	Site is too small for 8,000 houses and associated services, facilities and infrastructure. Development will either have to be at densities of more than 40dph or there will be less green spaces.	The estimates of the amount of development that can be accommodated on Option A demonstrate that at an average density of 40 dph that approximately 8,000 dwellings can be accommodated with sufficient green separation and open spaces. Members of the Northstowe Steering Group carried out an extensive site visit of the margins on Longstanton and Oakington to satisfy themselves how much land would be needed to provide 'green separation' yet still allow for Northstowe to be located at Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. Whilst 40dph as a density for development in a village might be out of character, such densities in a town would not be particularly high. Indeed, based on research of locally available examples, the Structure Plan proposes that a density of 40 dph should be the minimum and that "in planned new communities, and in locations with access to high quality public transport services, significantly higher densities should be sought". In the context of Northstowe as a small market town, an average density which is higher than 40 dph may be appropriate to allow for higher densities in the town and local centres. At such town scales of density it is possible to provide sufficient open spaces within the town which can be supplemented by providing improved access to the countryside which because of its compact size will be close to all parts of Northstowe.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3535 3568 6923	Object	The Guided Busway should not be considered as a severance rather as an artery serving the town.	In order that Northstowe will be the "sustainable high quality settlement" proposed in the Structure Plan it will be necessary to secure a design and layout which maximises opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use within the town. The County Council as promoters of the Guided Busway has advised that it will seek to minimise crossing of the guideway. Any option which spans the guideway will be less well connected to the main body of the town. Travel within the town will be more circuitous and significantly less convenient. The effects of such severance can be observed on a daily basis in Cambridge where the town is severed by the river and the railway. Not only are its residents inconvenienced by circuitous journeys (which will discourage walking) but the limited number of crossings are notorious congestion points.	
6925 - Longstanton Action Group	Object	This option is unlikely to provide the basis for the 'high quality' development required by the structure plan.	Objection noted. Option A is capable of delivering a development of 8,000 houses at 40 dph with the associated services, facilities, infrastructure and open space that its population will require. Development at this density is not unusual for a town. The quality of which is built will require a long term commitment from the Council to ensure that developers deliver development which is of a high quality. The Council has committed itself to that objective by establishing a team will be dedicated to Northstowe.	
6927	Object	Object to using good agricultural land for building.	The Structure Plan proposal for this new town is of such a scale that high grade agricultural land will be needed for development. However, in the long term interests of the sustainable production of food, the loss of land of the highest grades should be kept to a minimum.	Ensure that the chosen option minimises the loss of agricultural land of grade 1 and 2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6926	Object	If it is to be done it should be not be limited by sticking with the easiest option for the builders and the council.	The Council is required to conduct its plan-making and planning application decisions in an open and transparent manner. The plan-making process allows for objections to the 'soundness' of its plan to be considered by an independent planning inspector who can make a 'binding' recommendation as a result of any objections that he/she hears.	
6798	Object	The document concentrates on Oakington and Longstanton at the expense of Willingham and Rampton.	Noted. The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and therefore the Preferred Option Report concentrates on the effects on those two villages. Only Option C which crosses the railway line takes a site closer to Willingham and Rampton.	
994	Support	I agree with SCDC's conclusions re site, impact etc. However, guided bus is not the best transport solution.	Support noted. Reservation concerning guided bus noted but guided bus is being actively pursued by the County Council.	
1039	Support	Development of Northstowe should be restricted to the area of the airfield as Longstanton village is scheduled substantial development.	Support noted but Oakington Airfield is not large enough for a town of 8,000 houses and associated development, unless it is developed at an average density in excess of 80 dwellings per hectare - average densities which in England are more closely associated with the centre of the major conurbations rather than a small Cambridgeshire market town.	
1210	Support	I hope the district councillors will not use the size of a village as a simple gauge of how they should vote otherwise small villages such as Rampton don't stand a chance.	Support noted. Whilst the number of responses is a material consideration as an expression of public opinion, decisions on the content of the plan must be based on material planning considerations which in particular are in conformity with the Structure Plan and have proper regard to national planning policy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1519	Support	8000 dwellings max with adequate green separation of 200mts not 50 for Station Road.	This ribbon of development in the countryside lies outside the established village of Longstanton. The Structure Plan proposes that 'green separation' is intended to protect village character. The existing houses on Station Road would be separated from Northstowe by the busy B1050 road as well as by a 50 metre landscaped buffer under this option.	
1425	Support	NS1 is site option preferred, but site C if not. Nothing on site B unless a bypass is guaranteed.	Support noted, including order of preference (A, C and B only if B1050 bypass extended).	
1604 1109	Support	Do not support Guided Bus	Noted that these representations of Support for Option A should not be interpreted to imply support for the Guided Busway.	
1748	Support	Policy P9/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan gives clear guidance that the new settlement should be located to the east of Longstanton; this is the only option that meets this criterion.	Support noted. The Structure Plan gives quite detailed guidance on the location of Northstowe. Option A best fits that part of its requirements to be located to the East of Longstanton.	
6784 - English Partnerships	Support	The strategic infrastructure requirements for the wider development are identified at the earliest opportunity to meet the requirement beyond 2016.	Support noted. It will be important to ensure that the plan and planning permission provide a framework for securing the provision of all the services, facilities and infrastructure that will be need for ultimate size of Northstowe.	
6785 - English Partnerships	Support	The Vision should emphasise new opportunities for existing communities to access new and improved local services, new public transport, housing, and employment.	Whilst the Structure Plan proposes that there will be 'green separation' between Northstowe and Longstanton and Oakington, it also proposes that its services should benefit surrounding villages. It will be important to ensure that providing any such access would not encourage non local traffic in villages.	Ensure that measures to provided accessibility between surrounding villages and Northstowe do not generate extraneous traffic in villages.
3423 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships requests the Local Authority plans for appropriate infrastructure provision over and above 8000 units so that expansion options can be strategically masterplanned and designed in an integrated way.	Agreed. It will be important to ensure that the overall infrastructure package for Northstowe is known at the outset and that is comprehensively masterplanned to ensure that the most sustainable development overall is achieved.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2182 1216	Support	Least damaging to villages of Longstanton and Oakington	Support noted. The houses on Station Road which currently lie in the countryside between Longstanton and Oakington will retain much of their rural character under Option A. The 'green separation' proposals and access arrangements which avoid using village road to access Northstowe should ensure that Longstanton and Oakington retain their village character. Just because they are very close to Northstowe does not mean that they will lose that character e.g. villages such as Fen Ditton and Girton are just as close to Cambridge which is presently more than five times larger than Northstowe will be and yet retain their village character.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2186 - Longstanton Parish Council	Support	Site Option A must be expressly limited to 8,000 homes. Longstanton PC is concerned that, if option A is approved, more houses will be built at the expense of density, amenities, and separation.	<p>The estimates of the amount of development that can be accommodated on Option A demonstrate that at an average density of 40 dph that approximately 8,000 dwellings can be accommodated with sufficient green separation and open spaces. Members of the Northstowe Steering Group carried out an extensive site visit of the margins on Longstanton and Oakington to satisfy themselves how much land would be needed to provide 'green separation' yet still allow for Northstowe to be located at Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. Whilst 40dph as a density for development in a village might be out of character, such densities in a town would not be particularly high. Indeed, based on research of locally available examples, the Structure Plan proposes that a density of 40 dph should be the minimum and that "in planned new communities, and in locations with access to high quality public transport services, significantly higher densities should be sought". In the context of Northstowe as a small market town, an average density which is higher than 40 dph may be appropriate to allow for higher densities in the town and local centres. At such town scales of density it is possible to provide sufficient open spaces within the town which can be supplemented by providing improved access to the countryside which because of its compact size will be close to all parts of Northstowe. During the course of the development which could take 20 years, it is possible that good masterplanning and design may be able to demonstrate that higher densities are acceptable. Provided that 'green separation' would not be affected and that the amenity requirements of any extra population is properly addressed, there need not be any reason not to permit such increases -</p>	Ensure that the AAP requires that development on Option A provides for a minimum of 8,000 homes but allows flexibility for an increased number through densities above 40dph in the town and local centres.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4925 4919	Support	Concerned about the effects of traffic movements on surrounding areas, given extreme congestion already evident.	provided that additional contributions towards any additional services and infrastructure that would be required would also be captured. Support noted. Agreed. It will need to be a requirement of the AAP and any subsequent planning permissions that all the infrastructure requirements of Northstowe are known before development commences. Any planning permissions will need to include suitable trigger mechanisms which will govern the development of Northstowe in order to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the infrastructure that each phase of development will require. The A14 upgrade, road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14 and surface water attenuation will be crucial to delivery of a satisfactory development.	Ensure that the AAP includes policies, proposals and trigger mechanisms governing access to Northstowe which will keep Northstowe traffic out of local villages and provide adequate capacity to accommodate the overall increase in traffic.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2071 5642	Support	Least undesirable option	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The estimates of the amount of development that can be accommodated on Option A demonstrate that at an average density of 40 dph that approximately 8,000 dwellings can be accommodated. Whilst 40dph as a density for development in a village might be out of character, such densities in a town would not be particularly high. Indeed, based on research of locally available examples, the Structure Plan proposes that a density of 40 dph should be the minimum and that "in planned new communities, and in locations with access to high quality public transport services, significantly higher densities should be sought". In the context of Northstowe as a small market town, an average density which is higher than 40 dph may be appropriate to allow for higher densities in the town and local centres.</p> <p>The proposed Guided Bus service will ensure that Northstowe has a high quality and frequency of public transport. The majority of external journeys from Northstowe are still likely to be by private car and providing suitable road capacity between Northstowe and Cambridge will be crucial.</p>	
5650	Support	Would make best use of proposed rapid transit system.	Support noted.	
4518	Support	I support this provided that there is a separation of 200 m all around it.	Support noted. 200m 'green separation' is proposed only for the villages of Longstanton and Oakington. Longstanton parish includes some outlying development at Rampton Drift and Station Road for which landscape buffering can be provided in the plan. Providing 200 metres for these outlying properties would not make it possible to deliver a new town in the terms described in the Structure Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4807 4806	Support	Best protection against flash flooding for Rampton.	Support noted. As the smallest site, Option A will generate the least surface water run off of all the options. However, whichever option is included in the plan will be required to attenuate surface water run off.	
4980 4978	Support	Would reduce flood risk in Rampton	Support noted. However, discussions with the Environment Agency have concluded that Cottenham Lode will be the principle route for draining Northstowe and therefore whichever option is permitted will be required to ensure that the Lode can accommodate the flow of water without causing flooding.	
5431	Support	If Northstowe HAS to expand it makes more sense to do so towards the south.	Support noted, however, expanding Northstowe southwards would either place it in the floodplain of Beck Brook, engulf Oakington village or take the location west of Longstanton and Oakington which would not be compatible with the Structure Plan.	
6823 6820	Support	The other options would allow a sprawl which would encroach on the villages to the north.	Support noted. By containing Northstowe within the line of the disused St Ives railway, future growth can be limited with the greatest certainty and impact on Willingham and Rampton will be minimised.	
6828	Support	Uses less greenfield land.	Support noted. By virtue of being the smallest site, Option A uses the least greenfield land.	
6830 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 6787	Support	B1050 makes clear boundary	Support noted. The Preferred Options Report noted that the B1050 north of Longstanton village provides clear physical boundary for Option A (as well as Option C) and is much clearer than Option B which would be bounded by the limit of the floodplain rather than any existing features in the landscape.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3066 - Rampton Parish Council 3153 6761 2960 3519 3518 6800 3230 2371 1332 6799 4942 1509 1906 907 6858 1744 1677 1571 6825 6809 6815 6814 6804 4002	Support	Provides clear boundary for development and Green Belt	Support noted. Part of minimising the impact on neighbouring communities will be establishing a green belt around Northstowe. The Preferred Option Report draws attention to the clear advice in PPG2 "Green Belts" concerning the delineation of green belt boundaries. Option A provides the clearest such boundaries.	
6903 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Site A accords squarely with the planning policy guidance in RPG6.	Support and conformity with RPG6 noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6906 - Cambridgeshire ACRE 6829 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 4657 6786 6819 6436 5616 5633 6783 5329 6796 6794	Support	Railway line makes clear boundary	Support noted. The Preferred Option Report identifies the disused railway line which will be re-used as the Guided Busway as marking the clearest physical boundary in the landscape. To the south of Reynolds Drove the floodplain along the Beck Brook precludes development. To the north of Reynolds Drove the only boundary of any significance is Stanton Mere Way, but this only extends part way across the open countryside between Longstanton, Rampton and Willingham	
6821	Support	This option, at least to some extent, allows the character of the existing villages to be retained, and not swamped from all sides.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6778 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6862 - Rampton Parish Council 6831 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 6875 6869 6836 6853 6872 6850 6844 6866 6839 6856 6859 6881 6847 5139 6816 6826 6808 6805	Support	Best served by rapid transit system	Option A would be best integrated into the proposed express Guided Bus service running along the disused St Ives railway line by a local loop with a greater frequency of stops through the town. This will provide the opportunity to create a sustainable design of new town which will provide the greatest opportunities to its residents to use public transport for internal and external journeys.	
6884	Support	- The least environmentally damaging option	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6779 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6863 - Rampton Parish Council 4462 - RLW Estates 6832 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 3242 - W A Fairhurst & Partners 6876 6870 6762 6837 6854 6873 6851 6748 6845 6867 6842 6840 2085 6860 6882 6848 6885 6797 6827 6810 6806 6878 6835	Support	Makes best use of previously developed land	Support noted. However, Options A, B and C all propose to use the same amount of Previously Developed Land. The only currently known proposal which would not make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield is being promoted by the development company "The Fairfield Partnership" which is currently promoting a site which mainly includes the buildings at Oakington Barracks and a larger area of land north of the St Ives railway line. However, that company has also raised objections to having limits on the expansion of Northstowe beyond 10,000 dwellings and may therefore intend that more of the previously developed land is used in the future (which would improve their proposal) or even that more agricultural land would be required (which would make their proposal perform even worse against the Structure Plan tests).	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6864 - Rampton Parish Council 6877 6763 6871 6838 6855 6874 6852 6752 6822 6846 6868 6843 6841 6857 6883 6849 6886 6802 6818 6811 6807 6879	Support	Uses least (high grade) agricultural land	Support noted. Options B includes an additional 63 hectares of land which is almost entirely grade 2 agricultural land. Option C includes an additional 100 hectares of which about a third is grade 3 and two thirds is grade 2 agricultural land.	
5674 - Ely Diocesan Board 6865 - Rampton Parish Council 1838 - Cambridgeshire ACRE 6833 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 2982 6750 6758 6887 6880	Support	Best contained site with least landscape intrusion	Support noted. Option A is contained by clear physical boundaries - the B1050, St Ives railway line, Oakington and Longstanton villages. Options B and C introduce development into areas without clear boundaries where there is little screening currently available.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6888 6817	Support	Meets Structure Plan test 'east of Longstanton and north of Oakington'	Support noted. The importance of this strategic test is that (together with the requirement to make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield) it provides the readers of the Structure Plan with the clearest of geographic indications of where Northstowe will be located. Both Options B and C include substantial areas of land which are to the north of Longstanton village. Option C in particular includes substantial land in the proximity of Willingham and Rampton which are not even mentioned in the Structure Plan.	
6892	Support	The site is very small for the proposed 8000 homes, despite this, it is superior to the other options.	Qualified support noted.	
6893 6889 6891	Support	Site not severed by B1050	Support noted. Option A is not severed by the B1050 or any other physical boundary to movement within the town site.	
1505 1503 1502 6896 6754 6743	Support	Least impact on Rampton	Support noted. Option A will have the least impact on Rampton because it is the smallest option and is contained by the boundary of the St Ives railway line. The specific comments concerning traffic and flood risk affecting Rampton may less clearly favour any option as none of the Options would have road links in the vicinity of Rampton and whichever option is permitted will be required to attenuate surface water on-site.	
6897	Support	I support this option as it seems to be the best that can be achieved for Longstanton.	Qualified support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6780 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6899 - RLW Estates 6234 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 6900 - W A Fairhurst & Partners 6749 6894 6788 5205	Support	Best fit overall with the Structure Plan location criteria	Support based on best fit with Structure Plan location criteria noted.	
6898 - RLW Estates 6902 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 6890 6895	Support	Most sustainable option	Support noted. As Option A is contained by the B1050, St Ives railway line (Guided Busway) and the villages of Oakington and Longstanton, it will be such a shaped site that it can be served by a public transport loop passing through the town connecting the local centres and the town centre in such a way that most parts of the town will be within 400 metres of each. The site also includes a variety of opportunities to take advantage of existing landscape and other features to create a town which will support a number of rich and diverse wildlife habitats. The amount of countryside and agricultural land taken for development will also be minimised.	
6781 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6834 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 6905 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 6901 - W A Fairhurst & Partners	Support	Site option is capable of early delivery.	These representations are made by the developers/landowners who are part of the Gallagher consortium (including Defence Estates) and by the County Council. It is known that the Gallagher consortium controls sufficient land at Option A and land connecting the site to the A14 from which access will be taken for development to start as soon as the planning processes are complete. Early delivery is a material planning consideration as development at Northstowe is intended by the Structure Plan and RPG6 to start in 2006.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2464 3522 2963 2308 1074 5959 5960 5625 5624 4902 4899	Support	Unqualified support.	Support noted.	
6608	Support	Northstowe is very much bigger than anything else in the area. It will bring a lot of problems, especially flooding, traffic and pollution. If any option should be considered it should be A.	Qualified support noted.	
1740 6016	Support	As only 6,000 houses required by 2016, illogical to require plan for 8,000 houses at this stage	Although only 6,000 houses are required by the Structure Plan at Northstowe during the lifetime of this Area Action Plan, the Structure Plan proposes that it will have a minimum size of 8,000 dwellings. Planning the ultimate size of settlement from the outset will also provide certainty for developers, service providers, facility providers, infrastructure providers, local residents and future residents of Northstowe on the extent of Northstowe. It will be particularly important to ensure that all the services and facilities that will be needed for the ultimate size of the town can be planned coherently it is necessary to produce a plan for the final size of the settlement. Many services, facilities and infrastructure will need to be 'sized' from the outset to serve the ultimate size of settlement.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6746	Support	Also if there is more green land around the new town there 'should' be less risk of flooding, also giving you the option to build areas i.e. lakes where any excess water can run off.	Qualified support noted. Whatever site is included within the AAP will be required to attenuate surface water such that it is not discharged into surrounding water courses at a faster rate than from the presently undeveloped land and does not cause flooding.	
6747	Support	The golf course needs to stay	It is not possible for the golf course to stay in its present location and develop a new town of 8,000 to 10,000 houses at Longstanton and Oakington which makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The floodplain at Beck Brook to the west of Oakington Airfield limits development in that area.	
6751	Support	The considerable car traffic that will result could be filtered south into the upgraded A14.	Qualified support noted. Traffic accessing the town will need to access the A14 via an improved B1050 and Drayton Road giving access to the upgraded A14 direct or via new parallel roads for local traffic.	
6753 2883	Support	Impact of small option should be monitored before considering further expansion	Planning the ultimate size of settlement from the outset will be necessary to provide certainty for developers, service providers, facility providers, infrastructure providers, local residents and future residents of Northstowe on the extent of Northstowe. It will be particularly important to ensure that all the services and facilities that will be needed for the ultimate size of the town can be planned coherently it is necessary to produce a plan for the final size of the settlement. Many services, facilities and infrastructure will need to be 'sized' from the outset to serve the ultimate size of settlement. It will therefore be necessary to forecast the possible impacts of Northstowe at whatever size before granting planning permission to ensure the services, facilities and infrastructure are 'sized' accordingly and to put in place the necessary measures to avoid or mitigate impacts.	Ensure that the policies in the AAP require that the possible impacts of Northstowe at whatever size are considered before granting planning permission to ensure the services, facilities and infrastructure are 'sized' accordingly and to put in place the necessary measures to avoid or mitigate impacts.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1943 - Cottenham Parish Council 3420 3056 2950 6757 2140 2487 1529 1108 1249 1100 1030 6759 912 1993 1987 1973 1972 1585 1745 2895 2953 5644	Support	The smallest option	<p>A new town of 8,000 dwellings is within the range of acceptable town size proposed in the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Following the debate at the Examination In Public, the Structure Plan was amended to propose that Northstowe will have a ultimate size between 8,000 and 10,000 dwellings, rather than "an ultimate size of 10,000 dwellings or thereabouts". In reaching that conclusion, the EIP Panel advised that the principle factors in determining size were likely to be secondary education provision, landscape and design issues and the possible impact on neighbouring communities.</p> <p>Discussions with County Education have led to the conclusion that to secure the best resourced secondary education at Northstowe which will provide the best possible education for its pupils will mean one larger school rather than two small schools. At 8,000 dwellings Northstowe would be a good sized school which would support 8 forms of entry. 10,000 dwellings would support a 10-11 form of entry school. There are only three schools in Cambridgeshire which provide 10 or more forms of entry and experience demonstrates that a larger school would not be desirable. The size of secondary school does not therefore appear to be a limiting factor. However, given the proximity of Option A to Longstanton and Oakington, County Education adviser consider that it is possible that those 2 villages would be considered for inclusion in the catchment for the Northstowe school, in which case Northstowe at 8,000 dwellings with Longstanton and Oakington would support a 10-11 form entry secondary school.</p> <p>The landscape analysis demonstrates that Option</p>	There is a good case for the development of Option A at a settlement size of 8,000 dwellings.

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD***

A will have the least impact on the wider landscape by containing Northstowe almost wholly in views from the west by Longstanton village. Containment by the disused St Ives railway to the east will also ensure that impact on Willingham and Rampton is minimised.

Given the Structure Plan requirement for Northstowe to be located at Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, for these 2 villages the impacts will also be minimised because Northstowe will be at the lower end of the size range; Options B and C would give no greater separation and would result in these villages being simply as close to a larger town. Local impacts can be managed by a number of means but principally (1) the Structure Plan requirement for green separation for these 2 villages which can be supported by locating lower intensity uses on the nearest edges of Northstowe and (2) ensuring that access roads avoid traffic passing through the 2 villages.

Option A also has the best fit with the requirement to be east of Longstanton and north of Oakington, would be best integrated into the proposed express Guided Bus service running along the disused St Ives railway line (by a local loop with a greater frequency of stops through the town) which provides the opportunity to create a sustainable design of new town and minimises the amount of agricultural land (including land of higher quality) that would be taken for development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6771 6764	Support	Does not cut Longstanton in half.	Support noted. As Option A lies wholly east of the B1050 and south of both the St Ives railway line and the proposed Park & Ride site adjoining the disused railway station, none of the houses on Station Road will lie within this option for Northstowe.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6773 6789 6775 5056 5055	Support	Whilst supporting site, concerned that might not be large enough for green separation, open spaces etc	<p>Support noted</p> <p>The estimates of the amount of development that can be accommodated on Option A demonstrate that at an average density of 40 dph that approximately 8,000 dwellings can be accommodated with sufficient green separation and open spaces. Members of the Northstowe Steering Group carried out an extensive site visit of the margins on Longstanton and Oakington to satisfy themselves how much land would be needed to provide 'green separation' yet still allow for Northstowe to be located at Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield.</p> <p>Whilst 40dph as a density for development in a village might be out of character, such densities in a town would not be particularly high. Indeed, based on research of locally available examples, the Structure Plan proposes that a density of 40 dph should be the minimum and that "in planned new communities, and in locations with access to high quality public transport services, significantly higher densities should be sought". In the context of Northstowe as a small market town, an average density which is higher than 40 dph may be appropriate to allow for higher densities in the town and local centres. At such town scales of density it is possible to provide sufficient open spaces within the town which can be supplemented by providing improved access to the countryside which because of its compact size will be close to all parts of Northstowe.</p> <p>Retail issues are addressed in that part of the report addressing the town centre where there is a clear objective to ensure that Northstowe town</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3039 6744 6790 1271 1023 990 6745 6755 6760 6756 5613 879 895	Support	A14, infrastructure and flooding need to be resolved before building commences	<p>centre is not dominated by a single large store.</p> <p>Agreed. It will need to be a requirement of the Area Action Plan and any subsequent planning permissions that all the infrastructure requirements of Northstowe are known before development commences. Any planning permissions will need to include suitable trigger mechanisms which will govern the development of Northstowe in order to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the infrastructure that each phase of development will require. The A14 upgrade, road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14 and surface water attenuation will be crucial to delivery of a satisfactory development.</p> <p>Some development may be able to proceed before the A14 upgrade is completed as it will take more than a year after development commences before houses will be available for occupation and completion rates will take a year or two to get up to full speed. However, there will need to be certainty about the start/completion of the A14 upgrade.</p>	Ensure that the phasing policies of the AAP and the subsequent planning permission includes a suitable trigger mechanism to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the provision of infrastructure, including the upgrade of the A14, road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14, and surface water attenuation.
6791 2235	Support	Only option which keeps Station Road within Longstanton	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>As Option A lies wholly east of the B1050 and south of both the St Ives railway line and the proposed Park & Ride site adjoining the disused railway station, none of the houses on Station Road will lie within this option for Northstowe.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6792	Support	I was under the impression that the initial number of dwellings was to be in the region of 5,000. Why has there been a vast increase? Despite this aberration in the number of dwellings would it not be better to combine options A, B and C using the larger areas but only building 8,000 dwellings? The "200m", "where practicable", separation belt could therefore be increased giving a more adequate separation area between the existing villages, thus retaining the existing village "frameworks".	The Structure Plan originally proposed that Northstowe would be 10,000 homes. Following independent examination the size can now be within the range 8,000 to 10,000 dwellings. The location of Northstowe must comply with the Structure Plan requirements to be located AT Longstanton/Oakington, to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The countryside at these villages will therefore change substantially, but the character of the villages themselves can be retained by 200 metres of separation provided that it is landscape accordingly, the closest edge of Northstowe has lower intensity use (including housing) and any access roads are also located away from Longstanton and Oakington.	
6801	Support	Risks of flooding in Rampton are now a reality since the flash floods and although all options are likely to increase this risk, option A appears less likely than the other options.	Qualified support noted.	
2940 894 6803 904	Support	Least impact on road infrastructure and flooding	Support noted. As the smallest site, Option A will generate the least surface water run off of all the options. However, whichever option is included in the plan will be required to attenuate surface water run off. It will, however, generate the least traffic and is therefore likely to have the least impact on existing road infrastructure.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1356 905 1117 2505 6795 6793 1206 1106 6813 1068	Support	Option A would ensure that no parts of Northstowe are severed from the main body of the town by the Guided Busway or the B1050 road.	Support Noted. In order that Northstowe will be the "sustainable high quality settlement" proposed in the Structure Plan it will be necessary to secure a design and layout which maximises opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use within the town. The County Council as promoters of the Guided Busway has advised that it will seek to minimise crossing of the guideway. Any option which spans the guideway will be less well connected to the main body of the town. Travel within the town will be more circuitous and significantly less convenient. The effects of such severance can be observed on a daily basis in Cambridge where the town is severed by the river and the railway. Not only are its residents inconvenienced by circuitous journeys (which will discourage walking) but the limited number of crossings are notorious congestion points.	

Decision on NS1 The Site: Option A - Alternative Option

The Options for choosing a site have brought forward a very high level of response. The Preferred Options Report put forward the 3 site options without expressing a preference. Of these sites there is very little support for Site B. Site C has received some support but has raised concerns about the impact on the wider landscape and other village communities without any benefit for Longstanton/Oakington and problems of severance by the Guided Busway. The most favoured site option is A, which would bring forward a town of 8,000 dwellings, at the lower end of the Structure Plan range, and which would be contained within the line of the St Ives railway/Guided Busway which would provide a very clear boundary. It is therefore recommended that Site A be agreed as the site to take forward into the AAP.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS2 The Site: Option B - Alternative Option</i>				
880	Object	The village character of Willingham will be lost - we will have a sprawling mass	Option B would extend Northstowe as far north as the disused St Ives railway line to the west of the B1050. It will extend no further north than Option A.	
906	Object	This part will be physically separated from the rest of Northstowe by the B1050 which is not in keeping with the vision of a contained new township.	Agreed. The extension of the Longstanton bypass around the additional land included in Option B would be imperative otherwise this part of the town would be severed from the remainder of Northstowe by a busy main road. If Option B were to be pursued, it would be a requirement of the development to fund this road in full in the same way that it is a requirement of the Home farm development to fund the Longstanton bypass.	If Option B is pursued, it will be a requirement in the AAP that the development funds this road in full.
1359	Object	Northstowe should be contained in an area and not allowed to extend into agricultural land. This extension would limit the ability to define with clarity the area of green belt.	Agreed. Unlike Option A which is well contained by physical boundaries, Option B introduces land which is bounded by the extent of the floodplain and has no clear physical boundary on its western edge.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1241 896	Object	Too many houses for the infrastructure to accommodate.	Northstowe will require a whole new town infrastructure within the town boundaries. Beyond the town boundaries, existing roads, surface water drainage systems, foul drainage systems etc will have to be upgraded/newly provided. It will need to be a requirement of the Area Action Plan and any subsequent planning permissions that all the infrastructure requirements of Northstowe are known before development commences. Any planning permissions will need to include suitable trigger mechanisms which will govern the development of Northstowe in order to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the infrastructure that each phase of development will require. The A14 upgrade, road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14 and surface water attenuation will be crucial to delivery of a satisfactory development. Some development may be able to proceed before the A14 upgrade is completed as it will take more than a year after development commences before houses will be available for occupation and completion rates will take a year or two to get up to full speed. However, there will need to be certainty about the start/completion of the A14 upgrade.	Ensure that the phasing policies of the AAP and the subsequent planning permission includes a suitable trigger mechanism to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the provision of infrastructure, including the upgrade of the A14, road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14, and surface water attenuation.
1217	Object	The houses in Station Road would lose their village status and become swallowed up in the new town.	The ribbon of 5 houses in the countryside on Station Road to the south of the disused St Ives railway line lie outside the established village of Longstanton. The Structure Plan proposes that 'green separation' is intended to protect village character. If Option B were chosen, these 5 houses in Station Road would effectively become part of Northstowe. Nevertheless, the Preferred Options Report proposes that a substantial 50 metre landscape buffer would be provided.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1266	Object	The guided bus link will make little difference to traffic even when it is eventually built.	The proposed Guided Bus Service when fully operation will provide a frequency of 6 services an hour on the express guideway plus at least 20 services and hour each way originating from Northstowe. This will provide significant public transport capacity for Northstowe.	
1730	Object	Also it does not make sense to have the main public transport route on the edge of the town.	The County Council has secured funding and is in the process of delivering an express Guided Busway using the disused St Ives railway line. The service which will operate on the disused St Ives railway line will be a high speed service with few stops in order to offer a speed of service which will be attractive to users. Between St Ives and Cambridge there will be just 4 stops. The County Council advises that it would make the service unattractive to users from villages and towns along the remainder of the route to run the service at slower speeds and more than doubling the number of stops by taking the main service through Northstowe. The County Council proposal is that the rapid transit link through Northstowe will be by means of a separate public transport loop which will pass through the town and local centres of Northstowe with a greater number of stops and a greater frequency of services.	
1997	Object	I object to this particular part of the option - adverse effects on the surrounding villages and countryside	Objection noted. Option B has a greater impact on the wider countryside by introducing development into the area to the north of Longstanton village and would have a greater impact on Longstanton village itself.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1315 1313	Object	Infrastructure requirements have not been adequately considered.	The infrastructure requirements for all site options are the subject of on-going investigation and decision-making by the infrastructure providers. It is not absolutely necessary for the AAP to specify what items of infrastructure will be provided but it does need to include the mechanism by which developer funding will be secured. The infrastructure providers themselves will need to target their budgets and plans to meet their infrastructure obligations. Cambridgeshire Horizons has an important part to play in co-ordinating the actions of infrastructure providers. It will be necessary to identify the key items of infrastructure without which development should not commence and which must be available at key stages in the development. The latest that this information must be available is the grant of planning permission which will not be until the end of 2006 at the earliest.	Ensure that the AAP and planning permission for whichever site Options is chosen includes trigger mechanisms tying the commencement and stages of development to the delivery of key items of infrastructure.
6991 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Para 2.5 falsely claims that only Option A has clear boundaries for drawing Green Belt boundaries. Para 3.3 surely means that tree-planting can satisfy requirements for defining Green Belt Boundaries.	PPG2 "Green Belts" provides the guidance for drawing green belt boundaries. PPG2 does not advise that new tree-planting is appropriate for drawing green belt boundaries. The advice is that: "Boundaries should be clearly defined, using readily recognisable features such as roads, streams, belts of trees or woodland edges where possible." Option C adds land to the north of the St Ives railway line which has such boundary features only on the B1050 and at Stanton Mere Way.	
6994 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	2.11(c) Implies consideration is being given to a P&R site at Westwick - it needs to be made clear that there are no such proposals.	There are no proposals for Park & Ride on the Guided Bus route at Westwick.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3310 2141 1291	Object	Option B would lead to integration of the village into the new town as separation is minimal.	Although there would be some landscape buffer for these 5 houses on Station Road, they would effectively be part of Northstowe if Option B is chosen. Similar houses at Cambourne are being assimilated into that villages. In considering this objection, members would have to balance the implications for 5 existing houses against any advantages to the District and to Northstowe of securing an extra 1,000 homes at the new town.	
2187 - Longstanton Parish Council 935 6998	Object	As additional land is not larger enough for an extra 1,000 dwellings, dwellings on Station Road will be offered minimal separation rather than what is required to maintain village character.	This ribbon of development in the countryside lies outside the established village of Longstanton. The Structure Plan proposes that 'green separation' is intended to protect village character. If Option B were chosen, the houses in Station Road would effectively become part of Northstowe. Nevertheless, the Preferred Options Report proposes that a substantial 50 metre landscape buffer would be provided for the ribbon of 5 houses on Station Road (south of the St Ives railway crossing).	
3305	Object	Supporting Option C	Support for Option C noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3264 - Oakington Riding School 2887	Object	Infrastructure cannot cope with the additional number of properties that are proposed.	Northstowe will require a whole new town infrastructure within the town boundaries. Beyond the town boundaries, existing roads, surface water drainage systems, foul drainage systems etc will have to be upgraded/newly provided. It will need to be a requirement of the Area Action Plan and any subsequent planning permissions that all the infrastructure requirements of Northstowe are known before development commences. Any planning permissions will need to include suitable trigger mechanisms which will govern the development of Northstowe in order to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the infrastructure that each phase of development will require. The A14 upgrade, road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14 and surface water attenuation will be crucial to delivery of a satisfactory development. Some development may be able to proceed before the A14 upgrade is completed as it will take more than a year after development commences before houses will be available for occupation and completion rates will take a year or two to get up to full speed. However, there will need to be certainty about the start/completion of the A14 upgrade.	Ensure that the phasing policies of the AAP and the subsequent planning permission includes a suitable trigger mechanism to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the provision of infrastructure, including the upgrade of the A14, road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14, and surface water attenuation.
5609	Object	Para 2.11 Several of the clauses (e.g. b and g) relate to option C not option B. Is this a typing error or am I misunderstanding the document?	The whole of paragraph 2.11 is the summary of the technical evaluation of Option C.	
5631 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	We support option A. In the event that it is deemed necessary to extend this area to accommodate 9,000 dwellings for the new settlement, then option B is preferable to option C in landscape and infrastructure terms, in that the minerals railway line still offers a clear boundary to halt development spreading towards Willingham and is a sensible basis for Green Belt definition.	Qualified support for Option B noted on the basis that main support is for Option A.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3068 - Rampton Parish Council 3154 2377 1333 1510 2091 1746 1678 1572 5138 5654 5632 4001	Object	Option would be less well served by rapid transport system.	Objection noted. One of the strong disadvantages of Option B is that it would be difficult to serve by a rapid transport system based on the disused St Ives railway line. Much of it would be too distant to be served by the Park & Ride stop off Station Road and it would relate well to any public transport loop which would run through the main body of the town.	
5058 5057	Object	It would be unacceptable for the northern end of Longstanton being virtually surrounded by new development.	This is a significant objection to Option B. Although it is possible to provide 'green separation', Longstanton village would be encompassed by Northstowe to the south, east and north of Option A is chosen.	
4269	Object	We are supportive of option A as we consider this will have least effect upon Longstanton. However, we are concerned over the series of policies such as that upon green belt and green separation and how they will fit together.	Policies for 'green separation' will be supported by the designation of a green belt.	
2971 1272 1742 6937 6934 1025	Object	Option B has no boundaries and further expansion could not be stopped.	Agreed. Unlike Option A which is well contained by physical boundaries, Option B introduces land which is bounded by the extent of the floodplain and has no clear physical boundary on its western edge. Should the flooding problems of Longstanton Brook be solved, then further westward development would be possible.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6943 2954 2943	Object	Inadequate separation threatens to engulf smaller nearby villages and thus destroy local character.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington and located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The extent of 'green separation' necessary to protect the village character of Longstanton and Oakington has been the subject of a lengthy report and detailed member site visit. 200 metres compares well with such villages as Fen Ditton which are slightly further away from a much larger settlement (Cambridge) and yet successfully maintain their village character. Village character will be much better protected by ensuring that traffic accessing Northstowe does not need to pass through surrounding villages.	
5639	Object	Will come too close to Rampton, spoiling its character.	Option B would be bounded by the disused St Ives railway line and would take the site for Northstowe no closer to Rampton than Option A. Only Option C would take the site of Rampton closer to Rampton.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4733 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 999	Object	New Town separation is too small to Oakington. A key advantage of Option C is that it gives the opportunity to significantly increase green separation around Oakington, yet this is not even given a mention.	<p>The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The Structure Plan envisages that it will be so close to these two villages that it is necessary to specifically require 'green separation' in order to clarify that they will not be part of the new town. The purpose of 'green separation' is to protect village character. It is likely that a relatively small number of properties on the boundary of each village will be in a position where they might be directly affected by Northstowe. Landscape treatment of the 'green separation' will minimise impacts on these properties. Members have considered a report and undertaken a site visit to investigate further the issue of 'green separation' and concluded that 200m should provide adequate separation in the context of the Structure Plan proposal for the new town.</p> <p>The extent of 'green separation' necessary to protect the village character of Longstanton and Oakington has been the subject of a lengthy report and detailed member site visit. 200 metres compares well with such villages as Fen Ditton which are slightly further away from a much larger settlement (Cambridge) and yet successfully maintain their village character.</p>	
6992 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	The fact that Para 2.11(a) effectively acknowledges that using land spanning the railway line is not at odds with the Structure Plan surely means that it is not a valid argument in favour of Option A.	The reference in the Preferred Option Report is to clarify that even a larger site option which crosses the St Ives railway line will still need to be closer to Longstanton and Oakington than it would be to Willingham and Rampton, in order that it be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6993 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	2.11(b) "matters could be resolved by agreement over the next two years" surely negates any justification for highlighting this and falsely adds weight to Option A.	In order to secure early delivery of the new town, land assembly is a material consideration. At the present time it is understood that there are different land option agreements covering the land either side of the disused railway and that the company promoting land to the north of the railway does not control any of the land necessary to deliver access to its site. In addition, agreement will be needed with the owners of the railway line to gain access across it, even by bridging.	
6995 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Para 2.11(f) There is no justification in the claim that because there are no existing villages to provide a screen, then Options B and C are disadvantaged because they would adversely impact on the surrounding landscape.	Options B and C do have a wider landscape impact because Option B extends north of Longstanton into open countryside and Option C would cross the line of the disused railway line which will become a more prominent feature in the landscape when it is used for the Guided Bus service. Option A would also have a wide landscape buffer associated with the preferred approach to surface water attenuation.	
4889 (Land at Southwell, B1050, Longstanton)	Object	Object to 50m green separation in the east as this would cut the Southwell smallholding in half - any 50m separation should be started outside the Southwell boundary.	A landscape buffer of 50 metres will provide adequate screening for this property which would lie within Northstowe under Option B. It will be a matter for the landowner whether to retain any additional land for use as a smallholding.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5537	Object	Do not support any of the three sites. There is a danger of further development going over the railway to the north (A&B) and to the west (C), thus increasing the size of the town and exacerbating problems. Fairfield's proposal goes both sides of the railway, but leaves room for a country park to the south west - formal protection is needed - Government promotes access to the countryside.	<p>Objection to Options A, B and C noted as is support for the Fairfield proposal. The Fairfield proposals provide a poor fit with the Structure Plan policy for the new town. The Structure Plan is quite specific in proposing a site: (a) AT Longstanton/Oakington, (b) located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, (c) located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield and (d) can be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway line. In order to meet those objectives, particularly to make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, the town will be located close to those 2 villages - that is why the Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington rather than midway between Longstanton/Oakington/Willingham and Rampton. The Fairfield proposal is as close to Willingham and Rampton as it is to Oakington. It is barely within Oakington Parish and could not be described as being described as AT Oakington. Furthermore, it uses less than 50% of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. 4. The Structure Plan locational criteria point to a location which is close to Longstanton and Oakington villages. The requirement to make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield also point to the development of this land. If there is any doubt, as part of meeting the government's objective to maximise new building on previously developed land, the Structure Plan sets South Cambridgeshire a target of 7,400 houses on previously developed land by 2016. Previously developed sites that are proposed for development in the Structure Plan or are in existing plans and could be developed in the Structure Plan period are Chesterton Sidings (approx 600</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			houses), Cambridge Airport and Marshall North Works (approx 2,000 houses)and Trumpington (approx 100 houses). Whilst there will be other 'windfall' sites, the Council needs to find 4,700 houses from previously developed sites which include Oakington Airfield/Barracks. Any landscaping that the Ministry of Defence has established for its own training purposes can provide the basis for landscape, open space and recreation within and adjoining Northstowe, e.g. as part of the 'green separation'. In addition the Fairfield site would not be well served by the Guided Bus system that the Council is actively in the course of implementing. The St Ives railway line will provide an express service with limited stopping places. As a consequence, the Fairfield proposal even with additional stops on the disused railway line (which the County Council does not favour) would not be as well served by public transport than an internal public transport loop passing through the town and local centres which can be provided under Option A.	
3688 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 3269 1977 1976 4905	Object	Strongly oppose Option B.	Objection noted.	
5298 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Also a settlement of 9000 dwellings should not be contemplated as the Structure Plan allows for the new settlement with an ultimate capacity of 10000 dwellings	Objection noted. The Fairfield Partnership's own proposal only provides capacity for 8,000 dwellings.	
6970	Object	Would take more green land than option A.	Objection noted. Option B would require 63 hectares of additional land all of which is grade 2 agricultural land.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6963 - Rampton Parish Council 6965 6961 6949 1027 6951 6959 6957 6955 6953 5634 6971 6947	Object	Identifiable boundaries would not be as good as in Option A.	Agreed. Unlike Option A which is well contained by physical boundaries, Option B introduces land which is bounded by the extent of the floodplain and has no clear physical boundary on its western edge.	
6946	Object	There are insufficient jobs to justify scale of development.	The Structure Plan strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is based on forecasts of job growth. The Structure Plan proposes only to accommodate that forecast job growth and no more. The role of Northstowe is to provide housing for the large number of jobs in and on the edge of Cambridge as well as for the residents of the new town itself.	
6977	Object	This site includes a conservation area which should be excluded from the proposed development site.	None of the sites in the Options report include all the land which will be needed for the delivery of Northstowe. This includes the land which will be needed for 'green separation' where the developers of the new town will need to invest in landscape and access improvements. These areas include the Conservation Areas at Longstanton St Michael's but there will be no proposals within them.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6979 827	Object	Inadequate separation from Oakington.	Option B provide the same separation from Oakington as Options A and C. The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington and located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The extent of 'green separation' necessary to protect the village character of Longstanton and Oakington has been the subject of a lengthy report and detailed member site visit. 200 metres compares well with such villages as Fen Ditton which are slightly further away from a much larger settlement (Cambridge) and yet successfully maintain their village character. Village character will be much better protected by ensuring that traffic accessing Northstowe does not need to pass through surrounding villages.	
6980	Object	There is a unique one off opportunity to develop a proper Country Park between Oakington and Northstowe to benefit present residents as well as newcomers. Don't miss it. Push the new town slightly further north.	The Structure Plan requires that the new town be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, and anticipates that it will be so close that it is necessary to include a requirement that they are kept apart by 'green separation'. A site which would be 800 metres from Oakington would not meet these Structure Plan location requirement and other Structure Plan requirements such as minimising the loss of high grade agricultural land. In addition the Guided Busway would cut the town in half and relatively little of such a site would be within easy walking distance of stops on the guide way. The Preferred Options Report proposals for 'green separation' could be incorporated into a Country Park which surrounds the new town and have the character of a number of Cambridge commons.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6982	Object	Land west of Station Road owned by the County Council would be ideal for a county park.	The land west of Station Road is proposed for a Country Park in Preferred Option NS84. Less land would be available for this proposal in Option B than in Options A and C.	
6983	Object	As an 18 hole golf course is needed for 8000 houses why not keep the existing mature golf course and just develop the Airfield land.	<p>The Longstanton golf course occupies most of the land between the St Ives railway, Rampton Road and Longstanton village. In order that a new town of at least 8,000 homes can be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, it is inevitable that development will mean that the golf course cannot remain in this location.</p> <p>Oakington Airfield is not large enough for a town of 8,000 houses and associated development, unless it is developed at an average density in excess of 80 dwellings per hectare - average densities which in England are more closely associated with the centre of the major conurbations rather than a small Cambridgeshire market town.</p>	
6964 - Rampton Parish Council 6966 6986 6962 1514 1530 6950 6952 6960 6958 6956 6954 6967 6975 6974 6972 6948	Object	More high grade agricultural and more agricultural land would be used.	Options B includes an additional 63 hectares of land which is almost entirely grade 2 agricultural land.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6987	Object	The town will dominate the local area which is rural in character having developed over centuries.	The new town will have an effect on the character of the area. Option B would have a greater effect on Longstanton village and a greater impact on the wider countryside by introducing development into the land north of Longstanton village.	
7004	Object	To not offer protection to homes outside the Framework is a perverse interpretation of the framework, which is defined for the purpose of discouraging development outside it.	The purpose of 'green separation' is clearly stated in the Structure Plan as being to protect village character. The Preferred Options Report proposes at suitable extent of 'green separation' for the village and a different treatment for those enclaves of development outside the village where smaller landscape buffers are proposed.	
7002 - Longstanton Parish Council 7005	Object	The village character is of a sinuous village from north of the railway line to St Michael's Mount in the east.	The parish of Longstanton comprises the village of Longstanton and a number of outlying developments. The village of Longstanton is bounded by Striplands Farm in the north and the entrance to St Michael's Mount in the south. The ribbon of some 30 houses on Station Road to the north along with the Toads Acre mobile home park and Rampton Drift (former MOD housing) lie within the surrounding countryside. Whilst they are clearly part of the community of Longstanton, they do not lie within the village.	
7003 - Longstanton Parish Council 7006	Object	If only the homes in the Framework are preserved then entire character of the village changes onto a compact community rather than the historic rural village it currently is.	By definition, the historic rural village of Longstanton cannot include the 20th century ribbon development on Station Road or any other outlying 20th century development. That view is reinforced by one of the purposes of the British town planning system - to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. The ribbon development on Station Road is just such ribbon development in the countryside which is no longer being permitted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7007 911	Object	Disadvantages of extending west across B1050 outweigh advantage of an extra 1,000 dwellings.	The advantages of the additional dwellings which would be secured under Option B as opposed to Option A need to be balanced against the increased impact on Longstanton village, the wider countryside to the west of Longstanton, the loss of additional grade 2 agricultural, the additional infrastructure cost of extending the B1050 Longstanton bypass and the benefits to the overall sustainability of Northstowe and its immediately neighbouring villages e.g. secondary school provision. It is clear that there is no local support for Option B. Only 4 of the parties support Option B (Government Office, Cambridgeshire County Council, English Partnerships and Gallagher Estates).	Not to pursue Option B as the advantages of securing up to 1,000 additional homes is outweighed by the greater impact on Longstanton village, the impact on the countryside to the north west of Longstanton and the loss of high grade agricultural land.
7011	Object	Splits Longstanton from Station Rd.	Option B would mean that Northstowe would separate the ribbon of houses in the countryside north of the disused St Ives railway line from Longstanton village. Access to Longstanton would still be possible without passing through Northstowe, via the extended Longstanton bypass.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2127 7023 6938 6935	Object	Inadequate green separation in terms of noise, amenity and physical separation	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The Structure Plan envisages that it will be so close to these two villages that it is necessary to specifically require 'green separation' in order to clarify that they will not be part of the new town. The purpose of 'green separation' is to protect village character. It is likely that a relatively small number of properties on the boundary of each village will be in a position where they might be directly affected by Northstowe. Landscape treatment of the 'green separation' will minimise impacts on these properties. Noise is likely to be contained by the buildings in Northstowe and therefore the nature of development on its edges and the location of access roads will be most influential in reducing any noise associated with Northstowe. Although there would be some landscape buffer for the 5 houses on Station Road, they would effectively be part of Northstowe if Option B is chosen.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7001 - Longstanton Parish Council 2063 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 7026 1521 1201 1104 1419 937 6941 6939 1382 5131 5120	Object	This option would result in the houses along Station Road being absorbed into Northstowe and cutting off homes to the north of the railway line from the rest of the village.	<p>The ribbon of 22 houses in the countryside on Station Road north of the St Ives railway crossing would be cut off from Longstanton village by Northstowe if Option B is chosen.</p> <p>The ribbon of 5 houses in the countryside south lies also lies outside the established village of Longstanton. The Structure Plan proposes that 'green separation' is intended to protect village character. If Option B were chosen, these 5 houses in Station Road would effectively become part of Northstowe. Nevertheless, the Preferred Options Report proposes that a substantial 50 metre landscape buffer would be provided for the ribbon of 5 houses on Station Road (south of the St Ives railway crossing).</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7030	Object	It will do nothing to mitigate the high density of building that will be necessary within the main Northstowe footprint.	The Structure Plan requires that the new town be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, and anticipates that it will be so close that it is necessary to include a requirement that they are kept apart by 'green separation'. The Structure Plan also proposes that the average density of development at locations such as Northstowe will be at least 40 dwellings per hectare and more in those parts of the development where accessibility by public transport is greatest - at Northstowe this will be at the town and local centres. Higher density development means that services and facilities including public transport will have a greater local population to help support them and is an important principle of sustainable development in urban areas. Significantly greater separation than proposed in the Preferred Options Report from Longstanton and Oakington and lower densities would not be compatible with the Structure Plan. Such densities are not unusual in towns and are often much higher.	
6017	Object	Site A falls within the Structure Plan and therefore must be acceptable. Extensions to it are only needed if the 6000 houses required by the plan are exceeded. I object to these on the grounds that they are not required.	Objection to sites B and C noted. However, the Structure Plan requirement is for at least 8,000 dwellings of which 6,000 should be completed by 2016. Options A which is also common to Options B and C is capable of delivering 8,000 dwellings.	
6942 6940 7057 7055 6997 7012	Object	Option B is only viable if the B1050 is rerouted to the west and there is no budget to do this.	Agreed. The extension of the Longstanton bypass around the additional land included in Option B would be imperative otherwise this part of the town would be severed from the remainder of Northstowe by a busy main road. If Option B were to be pursued, it would be a requirement of the development to fund this road in full in the same way that it is a requirement of the Home farm development to fund the Longstanton bypass.	If Option B is pursued, it will be a requirement in the AAP that the development funds this road in full.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7061	Object	There is an open natural water spring bang in the middle of the western Option B area called 'Fish Pond', there is a water reservoir due west of it, it is practically on the official flood plain, and it is criss-crossed by ditches.	Fish Pond and the local land drainage system would be matters which would need to be provided for if Option B is developed. Flooding issues would also have to be addressed and may well be addressed by 'upstream' improvements associated with new access roads and improvements to the B1050.	
7032	Object	The area west of the B1050 is particularly good for wildlife including barn owls which are becoming rarer.	If option B is chosen for development, most of the wildlife habitat west of Station Road would still remain intact.	
7024 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 2311 1495 1361 6978 1643 7038 6973	Object	Longstanton would be virtually surrounded by development and would loose its identity.	This is a significant objection to Option B. Although it is possible to provide 'green separation', Longstanton village would be encompassed by Northstowe to the south, east and north of Option A is chosen.	
7022 6989 7020 7017 7039	Object	As there are no firm plans for re-routing the B1050, the additional houses would be separated from the main development of Northstowe.	The extension of the Longstanton bypass around the additional land included in Option B would be imperative otherwise this part of the town would be severed from the remainder of Northstowe by a busy main road. If Option B were to be pursued, it would be a requirement of the development to fund this road in full in the same way that it is a requirement of the Home farm development to fund the Longstanton bypass.	If Option B is pursued, it will be a requirement in the AAP that the development funds this road in full.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7042	Object	Contrary to Structure Plan Policy P9/3 that identified Oakington Barracks and Airfield for the new town.	<p>The Structure Plan does not limit the area of search for the new town to Oakington Barracks and Airfield. The locational requirement of Policy P9/3 are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) located at Longstanton/Oakington (2) located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington (3) makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield (4) can be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway line. <p>There are a number of other Structure Plan policies which are also relevant e.g. minimising the loss of high grade agricultural land, but there is nothing in the Structure Plan which limits development to the Airfield/Barracks alone.</p>	
2779 - Longstanton Action Group 2968 2936 2145 1545 7021 1013 7018 2240 6999 1164 7015 1118 1081 7028 7027 7047 7043 1207	Object	Additional site area is not large enough for an additional 1,000 dwellings and associated infrastructure.	Option B is large enough for an extra 1,000 dwellings as it adds an extra 63 hectares of development land. 1,000 dwellings at a density of 40dph will require 25 hectares leaving 38 hectares for 'green separation', landscape buffering, a primary school and other local facilities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4519 7048 7045	Object	The B1050 would split both Northstowe and Longstanton.	<p>The extension of the Longstanton bypass around the additional land included in Option B would be imperative otherwise this part of the town would be severed from the remainder of Northstowe by a busy main road. If Option B were to be pursued, it would be a requirement of the development to fund this road in full in the same way that it is a requirement of the Home farm development to fund the Longstanton bypass.</p> <p>The ribbon of 22 houses in the countryside on Station Road north of the St Ives railway crossing would be cut off from Longstanton village by Northstowe if Option B is chosen by the new town rather than the B1050.</p>	
7049	Object	Options B and C are too large.	Objection noted. Option A meets the Structure Plan requirement for 8,000 dwellings. Options B and C allow for 9,000 and 10,000 dwellings respectively which are still within the range allowed by the Structure Plan but which will have greater impacts on the local area and may take Northstowe beyond the optimum size for a small market town - the most determining issue at the present time appears to be the size of the secondary school.	
7052	Object	The land here rises noticeably to the west. With the increased hard ground cover (tarmac & concrete) this will have a significant additional effect on water management and flooding to the east affecting Rampton and the main part of Northstowe itself.	If Option B is developed, the additional land would be drained by Longstanton Brook which would need to be improved at the cost of the development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1426 7060	Object	There should be no development west of the B1050 unless a bypass is guaranteed.	Agreed. The extension of the Longstanton bypass around the additional land included in Option B would be imperative otherwise this part of the town would be severed from the remainder of Northstowe by a busy main road. If Option B were to be pursued, it would be a requirement of the development to fund this road in full in the same way that it is a requirement of the Home farm development to fund the Longstanton bypass.	
7071 - Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes	Object	This option would place an unsustainable burden upon Longstanton Brook.	If Option B is developed, the additional land would be drained by Longstanton Brook which would need to be improved at the cost of the development.	
7072 - Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes	Object	This option has no provision for enough balancing pond capability let alone a stream bypass in Longstanton.	If Option B is developed, the additional land would be drained by Longstanton Brook which would need to be improved at the cost of the development.	
7051	Object	It would allow traffic to exit to the north thus significantly impacting Willingham and Rampton.	The experience from Bar Hill and similar developments is that a new town like Northstowe will need more than one exit onto the wider road network. As Northstowe must be located to the east of Longstanton village, this means that there will need to be road connecting Northstowe to the A14 from the north and south of the new town. A road link based on Hattons Road and the Longstanton bypass will be common to all Options.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7062 - Longstanton Action Group 7000 - Longstanton Parish Council 7064 - The Fairfield Partnership 7025 7037 7058 6990 7035 7053 7029 6985 7010 7019 7059 1075 936 7065 7013 7036 7056 7014 7054 2511 6996 7046 7044 1520 1069	Object	This option is contrary to the Structure Plan as Northstowe would be developed west of Longstanton.	The advantages of the additional dwellings to the north of the village of Longstanton which would be secured under Option B as opposed to Option A need to be balanced against the increased impact on Longstanton village, the impact on the wider countryside to the west of Longstanton, the loss of additional grade 2 agricultural, the additional infrastructure cost of extending the B1050 Longstanton bypass and the benefits to the overall sustainability of Northstowe and its immediately neighbouring villages e.g. secondary school provision. It is clear that there is no local support for Option B. Only 4 of the parties support Option B (Government Office, Cambridgeshire County Council, English Partnerships and Gallagher Estates).	Not to pursue Option B as the advantages of securing up to 1,000 additional homes is outweighed by the greater impact on Longstanton village, the impact on the countryside to the north west of Longstanton and the loss of high grade agricultural land

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7066 6976	Object	A14 is unable to cope with the current volume of traffic and must be upgraded to cope with the development of Northstowe.	It will need to be a requirement of the Area Action Plan and any subsequent planning permissions that all the infrastructure requirements of Northstowe are known before development commences. Any planning permissions will need to include suitable trigger mechanisms which will govern the development of Northstowe in order to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the infrastructure that each phase of development will require. The A14 upgrade and road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14 will be crucial to delivery of a satisfactory development. Some development may be able to proceed before the A14 upgrade is completed as it will take more than a year after development commences before houses will be available for occupation and completion rates will take a year or two to get up to full speed. However, there will need to be certainty about the start/completion of the A14 upgrade.	Ensure that the phasing policies of the AAP and the subsequent planning permission includes a suitable trigger mechanism to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the provision of infrastructure, including the upgrade of the A14 and road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14.
1060 - Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes 6944 6988 7041 7067 7033 7008 6981 1747 7016 6969	Object	Greater flood risk affecting Longstanton and surrounding villages.	Option B would introduce development into the catchment of Longstanton Brook and would therefore make it a requirement of the development to attenuate the discharge of surface water into the Brook. It is a recommendation elsewhere in the report that the flooding problems associated with Longstanton Brook are addressed at part of the surface water attenuation measures for the improvements to the B1050 and approach roads to the new town.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7068 - Oakington Riding School 3283 - Oakington Riding School 6945 7063	Object	A14 is unable to cope with the current volume of traffic and even when it is upgraded will not be able to accommodate the additional traffic.	The CHUMMS proposals for the A14 corridor comprise the upgrading of the A14 itself, parallel roads for local traffic and the use of the disused St Ives railway for a public transport service using Guided Bus. Planning of this transport infrastructure will include making adequate provision for the development of Northstowe.	
7040 7034 6984 7009 1844 7069 6968 7050 4926 4920	Object	Extra houses will stretch the already inadequate and congested transport infrastructure.	It will need to be a requirement of the Area Action Plan and any subsequent planning permissions that all the infrastructure requirements of Northstowe are known before development commences. Any planning permissions will need to include suitable trigger mechanisms which will govern the development of Northstowe in order to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the infrastructure that each phase of development will require. The A14 upgrade, road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14 and surface water attenuation will be crucial to delivery of a satisfactory development. Some development may be able to proceed before the A14 upgrade is completed as it will take more than a year after development commences before houses will be available for occupation and completion rates will take a year or two to get up to full speed. However, there will need to be certainty about the start/completion of the A14 upgrade.	Action: Ensure that the phasing policies of the AAP and the subsequent planning permission includes a suitable trigger mechanism to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the provision of infrastructure, including the upgrade of the A14, road upgrades between Northstowe and the A14, and surface water attenuation.
7070	Object	Hattons Road access to the A14 is woefully inadequate	Whichever Option is chosen, the Hattons Road access to the A14 will need to be upgraded at the cost of the development to accommodate the new town traffic.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5675 - Ely Diocesan Board	Support	Object to Option C. This extended shape, north of the railway line, adds to unnecessary landscape intrusion and it is likely to attract infrastructure problems in terms of added cost and the need to secure easements across the railway line. Option A is preferred, with Option B accepted as logical if the need to expand to 9000 dwellings is deemed necessary, and beyond the reasonable capacity of Option A.	The advantages of the additional dwellings to the north of Longstanton which would be secured under Option B as opposed to Option A need to be balanced against the increased impact on Longstanton village, the impact on the wider countryside to the west of Longstanton, the loss of additional grade 2 agricultural, the additional infrastructure cost of extending the B1050 Longstanton bypass and the benefits to the overall sustainability of Northstowe and its immediately neighbouring villages e.g. secondary school provision. It is clear that there is no local support for Option B. Only 4 other parties support Option B including Government Office, Cambridgeshire County Council, English Partnerships and Gallagher Estates.	Not to pursue Option B as the advantages of securing up to 1,000 additional homes is outweighed by the greater impact on Longstanton village, the impact on the countryside to the north west of Longstanton and the loss of high grade agricultural land.
6930 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Measures should be put in place to ensure that once development has reached its ultimate size, pressure to expand further can be resisted.	In order to avoid the floodplain, only half of the land between Station Road and Over Road could be developed. As the extent of development would be dictated by the rather arbitrary limit of the floodplain, there are few clear physical features to create a clear green belt boundary to contain the development. Proposals to solve the flooding problems associated with Longstanton Brook would remove these objections but a development which extended as far west as Over Road would effectively encompass Longstanton whatever 'green separation' was provided and it would read less clearly in the landscape as a village separate from the new town.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3425 - English Partnerships	Support	The strategic infrastructure requirements for the wider development are identified at the earliest opportunity to meet the requirement beyond 2016.	Planning the ultimate size of settlement from the outset will be necessary to provide certainty for developers, service providers, facility providers, infrastructure providers, local residents and future residents of Northstowe on the extent of Northstowe. It will be particularly important to ensure that all the services and facilities that will be needed for the ultimate size of the town can be planned coherently it is necessary to produce a plan for the final size of the settlement. Many services, facilities and infrastructure will need to be 'sized' from the outset to serve the ultimate size of settlement. It will therefore be necessary to forecast the possible impacts of Northstowe at whatever size before granting planning permission to ensure the services, facilities and infrastructure are 'sized' accordingly and to put in place the necessary measures to avoid or mitigate impacts.	Ensure that the policies in the AAP require that the possible impacts of Northstowe at whatever size are considered before granting planning permission to ensure the services, facilities and infrastructure are 'sized' accordingly and to put in place the necessary measures to avoid or mitigate impacts.
6931 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	With the proposals for the Guided Bus it is capable of being well served by public transport. The express route of the guided bus would provide a well-defined boundary to the site and it would be feasible for an internal service loop to serve the new town by high quality public transport.	Support noted. However, the land west of Station Road would not be so well served by a public transport loop passing through the new town as would Option A.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6932 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3747 - GO-East	Support	Given the need to increase housing supply in the Cambridge Sub-Region, the site which provides the most dwellings in a balanced and integrated community should be supported.	<p>These representations from the Government Offices and the County Council need to be considered very carefully as they are both statutory bodies with a particular in the planning of the sub-region. The Government Office in particular is responsible for ensuring that the Government's Sustainable Communities Plan is delivered. Clearly, the Government Office is not simply asking for the largest settlement regardless of the sustainability considerations otherwise it would prefer Option C. The advantages of the additional dwellings to the north of Longstanton which would be secured under Option B as opposed to Option A need to be balanced against the increased impact on Longstanton village, the impact on the wider countryside to the west of Longstanton, the loss of additional grade 2 agricultural, the additional infrastructure cost of extending the B1050 Longstanton bypass and the benefits to the overall sustainability of Northstowe and its immediately neighbouring villages e.g. secondary school provision.</p> <p>It is clear that there is no local support for Option B. Only 5 of the parties support Option B (including Government Office, Cambridgeshire County Council, English Partnerships and Gallagher Estates).</p>	Not to pursue Option B as the advantages of securing up to 1,000 additional homes is outweighed by the greater impact on Longstanton village, the impact on the countryside to the north west of Longstanton and the loss of high grade agricultural land.
6933 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Continuation of the Longstanton bypass around the north western edge of the development would be essential.	Noted. Unless the Longstanton bypass were to be extended around the land west of Station Road, this area would be severed from the remainder of Northstowe by a very busy B1050.	
4396 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	It would allow for better use of the significant investment of infrastructure in this location.	The significant investment in the Longstanton bypass has already been funded in full by the development at Home Farm.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6928 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships requests the Local Authority plans for appropriate infrastructure provision over and above 8000 units so that expansion options can be strategically masterplanned and designed in an integrated way.	Planning the ultimate size of settlement from the outset will be necessary to provide certainty for developers, service providers, facility providers, infrastructure providers, local residents and future residents of Northstowe on the extent of Northstowe. It will be particularly important to ensure that all the services and facilities that will be needed for the ultimate size of the town can be planned coherently it is necessary to produce a plan for the final size of the settlement. Many services, facilities and infrastructure will need to be 'sized' from the outset to serve the ultimate size of settlement. It will therefore be necessary to forecast the possible impacts of Northstowe at whatever size before granting planning permission to ensure the services, facilities and infrastructure are 'sized' accordingly and to put in place the necessary measures to avoid or mitigate impacts.	Ensure that the policies in the AAP require that the possible impacts of Northstowe at whatever size are considered before granting planning permission to ensure the services, facilities and infrastructure are 'sized' accordingly and to put in place the necessary measures to avoid or mitigate impacts.
6929 - English Partnerships	Support	The Vision should emphasise new opportunities for existing communities to access new and improved local services, new public transport, housing, and employment.	Whilst the Structure Plan proposes that there will be 'green separation' between Northstowe and Longstanton and Oakington, it also proposes that its services should benefit surrounding villages. It will be important to ensure that providing any such access would not encourage non local traffic in villages.	Ensure that measures to provided accessibility between surrounding villages and Northstowe do not generate extraneous traffic in villages.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6235 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	<p>Gallagher believes that the arguments in favour of Site Option A are entirely compelling.</p> <p>Option A offers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -□the most sustainable proposal; and -□accords squarely with the planning policy guidance in RPG6 and in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan. <p>If it is necessary to plan for a larger site to meet the development needs of the Sub-region then the only realistic opportunity to do so is in the manner envisaged in Option B.</p> <p>Expansion in the manner proposed by Option C is not credible. It would result in major conflict with adopted planning policy, raises substantive deliverability issues and would detract from the sustainability credentials of the new town.</p>	<p>Support noted. The advantages of the additional dwellings which would be secured under Option B as opposed to Option A need to be balanced against the increased impact on Longstanton village, the wider countryside to the west of Longstanton, the loss of additional grade 2 agricultural, the additional infrastructure cost of extending the B1050 Longstanton bypass and the benefits to the overall sustainability of Northstowe and its immediately neighbouring villages e.g. secondary school provision. It is clear that there is no local support for Option B. Only 4 of the parties support Option B (Government Office, Cambridgeshire County Council, English Partnerships and Gallagher Estates).</p>	<p>Not to pursue Option B as the advantages of securing up to 1,000 additional homes is outweighed by the greater impact on Longstanton village, the impact on the countryside to the north west of Longstanton and the loss of high grade agricultural land.</p>

Decision on NS2 The Site: Option B - Alternative Option

The Options for choosing a site have brought forward a very high level of response. The Preferred Options Report put forward the 3 site options without expressing a preference. Of these sites there is very little support for Site B. Site C has received some support but has raised concerns about the impact on the wider landscape and other village communities without any benefit for Longstanton/Oakington and problems of severance by the Guided Busway. The most favoured site option is A, which would bring forward a town of 8,000 dwellings, at the lower end of the Structure Plan range, and which would be contained within the line of the St Ives railway/Guided Busway which would provide a very clear boundary. It is therefore recommended that Site A be agreed as the site to take forward into the AAP.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS3 The Site: Option C - Alternative Option</i>				
910	Object	A greater number of houses can only mean a greater impact.	A larger number of houses will mean that Northstowe will itself be larger and have a greater physical impact on the countryside and surrounding villages. It will also generate additional traffic, surface water run off etc. These will place additional burdens for the development to mitigate.	
7124 1848	Object	Danger of coalescence with Longstanton, Oakington, Willingham and Rampton.	Objection noted. The danger of coalescence will be minimised by constraining Northstowe within major existing physical boundaries wherever possible. For Willingham and Rampton, the disused St Ives railway line is a very clear boundary which will become more significant when it is used as a Guided Busway. Given the need for Northstowe to be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, following clear boundaries is more problematic. However, the Council having identified the area of land which is needed for 'green separation', the Preferred Options Report proposes that this should also be included in a green belt which will surround Northstowe.	
7128	Object	Transport (already a shambles) will be far worse.	Whichever option is chosen for Northstowe will be planned to keep new town related traffic out of existing villages. This will be achieved by providing direct access from Northstowe to the A14 by new or improved roads. Option C is likely to add extra traffic onto the B1050 north of Longstanton village and may add to traffic flows on Station Road but any extra traffic would then use the Longstanton bypass and therefore avoid Longstanton village.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1273 1268 7129 5635 4974 4970	Object	Encroaches too close to Rampton and will adversely affect village character.	Objection noted. The Structure Plan proposes that the new town be located at Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington barracks. Option C would extend Northstowe into the open agricultural land setting of Rampton village. There are no clear physical boundaries between the disused railway line and Rampton village and any boundary for the new town would be arbitrary on the ground.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5315 - The Fairfield Partnership (Fairfields Proposed Northstowe Site) 7137 7136 7127 7139	Object	Support Fairfield proposal.	<p>Support for Fairfield proposals noted. The Fairfield proposals provide a poor fit with the Structure Plan policy for the new town. The Structure Plan is quite specific in proposing a site: (a) AT Longstanton/Oakington, (b) located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, (c) located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield and (d) can be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway line. In order to meet those objectives, particularly to make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, the town will be located close to those 2 villages - that is why the Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington rather than midway between Longstanton/Oakington/Willingham and Rampton. The Fairfield proposal is as close to Willingham and Rampton as it is to Oakington. It is barely within Oakington Parish and could not be described as being described as AT Oakington. Furthermore, it uses less than 50% of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. 4. The Structure Plan locational criteria point to a location which is close to Longstanton and Oakington villages. The requirement to make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield also point to the development of this land. If there is any doubt, as part of meeting the government's objective to maximise new building on previously developed land, the Structure Plan sets South Cambridgeshire a target of 7,400 houses on previously developed land by 2016. Previously developed sites that are proposed for development in the Structure Plan or are in existing plans and could be developed in the Structure Plan period are Chesterton Sidings (approx 600 houses), Cambridge Airport and Marshall North</p>	

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD***

Works (approx 2,000 houses) and Trumpington (approx 100 houses). Whilst there will be other 'windfall' sites, the Council needs to find 4,700 houses from previously developed sites which include Oakington Airfield/Barracks. Any landscaping that the Ministry of Defence has established for its own training purposes can provide the basis for landscape, open space and recreation within and adjoining Northstowe, e.g. as part of the 'green separation'. In addition the Fairfield site would not be well served by the Guided Bus system that the Council is actively in the course of implementing. The St Ives railway line will provide an express service with limited stopping places. As a consequence, the Fairfield proposal even with additional stops on the disused railway line (which the County Council does not favour) would not be as well served by public transport than an internal public transport loop passing through the town and local centres which can be provided under Option A.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
874 828	Object	Inadequate green separation for Longstanton and Oakington.	Objection Noted. The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington and located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The extent of 'green separation' necessary to protect the village character of Longstanton and Oakington has been the subject of a lengthy report and detailed member site visit. 200 metres compares well with such villages as Fen Ditton which are slightly further away from a much larger settlement (Cambridge) and yet successfully maintain their village character. Village character will be much better protected by a variety of means including ensuring that the 'green separation' is appropriately landscaped, only low intensity uses border the 'green separation' on the Northstowe side (NOT the town centre, employment or roads) and traffic accessing Northstowe does not need to pass through surrounding villages.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5676 - Ely Diocesan Board 4780 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 7208 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 7175 7164 7160 7155 2095 1681 7171 2514 5136 3998	Object	Bridging Guided Busway would add to costs and complexity of the development.	Objections noted. In order that Northstowe will be the "sustainable high quality settlement" proposed in the Structure Plan it will be necessary to secure a design and layout which maximises opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use within the town. The County Council as promoters of the Guided Busway has advised that it will seek to minimise crossing of the guideway. Any option which spans the guideway will be less well connected to the main body of the town. Travel within the town will be more circuitous and significantly less convenient. The effects of such severance can be observed on a daily basis in Cambridge where the town is severed by the river and the railway. Not only are its residents inconvenienced by circuitous journeys (which will discourage walking) but the limited number of crossings are notorious congestion points. Overcoming these drawbacks will add to the cost of development of Northstowe, additional costs which are likely to be at the expense of other services, facilities and infrastructure such as affordable housing.	
1119	Object	Although I do not support this option, it is certainly better than Option B, due to the extra space available for 10000 homes, enabling a more sensitive and various scheme of distribution of homes.	Comments that whilst it is not supported that Option C is preferred to Option B are noted.	
7104 7110	Object	This will throw more traffic onto the A14 which cannot cope with its current load. No development of this size should be permitted until the A14 has been upgraded.	The AAP and the planning permission for Northstowe will include suitable trigger mechanisms to ensure that the development of the new town is tied to the provision of necessary services, facilities and infrastructure including the upgrade of the A14 and improvements to local access roads.	Ensure that the Northstowe AAP policies and planning permission for the new town include trigger mechanism tying development to the provision of necessary services, facilities and infrastructure including the upgrade of the A14 and improvements to local access roads.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1103 7115 7111 1404 5607 4927 4921	Object	Impact of surface water drainage and traffic will be detrimental to all surrounding villages.	A new town of 10,000 houses would generate the greatest amount of traffic and surface water. The additional development from crossing the railway line would be likely to result in additional traffic being added to the already busy B1050 road. The Environment Agency advises that surface water from the land north of the St Ives railway line would not be allowed to drain northwards through Willingham village for fear of flooding and therefore the whole of the larger Northstowe site would drain via Cottenham Lode. This would place a requirement on the site to attenuate a greater amount of surface water before discharging it into Cottenham Lode.	
7226	Object	The building work is sure to improve access to the township from Rampton for its own purposes and that access will be retained for the benefit of Northstowe and the detriment of Rampton.	In order to minimise the impact of development on existing villages, access to Northstowe to Options C should not be provided through Rampton. Not only would this impact unacceptably on this small village but would also generate traffic through Willingham and Cottenham.	If Option C is chosen, include policies in the Northstowe AAP which would not permit road access to be taken through Rampton.
1501 1500	Object	Once the physical barrier of the railway is breached, the risk of the villages of Rampton and Willingham being absorbed over time increases significantly.	Objection noted. The Structure Plan proposes that the new town be located at Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington barracks. The disused St Ives railway line is the only feature of any significance between Longstanton and Oakington to the south and Willingham and Rampton to the north. Stanton Mere Way slightly further north is the only noticeable other boundary, but does not extend very far into the open agricultural land between the disused railway line and Willingham and Rampton.	
1751	Object	I do not believe that the area will be able to cope with the houses being proposed in option A let alone an extra 2000 being suggested in this option.	Objection in principle noted but the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan requires that a new town of 8,000 to 10,000 homes be developed in this location.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1743	Object	The position of this site will inevitably lead to further expansion of Northstowe.	Objection noted. Those part of Option C north of the St Ives railway line would not be contained by clear physical boundaries.	
1613	Object	Would all homes north of the railway line become Northstowe? If so we would object to this change of address.	Objection noted. Administrative arrangements for Northstowe and surrounding villages will not be determined in the Northstowe AAP but in a future parish boundary review.	
2014	Object	Not in favour of houses being built north of the railway line.	Objection to development north of the ST Ives railway line noted.	
7272	Object	Land west of Station Road owned by the County Council would be ideal for a county park.	Objection noted. Preferred Option NS84 proposes a Country Park on the land west of Station Road.	
7273	Object	As an 18 hole golf course is needed for 8000 houses why not keep the existing mature golf course and just develop the Airfield land.	The Longstanton golf course occupies most of the land between the St Ives railway, Rampton Road and Longstanton village. In order that a new town of at least 8,000 homes can be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, it is inevitable that development will mean that the golf course cannot remain in this location.	
7275 2013	Object	Land north of the railway line could accommodate a replacement golf course.	Sport England have made representations that Northstowe will be of such a size that a golf course could be supported. The land north of the disused railway could be used as a golf course for Northstowe. However, there is no specific requirement for a golf course to be contiguous with the new town as most golfers will need to use a car to transport their bulky golf clubs. It is possible to provide general policy guidance in the AAP and leave the market to find a suitable location through the planning application process.	Include a policy in the Northstowe AAP which will guide the provision of a golf course to serve the new town.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2064 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to NS3: in the parish Plan Survey, it is amply documented that Longstanton's residents consider it very important to maintain their village identity. Option B does not provide for the separation they seek to preserve this identity and it further annexes Longstanton's Station Road to Northstowe.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The Structure Plan envisages that it will be so close to these two villages that it is necessary to specifically require 'green separation' in order to clarify that they will not be part of the new town. The purpose of 'green separation' is to protect village character. It is likely that a relatively small number of properties on the boundary of each village will be in a position where they might be directly affected by Northstowe. Landscape treatment of the 'green separation' will minimise impacts on these properties. Members have considered a report and undertaken a site visit to investigate further the issue of 'green separation' and concluded that 200m should provide adequate separation in the context of the Structure Plan proposal for the new town.	
2241	Object	I object to site C for the same reasons as I object to B, beside development north of the railway line is not creating more separation relief space between Longstanton and Northstowe, so what is the point?	The point of Option C is that it would provide for the development of a greater number of houses, 10,000 houses at the top of the range proposed in the Structure Plan. This would mean that more of the development needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region could be met within existing planned developments for a longer period of time.	
3257 - W A Fairhurst & Partners	Object	This Option will result in some 100 hectares of additional greenfield land being taken for development.	Objection noted. Option C would take approximately 100 hectares of additional countryside which is currently in agricultural production. It is also high grade agricultural land - roughly two thirds is grade 2 and one third (closest to the railway line and not so well drained) is grade 3.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7206 - Ely Diocesan Board 7200 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	Greatest landscape impact.	Options B and C have a greater landscape impact that Option A. Landscape impact is one of the considerations that the Structure Plan Examination In Public Panel considered would be a determinant of the ultimate size of Northstowe. The disused St Ives railway line is the only feature of any significance between Longstanton and Oakington to the south and Willingham and Rampton to the north. Option C which crosses the railway line would take Northstowe into the open agricultural land setting of these 2 villages.	
3748 - GO-East	Object	NS1, 2 & 3: The Site Options Summary Given the need to increase housing supply in the Cambridge Sub-region and that this will be the largest and most sustainable settlement in South Cambridgeshire we consider that any approach to site boundaries should maximise provision of housing from Northstowe in line with National and Regional guidance, weighed against the need to develop a balanced and integrated community. Based on the balance of these considerations we support Site Option B as set out in NS2.	Government Office objection to Option C and support for Option B (as the largest AND most sustainable development) noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7252 7117	Object	Extra traffic impact on A14.	It will need to be a requirement of the Area Action Plan and any subsequent planning permissions that all the infrastructure requirements of Northstowe are known before development commences. Any planning permissions will need to include suitable trigger mechanisms which will govern the development of Northstowe in order to ensure that development does not proceed in advance of the infrastructure that each phase of development will require including the upgrade of the A14. Option C will generate traffic from an additional 2,000 houses but that additional traffic should be capable of being accommodated on the upgrade A14 with its proposed parallel local roads and the improvements to the roads linking Northstowe with the A14.	
5617	Object	Would not make best use of brownfield site	Options A, B and C would all make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. It is only the Fairfield proposal which was published the week before the Preferred Options Public Participation which would not make best use of this land.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2980 2966 2938 1028 1076 1750 5640 5538	Object	Option C is too large and would have too great an impact on the local area.	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>A new town of 10,000 dwellings is within the range of acceptable town size proposed in the Structure Plan. However, it was following the debate at the Examination In Public, that the Structure Plan was amended to propose that Northstowe will have a ultimate size between 8,000 and 10,000 dwellings, rather than "an ultimate size of 10,000 dwellings or thereabouts". In reaching that conclusion, the EIP Panel advised that the principle factors in determining size were likely to be secondary education provision, landscape and design issues and the possible impact on neighbouring communities.</p> <p>(1) Discussions with County Education have led to the conclusion that to secure the best resourced secondary education at Northstowe which will provide the best possible education for its pupils will mean one larger school rather than two small schools. At 8,000 dwellings Northstowe would be a good sized school which would support 8 forms of entry. 10,000 dwellings would support a 10-11 form of entry school. There are only three schools in Cambridgeshire which provide 10 or more forms of entry and experience demonstrates that a larger school would not be desirable. The size of secondary school does not therefore appear to be a limiting factor. However, given the proximity of Option A to Longstanton and Oakington, County Education advisor consider that it is possible that those 2 villages would be considered for inclusion in the catchment for the Northstowe school, in which case Northstowe at 8,000 dwellings with Longstanton and Oakington would support a 10-11 form entry secondary school.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
		<p>(2) The landscape analysis demonstrates that Option C will have the greatest impact on the wider landscape. Crossing the disused St Ives railway to the east will also ensure that impact on Willingham and Rampton is greater than Options A or B. Given the Structure Plan requirement for Northstowe to be located at Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, for these 2 villages the impacts will also be minimised because Northstowe will be at the lower end of the size range; Option C would give no greater separation and would result in these villages being simply as close to a larger town. Local impacts can be managed by a number of means but principally (A) the Structure Plan requirement for green separation for these 2 villages which can be supported by locating lower intensity uses on the nearest edges of Northstowe and (B) ensuring that access roads avoid traffic passing through the 2 villages.</p> <p>(3) Option C has the worst fit with the requirement to be east of Longstanton and north of Oakington.</p> <p>(4) Option would be less well integrated into the proposed express Guided Bus service running along the disused St Ives railway line (by a local loop with a greater frequency of stops through the town) which provides the opportunity to create a sustainable design of new town</p> <p>(5) Option C takes a greater amount of agricultural land (including land of higher quality) for development.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7132 5655	Object	Object to B & C - rapid transit system would bisect the development causing peak time traffic queues at crossings.	Objection noted. As promoted by the County Council in the Transport and Works Order application, the proposed Guided Bus would sever Northstowe if it crossed the railway line and not provide a convenient public transport system for much of the new town.	
4397 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1532	Object	Performance of rapid transport system will be compromised by multiple crossings.	Objection noted, particularly the safety and accessibility issues raised by the County Council which is promoting the Guided Bus services using the disused St Ives railway line.	
3275 - Oakington Riding School 3286 7123 7222 7220 7219 1242 897	Object	Too much development for the road and drainage infrastructure to accommodate.	A new town of 10,000 houses would generate the greatest amount of traffic and surface water. The additional development from crossing the railway line would be likely to result in additional traffic being added to the already busy B1050 road. The Environment Agency advises that surface water from the land north of the St Ives railway line would not be allowed to drain northwards through Willingham village for fear of flooding and therefore the whole of the larger Northstowe site would drain via Cottenham Lode. This would place a requirement on the site to attenuate a greater amount of surface water before discharging it into Cottenham Lode.	
4890	Object	Object to 50m green separation in the east as this would cut the Southwell smallholding in half - any 50m separation should be started outside the Southwell boundary.	Option C does not include any land west of the B1050 Station Road where the Southwell smallholding is located.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4734 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 2944 1000	Object	A key advantage of Option C is that it gives the opportunity to significantly increase green separation around Oakington, yet this is not even given a mention.	The Structure Plan is quite specific in proposing a site: (a) AT Longstanton/Oakington, (b) located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, (c) located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield and (d) can be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway line. In order to meet those objectives, particularly to make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, the town will be located close to Longstanton AND Oakington. The requirement to make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield also points to the development of this land. If there is any doubt, as part of meeting the government's objective to maximise new building on previously developed land, the Structure Plan sets South Cambridgeshire a target of 7,400 houses on previously developed land by 2016. Previously developed sites that are proposed for development in the Structure Plan or are in existing plans and could be developed in the Structure Plan period are Chesterton Sidings (approx 600 houses), Cambridge Airport and Marshall North Works (approx 2,000 houses) and Trumpington (approx 100 houses). Whilst there will be other 'windfall' sites, the Council needs to find 4,700 houses from previously developed sites which include Oakington Airfield/Barracks. As part of the preparation of the Preferred Options Report, members considered a report on 'green separation' and carried out an extensive site visit of the Oakington Airfield - the conclusion of that work was that with suitable landscape treatment and design of Northstowe to place low activity uses (including housing) on the perimeter of Northstowe.	
7196	Object	Rampton would experience more light pollution and be far more exposed to potential crime.	Objection noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2648 7198	Object	Development encroaches on Willingham and Rampton.	Objection noted. The Structure Plan proposes that the new town be located at Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington barracks. The disused St Ives railway line is the only feature of any significance between Longstanton and Oakington to the south and Willingham and Rampton to the north. Stanton Mere Way slightly further north is the only noticeable other boundary, but does not extend very far into the open agricultural land between the disused railway line and Willingham and Rampton.	
5103 4907	Object	Unqualified objection.	Objection noted.	
6012 881	Object	Village character of Willingham will be lost.	Objection noted. The disused St Ives railway line is the only feature of any significance between Longstanton and Oakington to the south and Willingham and Rampton to the north. Option C which crosses the railway line would take Northstowe into the open agricultural land setting of these 2 villages.	
3156 2383 1334 1511 908 909 1573 7133 5614 5612	Object	Less well served by rapid transport system.	Objection noted. Option A also has the best fit with the requirement to create a highly sustainable development which can be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway. Northstowe would be best integrated into the proposed express Guided Bus service running along the disused St Ives railway line by a local loop linking the town and local centres which would have a greater frequency of stops through the town and which would provide the opportunity to create a sustainable design of new town.	
7134	Object	Object to B & C - could change the rural feel of the area	Objection noted. Option A would have the least impact on the overall rural character of the area and still deliver a new town which meets the Structure Plan policy requirements.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7151	Object	Would not define a clear boundary for the Green Belt	Objection noted. Between the disused St Ives railway line and the villages of Willingham and Rampton, Stanton Mere Way is the only boundary feature and this only extends part way into this area of open agricultural land.	
7216 - Cambridgeshire County Council 7224 - Cambridgeshire ACRE 7118 7159 2001 5207 7254	Object	Greater impact on landscape and visual impact of development on Willingham and Rampton across open arable fields.	The disused St Ives railway line is the only feature of any significance between Longstanton and Oakington to the south and Willingham and Rampton to the north. Option C which crosses the railway line would take Northstowe into the open agricultural land setting of these 2 villages.	
7254	Object	If screened by trees in spoils the typical Fen landscape.	Objection noted but one of the features of most villages in South Cambridgeshire, including those on the Fen Edge, is an increase in tree and hedgerow cover on village edges.	
6236 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 7259 - W A Fairhurst & Partners 6018	Object	Does not meet Structure Plan criteria for Northstowe.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be at Longstanton/Oakington, located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. Other location criteria include minimising the loss of higher grade agricultural land, locating the town where it can be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway line and with a form and layout which will provide for the development of a sustainable high quality settlement. The EIP Panel also considered that impact on neighbouring communities and the landscape would be determining issues. Option C has a lesser fit with these criteria than Option A.	
7260 - W A Fairhurst & Partners	Object	This option unnecessarily intrudes into the open countryside.	Objection noted. Option C would introduce development into the area of open countryside with few landscape features between Willingham and Rampton.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7263 7249	Object	Not consistent with Structure Plan as part of site is west if Longstanton.	No part of Option C is west of Longstanton, however, all of the additional land in Option C is to the north of Longstanton and therefore fits less well with that part of the Structure Plan policy requirement to be east of Longstanton.	
6491 - The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards 7266 7121 7203 7188 7230 7229 7182 7246	Object	Too great a flood risk for Rampton and Cottenham.	A new town of 10,000 houses would generate the greatest amount of surface water of all the three options. The Environment Agency advises that surface water from the land north of the St Ives railway line would not be allowed to drain northwards through Willingham village for fear of flooding and therefore the whole of the larger Northstowe site would drain via Cottenham Lode. This would place a requirement on the site to attenuate a greater amount of surface water before discharging it into Cottenham Lode.	
7267	Object	No by-passes from Willingham to Bar Hill, or Cottenham to Dry Drayton as promised earlier.	Objection noted. Bypasses for Bar Hill, Cottenham and Dry Drayton have never been a County Council (as highway authority) proposal for the new at Longstanton/Oakington.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7209 7268	Object	Structure Plan does not allow for a new town to be so close to Willingham and Rampton.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be At Longstanton/Oakington, located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The new town will therefore be located on the Willingham/Rampton side of Longstanton and Oakington villages. The Structure Plan envisaged that these requirements would place the new town so close to Longstanton and Oakington that to ensure that they remained separate from it the Structure Plan specifically requires that 'green separation' is provided for these two villages alone. Similarly, if the Structure Plan envisaged that its locational criteria could be interpreted to mean that the new town site would come close to or even be equidistant to the villages of Willingham and Rampton, then it would have proposed 'green separation' for those villages too.	
7177 7173 7256 7211 7264 7237 7269 7167 7112 7156 1218 7169 7250 7185 7255 7194	Object	Development should not encroach on high grade agricultural land to north of the railway line.	Option C includes an additional 100 hectares of land of which about a third is grade 3 and two thirds is grade 2 agricultural land.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7253 7258 7270	Object	Increased traffic levels through the villages.	Whichever option is chosen for Northstowe will be planned to keep new town related traffic out of existing villages. This will be achieved by providing direct access from Northstowe to the A14 by new or improved roads. Option C is likely to add extra traffic onto the B1050 north of Longstanton village and may add to traffic flows on Station Road but any extra traffic would then use the Longstanton bypass and therefore avoid Longstanton village.	
7184	Object	No discernible green separation for Rampton.	Option C would take Northstowe the site of Northstowe to approximately 650 metres from Rampton village rather than approximately 1 kilometre under Options A and B. The open arable fields would however make that part of Northstowe north of the railway line more prominent in the landscape under Option C than Options A and B which would contain the new town by the Guided Bus way and associated landscaping/surface water drainage lakes.	
7202	Object	Would have major negative effect on Willingham & Rampton.	Objection noted. By introducing development north of the disused St Ives railway line, Option C has the greatest impact of all the options on Willingham and Rampton, particularly visual impact across this area of open agricultural land.	
7145 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	The fact that Para 2.11(a) effectively acknowledges that using land spanning the railway line is not at odds with the Structure Plan surely means that it is not a valid argument in favour of Option A.	The reference in the Preferred Option Report is to clarify that even a larger site option which crosses the St Ives railway line will still need to be closer to Longstanton and Oakington than it would be to Willingham and Rampton, in order that it be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7146 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	2.11(b) "matters could be resolved by agreement over the next two years" surely negates any justification for highlighting this and falsely adds weight to Option A.	In order to secure early delivery of the new town, land assembly is a material consideration. At the present time it is understood that there are different land option agreements covering the land either side of the disused railway and that the company promoting land to the north of the railway does not control any of the land necessary to deliver access to its site. In addition, agreement will be needed with the owners of the railway line to gain access across it, even by bridging.	
7147 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	2.11(c) Implies consideration is being given to a P&R site at Westwick - it needs to be made clear that there are no such proposals.	Noted. There are no proposals for a Park & Ride site at Westwick.	
7148 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Para 2.5 falsely claims that only Option A has clear boundaries for drawing Green Belt boundaries. Para 3.3 surely means that tree-planting can satisfy requirements for defining Green Belt Boundaries.	PPG2 "Green Belts" provides the guidance for drawing green belt boundaries. PPG2 does not advise that new tree-planting is appropriate for drawing green belt boundaries. The advice is that: "Boundaries should be clearly defined, using readily recognisable features such as roads, streams, belts of trees or woodland edges where possible." Option C adds land to the north of the St Ives railway line which has such boundary features only on the B1050 and at Stanton Mere Way.	
7213	Object	Would lead to huge growth traffic through Rampton and Cottenham villages on unsuitable roads.	Objection noted. However, whichever option is chosen measures will be required to mitigate impacts including traffic generation through existing villages.	
7215 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Major reassessment of drainage proposals would possibly be required.	Objection noted but the principle would remain the same - surface water would need to be attenuated before discharge into the surrounding land drains.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1825 - Cambridgeshire ACRE 1498 7218	Object	Northstowe will sprawl if the railway line is crossed.	Objection noted. The disused St Ives railway line is the only feature of any significance between Longstanton and Oakington to the south and Willingham and Rampton to the north. Stanton Mere Way slightly further north is the only noticeable other boundary, but does not extend very far into the open agricultural land between the disused railway line and Willingham and Rampton.	
7217 - Cambridgeshire County Council 7261 - Rampton Parish Council 7223 - Cambridgeshire ACRE 7207 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 7243 7212 7239 7265 7228 7274 7262 7276 7152 7271 7187 7181 7245 1208 1070	Object	Less sustainable option as the development would be severed by the Guided Busway/railway line and not be integrated as a whole.	<p>In order that Northstowe will be the "sustainable high quality settlement" proposed in the Structure Plan it will be necessary to secure a design and layout which maximises opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport use within the town. The County Council as promoters of the Guided Busway has advised that it will seek to minimise crossing of the guideway. Any option which spans the guideway will be less well connected to the main body of the town. Travel within the town will be more circuitous and significantly less convenient. The effects of such severance can be observed on a daily basis in Cambridge where the town is severed by the river and the railway. Not only are its residents inconvenienced by circuitous journeys (which will discourage walking) but the limited number of crossings are notorious congestion points.</p> <p>Option A would be best integrated into the proposed express Guided Bus service running along the disused St Ives railway line by a local loop with a greater frequency of stops through the town. This will provide the opportunity to create a sustainable design of new town which will provide the greatest opportunities to its residents to use public transport for internal and external journeys.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7135	Object	Diversion of guided bus New defensible development boundary.	There are no proposal to divert the line of the proposed Guided Busway. The County Council has recently promoted the use of the St Ives railway line alignment as a Transport and Works Order Public Inquiry.	
7141	Object	Option C represents increased infrastructure burden.	Objection noted. A larger scheme will inevitably carry a greater infrastructure burden.	
7140	Object	It is clear already from the publicity circulated by the developers that they already think they have control/ownership of this land - to be able to have invested in the land and say this, they must have received the "nod" from the planners as to their eventual ability to develop it.	It is the Structure Plan proposal for a new town at Longstanton/Oakington that has encouraged development companies to promote alternative sites for the development of Northstowe.	
7143	Object	There are insufficient jobs to justify number of dwellings.	The Structure Plan strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is based on forecasts of job growth. The Structure Plan proposes only to accommodate that forecast job growth and no more. The role of Northstowe is to provide housing for the large number of jobs in and on the edge of Cambridge as well as for the residents of the new town itself.	
7144 7130	Object	Encroaches on all four villages of Longstanton, Oakington, Willingham and Rampton.	Objection noted. Because the Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington, located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, Northstowe must be located between these four villages. However, the Structure Plan clearly envisages that the new town will be closest to Longstanton and Oakington and for that reason has included the requirement for 'green separation' to ensure that coalescence does not occur.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1362 1951 7227 7113 913 5630	Object	No natural boundary other than the railway line which should not be breached protect the rural nature of Rampton.	Option A is contained by clear physical boundaries - the B1050, St Ives railway line, Oakington and Longstanton villages. Option C introduces development into the open agricultural land surrounding Rampton without clear boundaries where there is little screening currently available.	
7122 1492 7233	Object	Unnecessary risk of flooding, traffic and pressure on infrastructure of Rampton village.	<p>It would be an objective for whichever site is chosen for Northstowe to ensure that new town traffic does not pass through existing villages. It is unlikely that any road access would be taken from Rampton, but it is possible that access from Station Road would be needed to serve development north of the railway line.</p> <p>A new town of 10,000 houses would also generate the greatest amount of traffic and surface water. The additional development from crossing the railway line would be likely to result in additional traffic being added to the already busy B1050 road. The Environment Agency advises that surface water from the land north of the St Ives railway line would not be allowed to drain northwards through Willingham village for fear of flooding and therefore the whole of the larger Northstowe site would drain via Cottenham Lode. This would place a requirement on the site to attenuate a greater amount of surface water before discharging it into Cottenham Lode.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7178 3271 7174 1513 7163 7166 7192 7119 7191 7170 7153 7234 7186 7180 7195	Object	Development would come close to Willingham/Rampton Road and would be difficult to screen in such open countryside.	Options B and C have a greater landscape impact than Option A. Landscape impact is one of the considerations that the Structure Plan Examination In Public Panel considered would be a determinant of the ultimate size of Northstowe. The disused St Ives railway line is the only feature of any significance between Longstanton and Oakington to the south and Willingham and Rampton to the north. Option C which crosses the railway line would take Northstowe into the open agricultural land setting of these 2 villages. It would need a substantial landscape buffer to screen the visual impact of Northstowe in such an open landscape.	
7204 7235	Object	Fear that feeder roads would have to be taken from Willingham and Rampton.	It would be an objective for whichever site is chosen for Northstowe to ensure that new town traffic does not pass through existing villages. It is unlikely that any road access would be taken from Rampton, but it is possible that access from Station Road would be needed to serve development north of the railway line.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7214 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3070 - Rampton Parish Council 7225 - Cambridgeshire ACRE 7199 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 7176 7126 7172 7210 7236 7161 7165 7116 7158 7154 7120 7189 7168 7231 7183 7179 7197	Object	No clearly identifiable site boundaries as compared with Option A.	Option A is contained by clear physical boundaries - the B1050, St Ives railway line, Oakington and Longstanton villages. Options B and C introduce development into areas without clear boundaries where there is little screening currently available.	
7201 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 7238 7150	Object	Contrary to Structure Plan policy P9/3 which bases new town on Oakington Barracks and Airfield.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be At Longstanton/Oakington, located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. Other location criteria include minimising the loss of higher grade agricultural land, locating the town where it can be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway line and with a form and layout which will provide for the development of a sustainable high quality settlement. The EIP Panel also considered that impact on neighbouring communities and the landscape would be determining issues. Option C has a lesser fit with these criteria than Option A.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7125 7142 2896 7241 7240	Object	Greater risk of flooding from 10,000 houses.	A new town of 10,000 houses would generate the greatest amount of surface water of the three options. The Environment Agency advises that surface water from the land north of the St Ives railway line would not be allowed to drain northwards through Willingham village for fear of flooding and therefore the whole of the larger Northstowe site would drain via Cottenham Lode. This would place a requirement on the site to attenuate a greater amount of surface water before discharging it into Cottenham Lode.	
7242 7162 7157 7190 7205 7131 7232	Object	Would result in loss of more agricultural land.	Option C includes an additional 100 hectares of agricultural land of which about a third is grade 3 and two thirds is grade 2 agricultural land.	
7251	Object	Suggest planting a broadleaved woodland north of the railway line.	Extensive woodlands are not characteristic of the Fen Edge countryside.	
7244 7247 7114 1026	Object	Option C has no physical boundaries and there is therefore a risk of further growth.	Option A is contained by clear physical boundaries - the B1050, St Ives railway line, Oakington and Longstanton villages. Options B and C introduce development into areas without clear boundaries where there is little screening currently available. PPG2 advice on the drawing of green belt boundaries to contain development is to use clear physical boundaries. The best boundary between Longstanton and Oakington, and Willingham and Rampton is the disused St Ives railway line.	
7083 - Longstanton Parish Council 7091 7074	Support	Ensures Longstanton is not enveloped.	Support noted. Only Option B would take development further round Longstanton to the north of the present village.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7092	Support	A larger footprint for Northstowe should and must prevent too higher density housing while still allowing the economics to support better infrastructure for Northstowe and the surrounding area. i.e. plan in a reasonable compromise now, rather than pack all 8,000 houses into an area that quite clearly isn't big enough!	40 dph is not a particularly high density for development in a town. The Structure Plan proposes that the average density of development at locations such as Northstowe will be at least 40 dwellings per hectare and more in those parts of the development where accessibility by public transport is greatest - at Northstowe this will be at the town and local centres. Higher density development means that services and facilities including public transport will have a greater local population to help support them and is an important principle of sustainable development in urban areas.	
7094	Support	As somebody that has monitored birdlife in the area the boundary of the golf course supports an abundance of wildlife with numerous owls and woodpeckers, with even Golden Oriole amongst the sitings.	The present golf course at Longstanton is one of the newest courses in the Cambridge area. It was granted planning permission in 1990 and has been in use as a golf course for little over 10 years. The best wildlife habitat is to be found within the mature wooded landscape adjoining the village which will be retained as part of the 'green separation'. More recent planting on the main body of the golf course can be incorporated into the development wherever possible.	
7093 7095	Support	Only option which maintains character of Longstanton and Oakington.	Support noted but Option C is no different from Option A in respect of 'green separation' from Longstanton and Oakington and is unlikely to have any different effect on the character of the two villages.	
1427	Support	NS1 is site option preferred, but site C if not. Nothing on site B unless a bypass is guaranteed.	Support noted.	
7081 5171	Support	Development north of railway is inevitable and should be planned for now.	Development north of the railway line is not inevitable as the railway line provides a clear boundary in the landscape and would provide a solid basis for a green belt boundary limiting development to the north of the railway in the vicinity of Willingham and Rampton.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7101 7099 3115	Support	Support Fairfield proposals.	Support for Fairfield proposals noted. The Fairfield proposals provide a poor fit with the Structure Plan policy for the new town. The Structure Plan is quite specific in proposing a site: (a) AT Longstanton/Oakington, (b) located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, (c) located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield and (d) can be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway line. In order to meet those objectives, particularly to make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, the town will be located close to those 2 villages - that is why the Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington rather than midway between Longstanton/Oakington/Willingham and Rampton. The Fairfield proposal is as close to Willingham and Rampton as it is to Oakington. It is barely within Oakington Parish and could not be described as being described as AT Oakington. Furthermore, it uses less than 50% of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. 4. The Structure Plan locational criteria point to a location which is close to Longstanton and Oakington villages. The requirement to make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield also point to the development of this land. If there is any doubt, as part of meeting the government's objective to maximise new building on previously developed land, the Structure Plan sets South Cambridgeshire a target of 7,400 houses on previously developed land by 2016. Previously developed sites that are proposed for development in the Structure Plan or are in existing plans and could be developed in the Structure Plan period are Chesterton Sidings (approx 600	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			<p>houses), Cambridge Airport and Marshall North Works (approx 2,000 houses) and Trumpington (approx 100 houses). Whilst there will be other 'windfall' sites, the Council needs to find 4,700 houses from previously developed sites which include Oakington Airfield/Barracks. Any landscaping that the Ministry of Defence has established for its own training purposes can provide the basis for landscape, open space and recreation within and adjoining Northstowe, e.g. as part of the 'green separation'.</p> <p>In addition the Fairfield site would not be well served by the Guided Bus system that the Council is actively in the course of implementing. The St Ives railway line will provide an express service with limited stopping places. As a consequence, the Fairfield proposal even with additional stops on the disused railway line (which the County Council does not favour) would not be as well served by public transport than an internal public transport loop passing through the town and local centres which can be provided under Option A.</p>	
7102 7098	Support	Fairfield drainage/fluid proposals sensible, also proposed Oakington Bypass.	<p>Comments noted. The Fairfield drainage proposals for a single large lake have been the subject of an objection from wildlife organisations as not being appropriate in a fen landscape and not beneficial for local wildlife. There is no indication that the proposed bypass is deliverable by Fairfield as it includes substantial areas of land east of the St Ives railway line which is not within the control of any development interest and includes crossing the Beck Brook floodplain which will need to be bridged in a way that would not increase flood risk in Oakington village.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1531	Support	I would broadly support the idea of using a larger site if it meant we could aim for more like 8000 houses, but more spread out.	The Structure Plan requires that the new town be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, and anticipates that it will be so close that it is necessary to include a requirement that they are kept apart by 'green separation'. The Structure Plan also proposes that the average density of development at locations such as Northstowe will be at least 40 dwellings per hectare and more in those parts of the development where accessibility by public transport is greatest - at Northstowe this will be at the town and local centres. Higher density development means that services and facilities including public transport will have a greater local population to help support them and is an important principle of sustainable development in urban areas.	
3326	Support	This is supported in relation to emerging preferences on separation between the New Town and surrounding villages.	Support noted.	
7089	Support	Why can't the extra land be used to preserve the Conservation area north-east of Woodside/St. Michaels from of the Development?	All of the Options A, B and C provide for the development of Northstowe to preserve the Conservation Area at St Michaels/Woodside.	
2231	Support	While I broadly support this siting, so long as the boundaries are fixed and will not spread, I object to any B1050-diverting proposals that would reduce direct access to Longstanton centre for those residents north of the railway line. Also there must be direct access from Longstanton to its allotment site N of level crossing, and a direct, safe route to Willingham from Longstanton, especially for cyclists and pedestrians.	Option C does not include proposals for diverting the B1050 which would continue to provide direct access from the houses on Station Road to Longstanton village.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2821 3521 3520 2959	Support	Only supported if 800 metres separation provided for Oakington for use as a Country Park.	Support noted. The Structure Plan requires that the new town be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, and anticipates that it will be so close that it is necessary to include a requirement that they are kept apart by 'green separation'. A site which would be 800 metres from Oakington would not meet these Structure Plan location requirement and other Structure Plan requirements such as minimising the loss of high grade agricultural land. In addition the Guided Busway would cut the town in half and relatively little of such a site would be within easy walking distance of stops on the guide way. The Preferred Options Report proposals for 'green separation' could be incorporated into a Country Park which surrounds the new town and have the character of a number of Cambridge commons.	
3689 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 833	Support	Unqualified support	Support noted.	
2147 4009	Support	Least objectionable option	Qualified support noted. Whether the present houses on Station Road which lie north of the railway would be included into Northstowe or remain in Longstanton Parish would be a matter for a future parish boundary review.	
2964 2129 1364 4318 1728	Support	Support for this option, as it allows greater separation between Northstowe and Longstanton and Oakington.	Members decided at the Council meeting on 22nd July decided to determine the extent of 'green separation' necessary to maintain the village character of Longstanton and Oakington, and to produce site options for public participation from that pre-determined starting point. The 'green separation' for Longstanton and Oakington is in the Preferred options Report is therefore the same in Option A, B and C.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2786 - Longstanton Action Group 2188 - Longstanton Parish Council 2324 1232 1014 1292 1438 938 1456 1165 5132 5122 1628	Support	Provides enough land for 10,000 dwellings.	Support noted. It is only possible to produce a plan for a new town of 10,000 dwellings by crossing the railway line. The Council will need to balance the possibility of achieving a new town of 10,000 dwellings rather than a smaller number against any disadvantages of crossing the railway line and the degree of fit with the Structure Plan policy.	Balance the possibility of achieving a new town of 10,000 dwellings rather than a smaller number against any disadvantages of crossing the railway line and the degree of fit with the Structure Plan policy.
6501 - English Partnerships	Support	The strategic infrastructure requirements for the wider development are identified at the earliest opportunity to meet the requirement beyond 2016. English Partnerships requests the Local Authority plans for appropriate infrastructure provision over and above 8000 units so that expansion options can be strategically masterplanned and designed in an integrated way.	Support noted. It will be necessary to establish the ultimate size of Northstowe in order to 'size' the services, facilities and infrastructure for the town as a whole. That could still allow some flexibility for marginal increases in the number of houses as a result of increasing densities provided that the AAP and planning permission includes mechanisms for securing additional contributions.	Ensure that the AAP and planning permission allow for the capture of additional contributions towards any additional services, facilities and infrastructure that would be needed if subsequent increases in development density are permitted to occur.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3543 3247 3574 7075 1236 7073	Support	Only option to provide adequate separation for Longstanton and Oakington.	Support noted. The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The Structure Plan envisages that it will be so close to these two villages that it is necessary to specifically require 'green separation' in order to clarify that they will not be part of the new town. The purpose of 'green separation' is to protect village character. It is likely that a relatively small number of properties on the boundary of each village will be in a position where they might be directly affected by Northstowe. Landscape treatment of the 'green separation' will minimise impacts on these properties. Members have considered a report and undertaken a site visit to investigate further the issue of 'green separation' and concluded that 200m should provide adequate separation in the context of the Structure Plan proposal for the new town.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1202 7078	Support	Better to use both sides of railway.	<p>Support noted. The site performs less well against the Structure Plan requirement to be located AT Longstanton/Oakington, would not be contained by clear boundaries, have a greater impact on the wider countryside, take more high grade agricultural land, would take the site of the new town closer to Willingham and Rampton than the Structure Plan may have intended and result in a less sustainable development because part of the town would be severed from the bulk of the town which would lie to the south of the St Ives railway line.</p> <p>The severance will occur because the St Ives railway line will be used to provide a Guided Bus system which would impede movement within the town. The County Council has secured funding and is in the process of delivering an express Guided Busway using the disused St Ives railway line. The St Ives railway line alignment has now been scrutinised at a Transport and Works Order Inquiry which did not consider any other route alignments. The proposed service which will operate on the disused St Ives railway line will be a high speed service with few stops and surface crossings in order to offer a speed of service which will be attractive to users. Between St Ives and Cambridge there will be just 4 stops. The County Council advises that it would make the service unattractive to users from villages and towns along the remainder of the route to run the service at slower speeds through parts of Northstowe.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7086 - Longstanton Action Group 7082 - Longstanton Parish Council 7084	Support	Provides opportunity for greatest separation.	Support noted. Option C proposes that same 'green separation' as Options A and B because the Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The Structure Plan envisages that it will be so close to these two villages that it is necessary to specifically require 'green separation' in order to clarify that they will not be part of the new town. The purpose of 'green separation' is to protect village character. The issues is how close to these two villages can Northstowe be located and have them retain their village character. The report to the Northstowe Member Steering Group and members subsequent site visit demonstrated that this could be achieved by a distance of a 200 metres. This will need to be reinforced by locating low intensity uses on the edge of Northstowe, including housing and by locating access roads away from the edges of Northstowe and way from Longstanton and Oakington.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1653 7088 7079	Support	Lower number and lower density would also allow for greater separation.	The Structure Plan requires that the new town be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, and anticipates that it will be so close that it is necessary to include a requirement that they are kept apart by 'green separation'. The Structure Plan also proposes that the average density of development at locations such as Northstowe will be at least 40 dwellings per hectare and more in those parts of the development where accessibility by public transport is greatest - at Northstowe this will be at the town and local centres. Higher density development means that services and facilities including public transport will have a greater local population to help support them and is an important principle of sustainable development in urban areas. Significantly greater separation than proposed in the Preferred Options Report from Longstanton and Oakington and lower densities would not be compatible with the Structure Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3576 3575 1267 1994 7090	Support	Bisecting town with Guided Bus is not a problem but an advantage.	Support noted. Crossing the disused railway in Option C would result in a less sustainable development because part of the town would be severed from the bulk of the town which would lie to the south of the St Ives railway line. The severance will occur because the St Ives railway line will be used to provide a Guided Bus system which would impede movement within the town. The County Council has secured funding and is in the process of delivering an express Guided Busway using the disused St Ives railway line. The St Ives railway line alignment has now been scrutinised at a Transport and Works Order Inquiry which did not consider any other route alignments. The proposed service which will operate on the disused St Ives railway line will be a high speed service with few stops and surface crossings in order to offer a speed of service which will be attractive to users. Between St Ives and Cambridge there will be just 4 stops. The County Council advises that it would make the service unattractive to users from villages and towns along the remainder of the route to run the service at slower speeds through parts of Northstowe. Providing bridging points across the guideway would add to the overall costs of the development and may have a bearing on the developments ability to fund other services, facilities and infrastructure such as affordable housing.	
7105 7103	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7076 7106 7096	Support	Locate town centre and business area at the centre of the community on Guided Busway.	Support noted. However, locating the town centre on the Guided Busway would not place it in the centre of the town. It would be located towards and on the edge of the town where it would not be well placed to serve the majority of the towns residents, would be in close proximity to Rampton Drift and prominent in views from Rampton village.	
7108	Support	This is supported in relation to the undesirability of one developer monopoly.	Support noted.	
7109	Support	This option is supported in relation to flexibility to accommodate other public transport options should Guided Bus fail to obtain TWO approval.	Support noted. However, there are presently no viable alternatives to the use of the St Ives railway line for Guided Bus.	
7149 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Support	Para 2.11(f) There is no justification in the claim that because there are no existing villages to provide a screen, then Options B and C are disadvantaged because they would adversely impact on the surrounding landscape.	Support noted. Options B and C do have a wider landscape impact because Option B extends north of Longstanton into open countryside and Option C would cross the line of the disused railway line which will become a more prominent feature in the landscape when it is used for the Guided Bus service. Option A would also have a wide landscape buffer associated with the preferred approach to surface water attenuation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7087 - Longstanton Action Group 7100 7097 7085 7077 7080	Support	Town better served by central Guided Busway (with footbridges, cycleway and 1 at grade road crossing).	Support noted. Crossing the disused railway in Option C would result in a less sustainable development because part of the town would be severed from the bulk of the town which would lie to the south of the St Ives railway line. The severance will occur because the St Ives railway line will be used to provide a Guided Bus system which would impede movement within the town. The County Council has secured funding and is in the process of delivering an express Guided Busway using the disused St Ives railway line. The St Ives railway line alignment has now been scrutinised at a Transport and Works Order Inquiry which did not consider any other route alignments. The proposed service which will operate on the disused St Ives railway line will be a high speed service with few stops and surface crossings in order to offer a speed of service which will be attractive to users. Between St Ives and Cambridge there will be just 4 stops. The County Council advises that it would make the service unattractive to users from villages and towns along the remainder of the route to run the service at slower speeds through parts of Northstowe. Providing bridging points across the guideway would add to the overall costs of the development and may have a bearing on the developments ability to fund other services, facilities and infrastructure such as affordable housing.	
7107 - English Partnerships	Support	The Vision should emphasise new opportunities for existing communities to access new and improved local services, new public transport, housing, and employment.	Support noted. Whichever Option is chosen, new opportunities for existing communities to access new and improved local services, new public transport, housing, and employment will provided. It will however be important to ensure that existing villages are not disadvantaged for example by increased traffic in order to secure those benefits.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS3 The Site: Option C - Alternative Option

The Options for choosing a site have brought forward a very high level of response. The Preferred Options Report put forward the 3 site options without expressing a preference. Of these sites there is very little support for Site B. Site C has received some support but has raised concerns about the impact on the wider landscape and other village communities without any benefit for Longstanton/Oakington and problems of severance by the Guided Busway. The most favoured site option is A, which would bring forward a town of 8,000 dwellings, at the lower end of the Structure Plan range, and which would be contained within the line of the St Ives railway/Guided Busway which would provide a very clear boundary. It is therefore recommended that Site A be agreed as the site to take forward into the AAP.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 4. Vision				
<i>NS4 Vision - Preferred Approach</i>				
914	Object	Overall I support this option with the only problem being the proposed "Guided Busway". I am aware that this part of the scheme is currently being decided by Public Enquiry and is not under your control being run by the County Council. I am in full favour of a good public transport system - the Guided Busway is not a good public transport system.	This is a matter which will be determined by the public inquiry into the Guided Busway. The Structure Plan requires the town to take account and make best use of the facility.	
1015	Object	One of your points is "the advance provision of the parallel distributor roads which are proposed as part of the upgrading of the A14" - I suggest this is an essential part of the work before 2,000 houses are completed.	It will be a requirement of the development of Northstowe that there is sufficient highway capacity for traffic that will be generated by the new town. This will mean that investment in creating additional road capacity from the outset. The Structure Plan Examination In Public was advised that there was forecast to be limited capacity in the A14 south of Bar Hill and the Traffic Impact Assessment that will accompany the planning application for Northstowe will need to demonstrate what capacity exists and provide the basis for assessing when the parallel distributor road which form part of the CHUMMS proposals will be needed. The advice of the County Council and Highways Agency will be sought to establish the stage in the development process at which a relevant trigger mechanism should be set.	Seek the advice of the County Council and Highways Agency to establish the stage in the development process that a relevant trigger mechanism should be set for the provision of parallel distributor roads.
1120	Object	Housing types should not include multiple occupancy units above two stories in height.	Not agreed; it is important that there is a mix of housing types and that density is consistent with Government requirements. It is also important to ensure that a character consistent with a Cambridgeshire market town is achieved. This matter is considered in the housing chapter.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1608	Object	The mention of harnessing either solar or wind power for use by Northstowe is a positive proposal. However if it is designed to be used by Northstowe it should be situated within the Northstowe boundaries and not situated in an area that would be visually disadvantageous to Longstanton or Oakington.	Paragraph 4.14 proposes that as part of the aim to ensure that development is sustainable and meets the government's carbon dioxide objectives that opportunities to harness solar or wind power are investigated. Those investigations will include investigating the impact on the amenity of the town and surrounding villages including Longstanton and Oakington as well as the wider impact on the landscape.	
1857	Object	This text is simple PR consultant's fiction. Road links will not be in place, and are anyway completely inadequate (already!). Public transport take-up will not be as claimed, wildlife and biodiversity claims are pure fiction, and development will inevitably be a dormitory for City.	Objections in principle noted. Funding for the delivery of Guided Bus has been secured and the County Council is actively pursuing its early delivery. Planning for the new town to included green spaces which will be attractive for wildlife is now accepted planning practice. Whilst the town will have its own employment, it is intended to have a dormitory role for Cambridge as insufficient housing can be developed in and on the edge of Cambridge for the number of jobs that are located in the city. There is nothing unusual about this as most cities serve a surrounding local catchment.	
7286 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to 4.17/NS4. Park and Ride NE/Station Road Longstanton means more traffic.	The Park & Ride site on Station Road is being promoted by the County Council as an integral part of the proposed Guided Bus system. The place for the Longstanton Parish Plan Committee to object to this proposal was the Transport & Works Order Public Inquiry (now past) which will either grant or refuse permission for this proposal.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2636 - East of England Development Agency	Object	EEDA requests that South Cambridgeshire District Council provides greater clarity on the assumptions being used with regard to the balance between housing and jobs and greater consistency on the provision being made for strategic employment needs, in line with the requirements of the Structure Plan.	Paragraph 2.25 of the Structure Plan clarifies the purpose of a strategic employment location at Northstowe in the following terms: "The new settlement at Longstanton/Oakington will accommodate businesses primarily serving local needs and the needs of the Sub-Region, including possible re-locations from Cambridge. This will provide an additional focus for high technology and knowledge-based investment. The new settlement is not intended to attract new employment which does not need to be located in the Sub-Region." Given the current oversupply of employment land in South Cambridgeshire, there is no inconsistency with an objective for the employment to be provided at Northstowe to provide for prestige development which provides local employment - that after all is the whole purpose of a sustainable development strategy which provides for people to live and work locally. There will be significant amounts of other employment as the objection points out in the services and facilities of Northstowe as well a business location adjoining the Park & Ride site on Station Road for a range of lower technology employment.	Ensure that the employment strategy is fully explained in the Area Action Plan.
3215 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 1741	Object	Guided bus is inconveniently located, has too few stops, no facilities for cyclists, will not provide rapid transport within Cambridge and is not a good use of public funds.	The delivery of the proposed Guided Bus is a matter for the County Council which has secured government funding and is now awaiting the outcome of a Transport & Works Orders Public Inquiry.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2065 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	Residents voiced objections about vision versus reality; to quote but one: the most important thing is the development of transparent reporting in order that the community is under no misconception as to what is really happening this means that the reporting should contain all the caution and caveats necessary to avoid any misunderstanding about what is going and what is being planned. All too often affected residents are left to infer comforting outcomes from what planners and developers are saying, only to discover that the eventual reality of a development is materially at odds with their expectations.	The District Council is required to be transparent about its decision making on planning policy. Decisions can only be made by meetings of full Council on the basis of reports prepared a week in advance. All planning application decisions have to be taken in the light of the Development Plan and any Other Material Considerations. Northstowe will take a very long time to develop and some flexibility in decision making may be necessary as a result of unforeseen circumstances. The public will be fully consulted on any such changes should they occur.	
2074 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to paragraph 4.20 of NS4 because construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - traffic impact on Longstanton has not been assessed and no guarantee - is given here that it will be assessed. Residents object to the - serious disruption to their daily lives this traffic will produce. 	The forecast traffic impact of Northstowe is being modelled by Cambridgeshire County Council and the scheme that is eventually granted planning permission will also have been required to undertake a traffic impact assessment. This paragraph also addresses the impacts of construction traffic on existing villages with the specific objective of minimising those impacts which must be an appropriate objective but promises must not be made by the Council which it cannot deliver.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2067 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to paragraph 4.13 of NS4 because it does not - cover alterations to Longstanton Brook. These measures are needed to - address surface water drainage for Longstanton. In the 2004 - Parish Plan Survey, a majority supported enlargement/ diversion of the - Brook as flood preventing measures in our already high risk zone.	This paragraph of the Preferred Options Report is addressing surface water attenuation within Northstowe. It is only in Option B that Northstowe would include land through which Longstanton Brook flows and would therefore be appropriate for assimilating its surface water drainage function into the townscape of Northstowe. Improvements to Longstanton Brook if Option B is not selected may be appropriate as part of the improvement of the land drainage system which will be required as part of the access arrangements for Northstowe which will require new access roads and an upgrade of Hattons Road.	
2068 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to paragraph 4.16 of NS4. In the Parish Plan - Survey the majority of residents felt that no development should start before the A14 parallel road for local traffic is completed.	It is not necessary that no development is started before the A14 parallel roads are in place. It will for example take well over a year to put in the initial infrastructure before houses would be occupied and generating traffic on the A14. It will therefore be appropriate for the Northstowe AAP to include trigger mechanisms tying development to the provision and availability of infrastructure such as the A14 parallel roads.	Include appropriate trigger mechanisms in the Northstowe AAP and subsequent planning permission tying stages in the development to the provision and availability of infrastructure such as the A14 parallel roads.
2070 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to paragraph 4.18 of NS4 because no mention is - made about Hattons Road improvements concerning the specification of - cycle paths and footways. In the Parish Plan Survey, residents want - these paths wide enough, and with proper interaction with vehicles at - junctions. The responsibility for maintaining these routes (surfaces, - removing obstructions) needs to be clear from the outset.	Agreed. Providing proper provision for pedestrians and cyclists will be an important part of ensuring that development is sustainable and will encourage local travel by means other than the motor car.	Include proposals in the Northstowe AAP to require segregated cycle and footpath provision as part of the principle road network within Northstowe and on any roads built outside the town which can provide safe access to other local destinations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7287 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to paragraph 4.16 of NS4. In the Parish Plan - In the survey, residents expressed serious concerns about already congested roads being turned into rat-runs due to local traffic generated by developments.	Paragraph 4.16 is addressing the planned improvement of the A14 and the provision of parallel roads to accommodate local traffic. providing this additional road capacity will make rat running through villages which results from congestion on the A14 less likely rather than more likely.	
2072 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to paragraph 4.18/NS4 because, regarding routes to - Willingham, many residents regularly use shops and facilities in Willingham. Any closure or diversion of B1050 through Northstowe would disadvantage their access to Willingham. Similarly, Station Road's	Paragraph 4.18 does not propose the closure or diversion of the B1050. It understood that the Fairfield Partnership proposals which were consulyed upon during the weeks before the Council's public consultation did include proposals to divert the B1050 through their proposed site.	
2245	Object	This dream vision of Northstowe is a nightmare for Longstanton: its negative impacts on our community will destroy it. Paragraphs 4.4 to 4.20 reveal drawbacks for Longstanton of which no doubt the planners are perfectly well aware but do not acknowledge here.	Paragraph 4.4 clarifies that Northstowe will be a town and paragraph 4.20 that it will be planned from the outset to avoid any adverse impacts from construction wherever possible and to minimise them where avoidance is not possible.	
2237	Object	Policies to reduce car-dependency are not radical enough. Given the recent flurry of retro-fitting traffic calming measures through SCDC villages, you must now specify a mandatory 15-20 mph speed limit throught Northstowe and its approaches from the outset, except for 999 vehicles in emergencies. This will increase safety and make alternative transport modes more viable.	The speed limits for the roads inNorthstowe as for all other roads can only be determined by the County Council which is the highway authority.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6434	Object	The chosen site for Northstowe is not the most appropriate site for new development. It appears the task of obtaining the land was the deciding factor on where this new settlement should go and not the factors on the ground. Northstowe will damage the villages of Longstanton and Oakington. Bar Hill would benefit greatly from further development which would attract amenities and infrastructure to Bar Hill.	Obtaining the land will not be the deciding factor in deciding the location of Northstowe although deliverability is a material consideration. Structure Plan policy P9/3 provides the principle criteria for the selection of Northstowe.	
3889 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Concern that in the Land Use Budget (paragraph 2.4), urban spaces does not mention/contain informal open space or children's play space. These are identified by SCDC in their Recreation Study and are mentioned later in the Northstowe Area Action Plan. Unclear what 'sport and recreation' includes.	Play spaces are included within the land use budget under the heading of 'sport and recreation'. Informal open space would be included within the 'structural landscaping and surface water drainage' and within the residential and other development headings.	
3890 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Urban Open Space: it is assumed that any 'green space' provision within this comes under the category of 'recreation' in 'Sport and Recreation'. However, there is a danger in categorising these together, that there is no explicit provision for informal green space, which would be the type most closely associated with biodiversity provision. There is also no explicit reference to the proposed country parks (NS84), which would provide the 'informal green space'. To meet the minimum standard of Open Space of 2.8 ha/1000 population, some of this will have to come from other uses within the land budget, as 'Sport and Recreation' only provide 2.4 ha/1000 population (from 58 ha provided for population of 24,000) but it is unclear in the land budget where this will come from.	Play spaces are included within the land use budget under the heading of 'sport and recreation'. Informal open space would be included within the 'structural landscaping and surface water drainage' and within the residential and other development headings. Country Parks could be included as part of the 'green separation' or on land outside the boundaries of Northstowe. The County Council owns land identified in Option NS84 as being suitable for a Country Park.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3891 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Amendment to paragraph 2.7 (e) There are no SCHEDULED ancient monuments or nationally important archaeological sites, WHICH ARE CURRENTLY KNOWN OF. As in paragraph 3.2.	Agreed.	As the planning for Northstowe proceeds and over the lifetime of the development, any newly scheduled ancient monuments will need to be accommodated within the masterplan and development of the new town.
3892 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 3.3 Not enough emphasis on the protection of existing habitat (not as robust as the other Area Action Plans). Would welcome emphasis on the opportunity for habitat replacement elsewhere on site and protection/replacement of features - refer to Core Strategy paragraph 2.6 'net overall gain in biodiversity' as the aim.	The approach in paragraph 3.3. is appropriate - it describes the countryside and habitat that has been created by the MOD and that a survey of flora and fauna will be required to decide what must be retained and incorporated into the open space network if Northstowe. It also proposes that the length of time that it will take to build Northstowe provides enough time to undertake new planting and provision of landscape features - the gain in biodiversity requested in the objection.	
3893 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 3.3 No mention of the existing water feature as a constraint.	Agreed.	Treat existing water features as a constraint which should be retained within the development wherever possible.
3901 - Cambridgeshire County Council 997 1410	Object	Wind turbines/wind farm would not be appropriate within or close to the new town site.	Paragraph 4.14 proposes that as part of the aim to ensure that development is sustainable and meets the government's carbon dioxide objectives that opportunities to harness solar or wind power are investigated. Those investigations will include investigating the impact on the amenity of the town and surrounding villages as well as the wider impact on the landscape. It would be premature to rule wind turbine out at this stage.	
3904 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 4.15 No attempt is made to divide open space and green separation into the various types identified by South Cambridgeshire District Council. Reference should be made to the table in paragraph 4.1 of the Draft Recreational Study.	The land use budget provides a breakdown of the various types of recreation and open space uses.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2789 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	The Trust supports the general thrust of the development principles but objects to the fact that the need to provide Community facilities is not included in the vision for Northstowe.	The vision is a broad statement of the overall objectives for Northstowe. The provision of community facilities would be covered in the vision by the penultimate bullet which reads "As a place where social sustainability is a fundamental principle and where people can live a healthy lifestyle, in a safe environment and where most of their learning needs can be met".	
2581	Object	The vision does not include horseriding, which is a popular pastime and has many benefits economically, socially, and environmentally.	Horseriding would not be excluded by the vision but neither does it need a specific mention otherwise the vision would be over long and prescriptive.	
3534 3532	Object	Concerned that Station Road to the north of the Guided Bus will become part of Northstowe. If so, who will pay legal fees to change documents.	The future administrative arrangements for Northstowe and adjoining parishes will be the subject of a future boundary review will be influenced by the choice of site. In the past it has been normal practice that the official notice of the change of address is made available to individual affected in order that it can be placed with the deeds of the properties affected.	
3755 - GO-East	Object	Section 21 - Planning Obligations The submission DPD will need to set out more comprehensively the range of site specific facilities which developers will be expected to contribute towards or provide in full.	At this stage it would be difficult for the AAP to come up with a definitive list as more detailed work needs to be undertaken. However, the approach in paragraph 10.10 does indicate in general terms the minimum that is likely to be required. Cambridgeshire Horizons should be approached to undertake further work to establish in more detail what is required.	Retain a minimum indicative list of facilities required. Request Cambridgeshire Horizons to undertake further work to feed into the masterplanning process. Ensure that the AAP includes a policy which sets out criteria for specifying facilities which developers will be expected to contribute towards or provide in full.
3825 - English Heritage	Object	Para 3.7 The site is not a 'blank sheet' in the sense that the landscape has evolved to the present day, and historic features such as field boundaries, can be traced by reference to the historic landscape database. In areas where features have been removed, this can provide a useful basis for both urban design and landscape re-instatement.	Agreed.	Include within the landscaping policies a requirement to consult the English Heritage's historic landscape database as a useful basis for both urban design and landscape reinstatement.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5611	Object	<p>Para 2.11 (a)</p> <p>Information (e.g. area, percentage of land take) on amount of agricultural land grades 1, 2, 3 is not given and therefore it is not possible to understand the importance of the issue.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.11(a) is addressing the difference agricultural land take of the 3 site Options. As Option A is common to all 3 options, it is only the additional agricultural land take of Options B and C which is material to the differences between the options. Options B includes an additional 63 hectares of land which is almost entirely grade 2 agricultural land. Option C includes an additional 100 hectares of land of which about a third is grade 3 and two thirds is grade 2 agricultural land. These will be material considerations in determining the preferred site for Northstowe</p>	<p>Have regard in site selection to the fact that Options B includes an additional 63 hectares of land which is almost entirely grade 2 agricultural land and Option C includes an additional 100 hectares of land of which about a third is grade 3 and two thirds is grade 2 agricultural land.</p>
5622	Object	<p>Para 3.3</p> <p>I am very concerned at the phrase "the planning of Northstowe need not be unnecessarily constrained by present features if they would be unduly disruptive to creating a sustainable town" if this means removing trees which are in very short supply in the area.</p>	<p>The development of Northstowe will result in a substantial increase in tree planting within and adjoining the development. Paragraph 3.3 is making the point that some of the planting put in by the MOD for training purposes is alien to the Fen Edge landscape and may also not be in the most appropriate locations if the site is to be developed for a town.</p>	<p>Clarify in the AAP that the development of Northstowe will result in an overall net increase in tree planting within and adjoining the new town site.</p>
5623	Object	<p>Para 4.12</p> <p>Larger buildings can create a very unattractive skyline and are not in keeping with the current skyline.</p>	<p>The reference in paragraph 4.12 to larger buildings is intended to indicate that development of 3 and 4 stories would not be out of place (as at Cambourne where the predominant height of buildings is still 2 storey) and the taller landmark buildings would also contribute to the character of Northstowe. That does not mean tower blocks - Church spires provide such landmark and interesting buildings in existing buildings and having a few buildings of such stature would be equally not out of place at Northstowe.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5626	Object	<p>Para 4.16</p> <p>Due to the very large increase in traffic to be generated by Northstowe the planning consent for the new town should include a clear link between the completion of the A14 upgrade and the in service date for the new guided bus service before the construction of a maximum and appropriate number of new homes.</p>	Agreed.	Esnure that the Northstowe AAP and the subsequent planning permission include suitable trigger points tying the staged development of Northstowe to the upgrade of the A14, associated local road improvements and the in service date for the proposed guided bus service.
5628	Object	<p>Para 4.20</p> <p>Minimising noise pollution from construction traffic using the new link roads should be acheived by early measures (e.g. earth banking and early infrastructure planting) and by setting maximum decibel readings at the existing nearest properties.</p>	Agreed.	Ensure that the Northstowe AAP and the subsequent planning permission provides for minimising noise pollution from construction traffic using the new link roads by early measures (e.g. earth banking and early infrastructure planting) and by setting maximum decibel readings at the existing nearest properties.
4943	Object	I support the principle of the guided bus system, but the proposed timing is another example of political wishful and hopeful thinking.	Support for Guided Bus noted. The County Council advises that (subject to the outcome of the Transport & Works Order Inquiry) that the timetable for delivery of the service by 2007 is still on target.	
5356 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	<p>Para 21.1</p> <p>Object to seeking that planning obligations associated with the new settlement to be funded by developers.</p>	Whichever site is selected for development, the developers will be required to fund those services, facilities and infrastructure that are required by their development.	
5359	Object	The development will have a huge detrimental impact on this area of the countryside.	Objection noted. The Structure Plan requires that a new town of 8,000 to 10,000 homes be built in this location.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5394 5393	Object	Oppose this monstrous development. Ill thought out scheme. We live in a quiet village that will be subsumed by a town causing increase risk of traffic noise, pollution etc. Should be at least 2-3 miles away from existing communities.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington, located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield and be served by a rapid transit system based on the disused St Ives railway line. The Structure Plan envisages that it will be so close to these two villages that it is necessary to specifically require 'green separation' in order to clarify that they will not be part of the new town. A location 2-3 miles from existing communities in the area would not meet these strategic location requirements.	
4351 4348	Object	Reference to Longstanton All Saints and Longstanton St Michaels should be removed, there is only one parish called Longstanton.	There is only one Longstanton Parish, but references to All Saints and St Michael's are helpful to identify the policies and proposals which apply in different parts of the village.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4883 (Land at Southwell, B1050, Longstanton)	Object	<p>Paras 1.38-1.42 & 2.1 decision of the new town was made in 2001 prior to 2003 workshops, without involving local communities. Site keeps changing - how can people comment when they do not know where boundary would begin and end?</p> <p>Para 1.51 (1) with Northstowe less people would want to go to Cambridge and Huntingdon.</p> <p>(2) road access is unsustainable and would add to congestion in Longstanton and Oakington.</p> <p>(3) affordable housing is needed for young people</p> <p>(4-7) how can Authorities consider where is appropriate to have town centre - continually expanding</p> <p>(8) not clear what Authorities have in mind or where these would be situated</p> <p>(9) would affect most of this areas watercourses and put villages at higher risk of flooding</p> <p>Para 1.53 (1) compact development does not necessarily minimise travel</p> <p>(2) what adjoining landscapes and skylines landmarks does this refer to?</p> <p>(3) green separation should be from my boundary and not middle of my land</p> <p>(4) will be mass destruction of everything of environmental value</p> <p>(5-6) failed to consider high water table</p> <p>(7) also need proper road infrastructure</p> <p>Para 2.2 land budgets contrary to Structure Plan that identified 287ha at Oakington Barracks and Airfield as the preferred site for 6-10,000 houses. Site does not avoid floodplain. Would not be served by public transport. Would destroy environment of Longstanton.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 1.38 - 1.42 & 2.1: The starting point in responding to this objection is that no decision has yet been made on the site for Northstowe - only option development.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.51: This lists requirements from the Cambridge Sub-Region chapter of the Structure Plan which need to be included and detailed in the Northstowe AAP.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.53: This lists requirements from the other chapters of the Structure Plan which need to be included and detailed in the Northstowe AAP</p> <p>Paragraph 2.2: Precedes the detailed land use budget which has been used to estimate the amount of land that will be required for a new town of 8,000, 9,000 or 10,000 dwellings.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4735 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Support the airport road remaining closed to through traffic, but many people illegally use this road. Para 4.19 needs to be strengthened to make it clear that additional features will need to be provided to ensure it is not physically possible for unauthorised vehicles to be driven along it - e.g. by installation of rising bollards.	The present Airfield Road is not open to through traffic and as a result of the development of Northstowe will be severed by its approach roads. There will still be an advantage in retaining the general alignment of the road as part of the cycle network from Girton to the villages beyond Longstanton.	Include policy provision in the Northstowe AAP to keep a cycleway route between Longstanton and Oakington on the general alignment of the Airfield Road.
4736 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	The suitability and appropriateness of maximum building heights varies considerably across the site. Accordingly there needs to be a map which clearly shows the maximum permitted heights throughout the site.	The parts of the site where higher buildings (3 and 4 storey, and individual landmark buildings might be higher) will at the town and local centres and in the main employment area.	Include a 'skyline' policy in the Northstowe AAP clarifying where buildings of more than 2 storeys would be considered appropriate.
4463 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 19.3 Within the waste chapter there needs to be a reference to the County Council as Waste Planning Authority identifying a comprehensive waste management strategy. In addition, a sentence needs to be included which advises developers to contact Cambridgeshire County Council at an early stage to talk about waste management requirements. This will be detailed and cross-referenced in the Phasing and Implementation chapter.	Agreed.	Include reference in the Northstowe AAP to the County Council as Waste Planning Authority identifying a comprehensive waste management strategy. In addition, a sentence needs to be included which advises developers to contact Cambridgeshire County Council at an early stage to talk about waste management requirements. This will be detailed and cross-referenced in the Phasing and Implementation chapter.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4464 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Para 19.3</p> <p>In addition to the provision of permanent facilities, there is also a compelling case for temporary waste management facilities dealing with the re-use, recycling and recovery of waste arising from redevelopment / construction activities within all new major development areas. Such provision should be explicitly provided within a waste management strategy for any new major development. This will be detailed and cross-referenced in the Phasing and Implementation chapter.</p>	Agreed.	<p>Include with the Northstowe AAP reference to temporary waste management facilities dealing with the re-use, recycling and recovery of waste arising from redevelopment / construction activities within all new major development areas. Such provision should be explicitly provided within a waste management strategy for any new major development which will be detailed and cross-referenced in the Phasing and Implementation chapter.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4874	Object	<p>Object to sites A, B and C as contrary to Structure Plan Policy P9/3 that identifies Oakington Barracks and Airfield as the Preferred Option.</p> <p>1 - Option B - Home Farm and Northstowe would only be separated by the B1050 new route. Map 7 shows Northstowe will engulf and destroy Longstanton.</p> <p>2 - what character will it take? - it is already expanding in all directions and how long before it engulfs nearby villages?</p> <p>3 - it is not compact - Map 7 shows it is expanding in all directions.</p> <p>4 - contrary to bullet 3 and not flexible to serve nearby villages</p> <p>5 - proven unworkable as majority would travel to work in other areas and others travel to Northstowe</p> <p>6 - HQPT will not be flexible to serve Northstowe and nearby villages</p> <p>7 - ghetto as failed to consider the problems of land with a high water table & people can't comment on wind power if don't know enough about it</p> <p>8, 9, 10 - whatever green separation would not protect nearby villages - would be environmental impact on nearby villages.</p> <p>12 - unclear how reached conclusion it will be socially sustainable, healthy lifestyle, safe environment etc</p> <p>13 - fails to consider travel through villages</p>	<p>The Structure Plan does not limit the area of search for the new town to Oakington Barracks and Airfield. The principal locational criteria are found in Policy P9/3 are (a) located at Longstanton/Oakington, (b) to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, (c) make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, and (d) be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway line.</p> <p>Continuing with the remainder of the objection:</p> <p>(1) Agreed that Option B would have greatest adverse impact on Longstanton.</p> <p>(2) The character will be that of a town, not a village.</p> <p>(3) Map 7 shows all 3 options on a single map.</p> <p>(4) Providing accessibility for surrounding villages to use the services and facilities at Northstowe but not encouraging traffic through the villages will present compromises.</p> <p>(5) The Structure Plan intends that Northstowe will provide homes for people working in Cambridge.</p> <p>(6) HQPT based on the St Ives railway will provide an efficient, frequent and flexible public transport system.</p> <p>(7) Bullet 7 is an aspiration for the sustainable high quality settlement sought by the Structure Plan.</p> <p>(8), (9), (10) These are addressing the landscape and built character of Northstowe rather than 'green separation' which included in the 1st bullet.</p> <p>(12) Providing a socially sustainable, healthy lifestyle, safe environment etc are what the vision should be seeking to provide - this will need to be turned into plans and proposals by the designers and masterplanners.</p> <p>(13) Includes an objective to prevent additional traffic through villages.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5147	Object	<p>Para 1.1 planning policies will environmentally destroy Longstanton and surroundings for the sake of development. (1) Home Farm and Northstowe are interconnected in many ways yet planned separately. (2) Structure Plan identifies the Barracks and Airfield. (3) Home Farm contrary to policy, aiming to minimise travel (4) infrastructure is not being provided to support development (5) Longstanton was not represented by a District Councillor when decision to locate Northstowe was made</p> <p>Para 1.18 (1) Home Farm and Northstowe should have been considered together (2) need long term environmental aims (3) communities are not aware of full facts (4)no action plan or community strategy for Home Farm and Northstowe</p> <p>Para 1.20 how will it improve Longstanton residents' quality of life? (1) means nothing and misleading (2) how will it protect when the environment will be destroyed? (3) B1050 bypass increase journeys 1 mile - wasted fuel (4) impact on surrounding shops/businesses</p> <p>Para 1.21 (1) use of farmland (2) would generate traffic chaos & guided bus not flexible enough (3) business & residential don't mix - too close (4) environmental disaster for whole area (5) absence of masterplan - no clear phasing</p> <p>Paras 1.25-1.27 & 1.29-1.31 & 1.49 lack of community involvement/representation in decision making</p> <p>Para 1.48 & 1.50 (1) majority of site outside Barracks and Airfield - further away (2) guided bus will not provide HQPT - not flexible (3) land may not be designated, doesn't make it any less important (4) drainage issue needs to be addressed (5-6) most of site on greenfield land</p> <p>Para 1.50 (6) not small town</p>	<p>The while of the Introduction including paragraphs 1.1, 1.18, 1.20, 1.21, 1.25-1.27 & 1.29-1.31 & 1.49, 1.48 & 1.50 provide background information to the process of LDF plan making and to the subsequent Options.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4649 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Bayer CropScience Ltd generally supports the work that is being done to identify the development locations in line with the Structure Plan approach. It is clear that significant releases of Green Belt land will be required to meet Structure Plan housing targets. However the local development framework must clearly recognise that the development of previously developed land is a first priority under government policy guidance (PPG1 and 3). There is a real risk that the action area plan sites will not come forward fast enough to meet Structure Plan housing targets, due to the timetable involved in amending the Green Belt boundary, the need to reach agreement on challenging infrastructure requirements and commercial agreements between landowners and infrastructure providers before practical implementation can proceed.	The approach to the Core Strategy which was agreed by Council at its meeting on 20th January 2005 will provide a basis for consideration the suitable redevelopment of the Bayer Crop Sciences site at Hauxton.	
4940	Object	The proposed programme is totally unrealistic, and there is no way that houses will be ready for occupation in 2007, particularly in view of stated requirements in NS109 which SCDC must rigidly enforce.	Option NS109 proposes that the landscape treatment of the 'green separation' and the agreed boundary treatment at Rampton Drift is planted before development commences at Northstowe. Advanced planting of strategic landscaping is normal practice. Occupation towards the end of 2007 would be possible, if challenging, as planting can be undertaken in the November 2006 to March 2007 planting season.	
5294 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to the Northstowe Land Use Budget set out on page 14.	Objection noted. However, the site proposed by the Fairfield Partnership for 8,000 dwellings includes 358 hectares of land excluding 'green separation' which compares with 348 hectares for Option A without the 'green separation' - a 3% difference in site area which is not material.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6517 - Histon & Impington Village Society	Object	Concern is expressed about the impact on Histon & Impington by increased traffic and other pressures from Northstowe.	Agreed.	The policies in the Northstowe AAP and the subsequent planning permission will need to ensure that the roads and junctions providing access to Northstowe are designed to discourage traffic from travelling through existing villages.
5671 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	With regard to paragraphs 1.13 and 1.44: The plan should go further in restricting development to the south of the existing railway line and establishing permanent green belts between the new town and the surrounding villages.	Objection to Options B and C noted.	
6138 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. 6097 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6098 - Centex Strategic Land	Object	No objection in principle to Northstowe. Concerns regarding achievable housing delivery rates. Seek to ensure the housing strategy is robust and provides for sufficient housing numbers during the plan period. Even assuming an optimistic date for granting detailed planning permission at end 2006, the infrastructure requirements for the scheme are likely to preclude any dwelling completions until mid 2008 at the earliest. Completion rates would need to run at 750 per annum for each of the 8 years to 2016 in order to achieve the 6,000 target. This is an over optimistic and unattainable build rate. LDF should have a more robust strategy, including additional development at Histon in order to ensure the delivery of the requisite level of dwellings.	Making additional development allocations elsewhere will discourage the achievement of the build rate at Northstowe. The Structure Plan provides a very clear steer to development in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Northstowe is higher in the development sequence than Histon and will become a much more sustainable location for development. Every endeavour must be made to ensure that the expansion of Cambridge and the development of Northstowe proceed at the rate envisaged by the Structure Plan. This will be important to ensure that sufficient development takes place quickly enough to pay for the very significant investment in services and infrastructure that will be needed.	No change to the preferred approach to the strategy for Histon and Northstowe.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6232 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Chapter 2 Land use budget:</p> <p>Gallagher understand the reasons for the inclusion of a land use budget in Chapter 2 - to inform the choice of site options.</p> <p>Gallagher agrees with much although not with all. It should be a matter for the Strategic Master Plan, and for design guidance, to work through the land use details.</p> <p>To provide a land use budget (and indeed Master Plan) within the AAP would be over prescriptive and unnecessary. There is no indication in ODPM guidance on the preparation of LDFs that such detail would be appropriate.</p>	<p>Objection noted. The purpose of the land use budget is to ensure with confidence that sufficient land is allocated for the development of Northstowe. The policies in the Northstowe Area Action Plan will list the requirements, e.g. 5 primary schools without specifying the amount of land that will be required in the knowledge that work on the land use budget has demonstrated that sufficient land is available.</p>	
6336 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Waste:</p> <p>GOEAST has recently advised on waste planning for Development Documents. Gallagher had expected a view to be taken on waste issues in the AAP by the District Council.</p> <p>Gallagher has undertaken technical work on waste to inform the Northstowe SMP. This work concluded that a Major Waste Management Facility within Northstowe is inappropriate for a number of reasons and that the appropriate facility is a Household Waste Recycling Centre. In setting out a land use budget for Northstowe it appears that the District Council has formed similar view. It would be beneficial if a that view were to be more clearly expressed.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>A household waste recycling facility for Northstowe and the immediately surrounding villages would be appropriate. A major waste management facility serving a wide area would not be appropriate and should not be provided for in the Northstowe AAP.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6481 - Royal Mail Group	Object	Para 1.43-1.44 The Cambridge Northstowe Development will have a major impact on infrastructure, services and facilities in the area. This will include capacity of services of statutory undertakers. Recognition of this impact should be made within this paragraph and section. Further, comment is made that the area can be planned for and all necessary infrastructure be secured from all phases in the development. A comment should be added that the direct impact of the development on all local services, facilities and infrastructure - including that for statutory undertakers to provide extra capacity to meet additional demand, shall be funded directly from the development.	Objection noted. The Planning Obligations chapter already makes it clear that the development will be expected to fund the services, facilities and infrastructure that will be needed at Northstowe. However, for many private companies the commercial opportunities that Northstowe offers for their services will also need to be taken into account.	
6492 - The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards	Object	P.13. 2.2. To 'avoid areas liable to flood' - generally support statement but should be extended to 'not to increase flood risk elsewhere'.	Agreed.	Ensure that the Northstowe AAP and the subsequent planning permission includes a requirement that development at Northstowe should not increase flood risk elsewhere.
6276 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Bullet Four - The form of the town centre should not be dictated by AAP policy but through detailed design guidance. Suggest word 'linear' is deleted from bullet 4.	Objection noted, but the objective is to create a new Cambridgeshire market town for the 21st century - a defining characteristic of a Cambridgeshire market town is a linear town centre. Linear does not require a single street, it could comprise two or more streets in parallel for all or part of the length of the town centre and include a town square as at Ely and St Neots.	
7292 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Reference to 'best practice' urban design better reflects need for robust urban design principles.	Agreed.	Amend the second bullet in the vision to read: "A distinctive town character which takes its clues from nearby market towns AND INCORPORATES 'BEST PRACTICE' IN URBAN DESIGN, that is well suited to sustainable living and is made up of a number of local centres with landmarks and other points of interest."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7293 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Bullet Two - It is appropriate also that the new town takes account of clues elsewhere in the sub-region.	The Cambridge Sub-Region only extends as far as the market towns referred to in the vision. Whilst it might be possible to take clues from Cambridge, care will be needed as the scale of Northstowe will be much smaller from Cambridge and what would be appropriate in the City would not necessarily be appropriate in a small market town.	
7294 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Bullet One - Gallagher supports the need to protect village character but does not believe it is realistic or desirable to propose completely separate developments. Sustainable development suggests positive, inclusive, relationships not segregation. The new town should be at, not separate from, Longstanton/Oakington. The suggestion of a new town entirely separate from the two nearest villages is misleading and not based on policy guidance.	Objection noted. The Structure Plan requires 'green separation' between Northstowe and Longstanton and Oakington villages. There will therefore be physical separation although there will be interaction across that open space, much like the different parts of Cambridge interact across the Commons, Backs etc.	
7278	Object	The "Vision" is not forward thinking and should cater for future growth in Northstowe. Development should be planned now to go North of the railway line. As such the unique opportunity to build-in green sites to the south area of the airfield, and between existing villages and new development must be taken now.	It will be important to determine the ultimate size of Northstowe as a planned new town, to determine how it will fit most comfortably into the surrounding settlement pattern and to ensure that balance for the future by placing a green belt around it. By requiring that it be located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, the Structure Plan inserts Northstowe into an area where it will there is little scope for growth without major impact on the landscape and existing villages.	Determine the ultimate size of Northstowe in the AAP and protect the character of existing villages and intervening countryside by extending the Cambridge Green Belt.
7290	Object	To be at the 'heart' of the community does not necessitate that the 'town centre' be geographically central to Northstowe.	Objection noted. However to be a sustainable town where travel distances are minimised a location close to the geographical centre of the new town will be advantageous.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7280	Object	Plans should be reviewed by SCDC, given the costly and disasterous decisions to recent roadworkings made by SC Transport Dept in the A14 area around Bar Hill and Girton.	South Cambridgeshire District Council is not a highway authority. This objection is referring to measures implemented by Cambridgeshire County Council which is the highway authority or the Highways Agency. The District Council will however be advised by those authorities concerning any access roads and other road improvements that will be needed for Northstowe and which will need to be secured through the grant of planning permission.	
7288 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to paragraph 4.18/NS4 because, regarding routes to - Longstanton residents north of the existing Level Crossing do no want to be isolated from their own village!	Only Option B would separate the houses on the B1050 north of Station Road from Longstanton village. Access would still be possible via an extended Longstanton Bypass. The Fairfield Partnership which was consulting shortly before the Council's consultation in the Autumn did propose a closure of the B1050 and a diversion through the site that they are promoting.	
7295 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Bullet Seven - Suggest elaboration as follows 'a balanced, viable. Socially inclusive and cohesive community'	Agreed.	Bullet Seven - Elaborate as follows 'a balanced, viable. Socially inclusive and cohesive community'
7289	Object	Care should also be taken to avoid noise and light pollution.	Agreed.	Ensure that the Northstowe AAP and subsequent planning permission provide a requirement for the designers and masterplanners of Northstowe to minimise the impact of noise and light pollution on surrounding villages and countryside.
7296	Object	It is totally dependent upon the A14 upgrade, which simply will not happen. What plans are there to overcome the traffic problems at the junction of the B1050 with the A14?	It will be a requirement of the Northstowe AAP and subsequent planning permission that the staged development of Northstowe will be tied to the upgrade of the A14, parallel distributor roads, local access roads, and any necessary junction improvements.	Ensure that the Northstowe AAP and subsequent planning permission include appropriate trigger mechanism tying the stages development of Northstowe to the upgrade of the A14, parallel distributor roads, local access roads, and any necessary junction improvements.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7297 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	With regard to paragraphs 1.13 and 1.44: The original concept of Northstowe as a town of six to eight thousand homes seems to have been lost with suggestions that it might now be in excess of ten thousand. The LDF should address this issue and cap the town at an absolute maximum of eight thousand homes. If more homes are needed they should be provided in another new town location built on a similar scale.	There is no suggestion that the town should anything beyond an ultimate size of 8,000 - 10,000, and the recommended site (A) would deliver at the bottom of this range.	
7291 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Bullet Nine - for reasons set out in full the specific reference to country park should be deleted.	Objection noted. Structure Plan policy P4/2 proposes "Local Plan and major development adjoining the countryside will include proposals for informal leisure and recreation, including country parks and routes for walkers, cyclists and horse riders". The policy continues but for the purpose of this representation there is a clear indication that development of the scale of Northstowe will include provision for Country Parks.	
891	Support	Make sure it is a new town for Longstanton/Oakington and not a new town for Longstanton/Oakington/Rampton and Willingham - if so call it as such!	Support noted. Conformity with the Structure Plan is a requirement of the process of plan-making - policy P9/3 is most relevant. In reaching decision on the site for Northstowe, the Council will need to ensure that the following criteria are met: (1) located at Longstanton/Oakington (2) located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington (3) makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield (4) can be well served by a rapid transit system based on the St Ives railway line. There are a number of other Structure Plan policies which are also relevant e.g. minimising the loss of high grade agricultural land.	
2735 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports the preferred approach, particularly in relation to green corridors and country park(s) providing for wildlife as well as people	Support for approach to green corridors, country park(s) and wildlife noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3894 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 3.6 Creation of new landmarks should include natural features, especially trees that are given the room to grow to full stature.	Support noted. Landmarks within the town will help make Northstowe an interesting place with a variety of points of reference. New landscape features can provide such landmarks in additional to buildings.	Ensure that landmark features within Northstowe comprise new landscape features as well as buildings.
3895 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 3.7 The value of the lake as a feature for wildlife includes its island and immediate surrounds.	Support noted. The value of the lake as a feature for wildlife includes its island and immediate surroundings.	Ensure that the strategic masterplan for Northstowe identifies the value of the lake as a feature for wildlife includes its island and immediate surroundings.
3897 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Split bullet point 3 so as to address accessibility by foot and cycle, and guided bus in separate bullet points. Amendment to NS4, 3rd bullet point - A compact linear form highly accessible and permeable to its residents by foot and cycle; - A high quality public transport system based on a loop from the Guided Busway on the former St Ives railway line through the town;	This representation is supporting the approach in bullet point 3 in the vision which addresses the proposed approach to non car movement within Northstowe. This change is not necessary.	Make no change to this vision in respect of this representation.
3898 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Amendment of NS4, (old) 9th bullet point - Green corridors that will penetrate the town and connect it to open countryside and country parks. These should be within walking distance for the community and will also provide for wildlife and biodiversity;	Support noted but the proposed change would make no difference to the objectives of the 9th bullet point.	Make no change to the Vision in respect of this representation.
3899 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Amendment to NS4, (old) 10th bullet point - As an attractive town in the landscape with which it is well connected and integrated through a variety of formal and informal edges;	Agree.	Amend 10th bullet to read: As an attractive town in the landscape with which it is well connected AND INTEGRATED through a variety of formal and informal edges

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3900 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a place which will be an exemplar of sustainable living with low carbon emissions and designed and built to be equipped to withstand the impacts of climate changes. - Where public rights of way connect to the wider public rights of way network to support sustainable transport, recreation and health benefits. 	Agreed.	<p>Add the following to the Vision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a place which will be an exemplar of sustainable living with low carbon emissions and designed and built to be equipped to withstand the impacts of climate changes. - Where public rights of way connect to the wider public rights of way network to support sustainable transport, recreation and health benefits.
3902 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Welcome early move to ensure that efforts are made to reduce energy use. Potential for additional comments including; embedded energy in building materials, reuse of hardcore waste onsite (thereby minimising transport needs), using locally sourced materials and labour.</p> <p>Amendment to paragraph 4.14, following last sentence add;</p> <p>Further efforts to reduce energy use in Northstowe should include: addressing embedded energy in building materials the reuse of hardcore waste onsite; and, the use of locally sourced materials and labour.</p>	Agreed.	<p>Amendment to paragraph 4.14, following last sentence add;</p> <p>Further efforts to reduce energy use in Northstowe should include: addressing embedded energy in building materials the reuse of hardcore waste onsite; and, the use of locally sourced materials and labour.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2970	Support	Strongly support the first policy point "As a physically separate settlement from surrounding villages including the closest villages of Longstanton and Oakington where there will be 'green separation' with the express purpose of maintaining their village character;" as long as a decent amount of separation is created. Needs to be at least 400+ metres to preserve the rural setting of Oakington which overlooks fields and paddocks.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington, located to the east of Longstanton and to the north of Oakington, and located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The extent of 'green separation' necessary to protect the village character of Longstanton and Oakington has been the subject of a lengthy report and detailed member site visit. 200 metres compares well with such villages as Fen Ditton which are slightly further away from a much larger settlement (Cambridge) and yet successfully maintain their village character. Village character will be much better protected by ensuring that traffic accessing Northstowe does not need to pass through surrounding villages.	
4168 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 1704 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	Amend 9th bullet to read "Where green corridors penetrate the town and connect it to open countryside including country parks within walking and riding distance to serve the community and provide for wildlife and biodiversity".	This objection is asking that the objective be amended to ensure that the green corridors which would penetrate the built up area of Northstowe are within riding distance as well as within walking distance of the population of the new town. Such a change is unnecessary as if any such green corridors are within walking distance then by definition they are within riding distance although it must be unlikely that any of the residents of Northstowe which will developed at an average density of 40 dph will keep horses at home.	Make no change to the Vision.
3814 - English Heritage 3813 - English Heritage	Support	Welcome reference to town character, local distinctiveness and sense of place. Utilise HLC database to ensure settlement reflects historic evolution of the area.	Support noted. The HLC database is the Historic Landscape Characterisation which identifies and describes historic components in the landscape. This will be a useful reference document to help assimilate the design and other assimilation of Northstowe into the local landscape.	Ensure that the AAP includes a requirement that English Heritage's Historic Landscape Characterisation database is referred to by the masterplanners and designers of Northstowe.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5317 - The Fairfield Partnership	Support	NS4 is supported , particularly the vision of achieving physical separation between the new settlement and the surrounding villages and maintaining green separation to preserve the character of these villages.	Support noted.	
2073 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 5627	Support	Airfield Road must remain open to cyclists and pedestrians and must be maintained properly. It should not be open to through traffic.	Support noted for retention of the alignment of the Airfield Road between Longstanton and Oakington villages for pedestrians and cyclists.	
4398 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 4.15 Agree that a Country Park or equivalent informal green space should be provided.	Support for Country Park noted and that the County Council owns the land identified in the Option NS84 west of Station Road and could therefore assist with the delivery of this important local facility.	If Option B is not chosen, include a policy in the AAP for a Country Park west of Station Road.
4465 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 19.3 Reference to the need for a major waste management facility and a household waste recycling centre at Northstowe.	Paragraph 19.3 is not an expression of support for a major Waste Management Facility, it is a record of what is in the Waste Plan. This is considered to be inappropriate at Northstowe which the Structure Plan proposes will not include any sub-regional facilities. A household waste recycling facility for Northstowe and the immediately surrounding villages would be appropriate.	This is considered to be inappropriate at Northstowe which the Structure Plan proposes will not include any sub-regional facilities. A household waste recycling facility for Northstowe and the immediately surrounding villages would be appropriate.
6413 - The Countryside Agency 3427 - English Partnerships	Support	Welcome the commitment to deliver a distinctive town character taking design clues from nearby market towns, to make water integral to the design of the town and its open spaces, to incorporate green corridors connecting town to country and to create an attractive town in the landscape to which it is well connected.	Support noted.	
6502 - English Partnerships 7277 - English Partnerships	Support	Should emphasise new opportunities presented for existing residents to access new and improved local services, new public transport, housing, and employment in a planned sustainable environment. The new development should promote inclusiveness and connectivity with its neighbouring villages.	Support noted. Accessibility to the services and facilities at Northstowe is a clear intention of the Structure Plan but will need to be carefully planned to ensure that providing such access does not result in increased traffic generation in surrounding villages.	Include the following within the vision: Include opportunities for existing residents to access new and improved local services, new public transport, housing, and employment in a planned sustainable environment.

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD*****Decision on NS4 Vision - Preferred Approach**

Determine the ultimate size of Northstowe in the AAP and protect the character of existing villages and intervening countryside by extending the Cambridge Green Belt.

Include the following within the vision: "Include opportunities for existing residents to access new and improved local services, new public transport, housing, and employment in a planned sustainable environment."

Ensure that the Northstowe AAP and subsequent planning permission provide a requirement for the designers and masterplanners of Northstowe to minimise the impact of noise and light pollution on surrounding villages and countryside.

Add the following to the Vision: - As a place which will be an exemplar of sustainable living with low carbon emissions and designed and built to be equipped to withstand the impacts of climate changes. - Where public rights of way connect to the wider public rights of way network to support sustainable transport, recreation and health benefits.

Amend the second bullet in the vision to read: "A distinctive town character which takes its clues from nearby market towns AND INCORPORATES 'BEST PRACTICE' IN URBAN DESIGN, that is well suited to sustainable living and is made up of a number of local centres with landmarks and other points of interest."

Ensure that landmark features within Northstowe comprise new landscape features as well as buildings.

Ensure that the strategic masterplan for Northstowe identifies the value of the lake as a feature for wildlife includes its island and immediate surroundings.

Include a 'skyline' policy in the Northstowe AAP clarifying where buildings of more than 2 storeys would be considered appropriate.

Ensure that the employment strategy is fully explained in the Area Action Plan.

Bullet Seven - Elaborate as follows 'a balanced, viable. Socially inclusive and cohesive community'

Ensure that the Northstowe AAP and the subsequent planning permission includes a requirement that development at Northstowe should not increase flood risk elsewhere.

Treat existing water features as a constraint which should be retained within the development wherever possible.

Amend 10th bullet to read: As an attractive town in the landscape with which it is well connected AND INTEGRATED through a variety of formal and informal edges.

If Option B is not chosen, include a policy in the AAP for a Country Park west of Station Road.

As the planning for Northstowe proceeds and over the lifetime of the development, any newly scheduled ancient monuments will need to be accommodated within the masterplan and development of the new town.

Include within the landscaping policies a requirement to consult the English Heritage's historic landscape database as a useful basis for both urban design and landscape reinstatement.

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD***

Clarify in the AAP that the development of Northstowe will result in an overall net increase in tree planting within and adjoining the new town site.

Seek the advice of the County Council and Highways Agency to establish the stage in the development process that a relevant trigger mechanism should be set for the provision of parallel distributor roads.

Include appropriate trigger mechanisms in the Northstowe AAP and subsequent planning permission tying stages in the development to the provision and availability of infrastructure such as the A14 parallel roads.

Include proposals in the Northstowe AAP to require segregated cycle and footpath provision as part of the principle road network within Northstowe and on any roads built outside the town which can provide safe access to other local destinations.

The policies in the Northstowe AAP and the subsequent planning permission will need to ensure that the roads and junctions providing access to Northstowe are designed to discourage traffic from travelling through existing villages.

Include policy provision in the Northstowe AAP to keep a cycleway route between Longstanton and Oakington on the general alignment of the Airfield Road.

Retain a minimum indicative list of facilities required. Request Cambridgeshire Horizons to undertake further work to feed into the masterplanning process. Ensure that the AAP includes a policy which sets out criteria for specifying facilities which developers will be expected to contribute towards or provide in full.

Ensure that the Northstowe AAP and the subsequent planning permission provides for minimising noise pollution from construction traffic using the new link roads by early measures (e.g. earth banking and early infrastructure planting) and by setting maximum decibel readings at the existing nearest properties.

Include reference in the Northstowe AAP to the County Council as Waste Planning Authority identifying a comprehensive waste management strategy. In addition, a sentence needs to be included which advises developers to contact Cambridgeshire County Council at an early stage to talk about waste management requirements. This will be detailed and cross-referenced in the Phasing and Implementation chapter.

Inappropriate to provide a major waste treatment plant at Northstowe which the Structure Plan proposes will not include any sub-regional facilities.

A household waste recycling facility for Northstowe and the immediately surrounding villages would be appropriate. A major waste management facility serving a wide area would not be appropriate and should not be provided for in the Northstowe AAP.

Include with the Northstowe AAP reference to temporary waste management facilities dealing with the re-use, recycling and recovery of waste arising from redevelopment / construction activities within all new major development areas. Such provision should be explicitly provided within a waste management strategy for any new major development which will be detailed and cross-referenced in the Phasing and Implementation chapter.

Amendment to paragraph 4.14, following last sentence add; Further efforts to reduce energy use in Northstowe should include: addressing embedded energy in building materials the reuse of hardcore waste onsite; and, the use of locally sourced materials and labour.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Have regard in site selection to the fact that Options B includes an additional 63 hectares of land which is almost entirely grade 2 agricultural land and Option C includes an additional 100 hectares of land of which about a third is grade 3 and two thirds is grade 2 agricultural land.

No change to the preferred approach to the strategy for Histon and Northstowe.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 5. Green Belt				
<i>NS5 Green Belt: Objectives - Preferred Approach</i>				
1797	Object	If recreational opportunities are a major planning factor why are you building over a perfectly good golf course?	The existing golf course site is required to ensure the appropriate development of the town. The issue of replacing the golf course is considered at NS83.	No change.
1858	Object	The proposal proves that the green belt designation is irrelevant to where development takes place. The separation proposed between Northstowe and other villages is too small, and in the long run Northstowe will grow to merge both with these villages and with Cambridge.	The development of a new town in this location makes the change to the Green Belt essential for the long term and is required by the Structure Plan. The degree of separation is considered at NS40.	No change.
4959 4960	Object	Whilst welcoming the extension of the Green Belt north of Oakington, do not agree that "every opportunity should be taken... for public access" in that area. If the recreation space for the new town abuts Oakington then the requirement that "Northstowe should not merge with any of the surrounding villages" is met only as far as buildings and roads are concerned. The effects on the residents of northern Oakington will be considerable in terms of disturbance and loss of security.	Noted. The disposition of land uses within the parts of the Green Belt which lies in the Green Separation is considered at NS40 where it is the Preferred Approach that whilst public access is to be maximised, it would not permit more formal recreation areas such as playing fields. With careful design and landscaping there should therefore be no loss of security for existing residents.	Note need to take into account disturbance and loss of security for existing residents in developing more detailed proposals.
4854	Object	Bullet 2 - object to this statement as Map 7 shows evidence that 119 houses and business areas that were in Longstanton are now within Northstowe - this is not merging? Bullet 3 - there would not be much countryside left by the time Northstowe is completed.	Most of the existing properties referred to are in Rampton Drift which it is not possible to protect by Green Belt given its position relative to the site for Northstowe. The appropriate treatment for the boundary between Rampton Drift and Northstowe is considered at NS45. Other sporadic development outside Longstanton such as the ribbon of development along the B1050 between Longstanton and Willingham, north of the St. Ives railway would be protected by Green Belt.	None required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6233 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Map 6 Green Belt:</p> <p>No options in the text relate to Map 6 in the AAP.</p> <p>Gallagher objects strongly to Green Belt boundary proposed in Map 6. Appears to be consistent with Option C described in NS3. Firstly, as spelt out in relation to NS3, breaching of the St. Ives to Cambridge railway line is flawed fundamentally and, secondly, it raises major issues of inconsistency in policy and sustainability terms.</p> <p>The inner boundary of the Green Belt follows no natural or clearly defined features. Agree that Green Belt boundaries should provide comfort to existing residents regarding future extent of Northstowe. There can be little or no confidence in the durability of this boundary. Local residents would be entitled to harbour concerns regarding the encroachment of the new town towards Willingham and Rampton.</p>	It is not recommended that Option C should be chosen for the site and therefore the Green Belt would be extended over land north of the railway.	None.
6287 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>PPG2 clearly outlines the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy. Cambridge Green Belt restricts the expansion (sprawl) of Cambridge to protect the setting of the City. This should remain the function of Cambridge Green Belt. Including additional land should be consistent with PPG2 and Cambridge Green Belt. Hence the primary function of the Green Belt should be to restrict outward expansion and preserve the setting of the City. In the first bullet reference should be made to PPG2 Green Belt objective - '..safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'.</p>	Agree this can be added.	Add new bullet: to safeguard the countryside from encroachment.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
7281 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher has significant reservations regarding washing over areas of green separation with green belt status although this is not the subject of a specific objection subject clarifications.	Not accepted; the Green Separation between Northstowe and the villages of Longstanton and Oakington must be protected by Green Belt as one of the functions of the Green belt is to ensure that coalescence does not occur.	None.
4399 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3179 - Longstanton Action Group 2190 - Longstanton Parish Council 3048 2939 3335 1293 1256 1439 1062 1317 2250 4944 940 939 915 1166 1411 2542 1082 6432	Support	Strongly support these general principles.	Support noted.	
3429 - English Partnerships	Support	Careful consideration must be given to the form and function of boundary treatments between the villages and new town to secure an inclusive and balanced community.	Support noted. The issue of boundary treatment is one for later stages in the planning process.	
1706 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire) 2584	Support	Support subject to taking every opportunity to provide opportunities for outdoor recreation and public access, specifying horse riders, cyclists and walkers.	Support noted. The last bullet of the objectives provides for this. It is not considered necessary to specify public access in greater detail as this is implicit in the term "public access".	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3749 - GO-East	Support	NS5, 6, 7 & 8: Green Belt Summary In line with our preferred option of NS2: Site Option B, GO East supports NS6: Green Belt - preferred option. We would also urge the authority to consider the inclusion of the wedge of land north of the settlement and bordered by the guided busway and the B1050 in the submission DPD as this would seem more in keeping with the aim to provide green separation between the settlement and the surrounding villages.	Support noted. Extending the Green Belt as suggested would be appropriate as it would ensure that Willingham and Over would not merge with Northstowe and the boundary would follow roads as a clearly defined boundary.	Extend Green Belt so that the outer boundary follows the road between Over and Willingham and the road between Over and Longstanton north of the St. Ives railway.
4632 - Westbury Homes 4178 - Westbury Homes	Support	Support the objectives. The preferred option for a clearly defined outer edge of the Green Belt using existing roads will provide a new Green Belt which is capable of being protected from development over the long-term, well beyond the Plan period.	Support noted	
2075 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 2989 2973 2336 2132 2088 1522 1016 1077 5098 5097 1001	Support	Support subject to there being adequate Green Belt separation for Longstanton and Oakington.	Support noted. The Preferred Option is to extend the Green Belt to include the Green Separation between Northstowe and these villages. The extent of Green Separation is dealt with in response to representations on that issue.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS5 Green Belt: Objectives - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Add new bullet: "TO SAFEGUARD THE COUNTRYSIDE FROM ENCROACHMENT".

Other actions proposed:

Extend Green Belt so that the outer boundary follows the road between Over and Willingham and the road between Over and Longstanton north of the St. Ives railway.

Note the need to take into account disturbance and loss of security for existing residents in developing more detailed proposals.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS6 Green Belt - Preferred Option</i>				
1002	Object	Northstowe should be developed north of the old railway.	This is an issue for site selection which will in turn guide the definition of the Green Belt.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4400 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3690 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 3180 - Longstanton Action Group 4612 - Westbury Homes 4185 - Westbury Homes 1944 - Cottenham Parish Council 2191 - Longstanton Parish Council 3072 - Rampton Parish Council 3750 - GO-East 6296 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 2076 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 2474 2975 2941 2344 3339 1523 1609 1357 1294 1257 1599 1209 1440 2451 1063 1318 2256 4945 1078 941 916 1992 1989 1167	Object	Support this option as being the best method of protecting the character of the surrounding villages and to prevent the merging of all the villages and Northstowe with Cambridge.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1412 2544 1083 6430 882 898				
5318 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to NS6 as this would limit the size of the new settlement not allowing expansion to reach the ultimate capacity of 10000 dwellings referred to in the Structure Plan. Therefore the Green Belt will be incapable of enduring in the long term. Also the Green Belt Boundary as defined along the Longstanton Oakington edges does not relate to any physical feature, when this is combined with other arguments this demonstrates the unsuitability of NS6.	An ultimate capacity of 10,000 is not an absolute requirement of the Structure Plan, rather an ultimate size of between 8,000 and 10,000 and this will be determined by site selection. Suitable features will determine the boundaries in the Green separation parts of the Green Belt although as with the existing Green belt boundaries these may be local rather than strategic features.	
4355 (Land adjacent to Clive Hall Drive, Longstanton)	Object	We are seeking a minor exclusion of land adjacent to Clive Hall Drive from the green belt. In addition to this we question the approach to future ownership, use and enhancement of the green belt, this needs to relate in a coherent manner to corresponding policies.	Not accepted; this is an important part of the Green separation which should be covered by Green Belt designation to ensure its long term protection. Green Belt designation should not take account of land ownership.	No change.
4737 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Wholly supportive of this initiative in principle, but very careful consideration needs to be given to the boundary around Oakington, because our village needs to develop in its own right.	Support noted; the rural settlement strategy does not propose peripheral development	
4861	Object	SCDC should consult with CCC, who is one of the biggest landowners in the area, before drawing up the Green Belt boundary. How many of the County's small holdings have been earmarked to be developed? Old and Stripland Farm in Longstanton and March and Mori's in Oakington are surplus to requirements in connection with the Home Farm and Northstowe proposed developments.	The County Council has been consulted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1071	Support	This should prevent the travellers buying up parcels of land east of Longstanton as is rumoured.	Support noted. Travellers' issues dealt with in specific policies elsewhere.	
1860	Support	While I agree that Northstowe, in the unfortunate event it ever exists, should have a tightly defined boundary, I have no confidence whatsoever that this will be achieved in practice, and no belief in any claims that the town will not eventually merge with the surrounding villages. Indeed, development of general facilities in Northstowe will only accelerate the decline of the few shopping and recreational facilities currently in these villages.	Support noted; Green Belt offers the most secure way of containing the expansion of the town. The issues of shopping and recreation are dealt with in those sections.	
2133	Support	I support this proposal to protect the existing communities, subject to agreeing the form and nature of the land to fall within the green belt.	Support noted. The issue of appropriate land uses within the Green Belt will be set out in the Core Strategy. Within the Green Separation, land use is considered at NS40.	
2994	Support	The area of green belt must be at least one kilometre wide at all points. The boundary of the new town should be fixed.	Support noted; however it will not be possible to ensure a depth of 1 km, nor is this essential to perform effectively.	
5439	Support	Reserve position as to some of the land if you have to increase the town area. Will need significant feeder roads across that land from A14, farming access will be difficult.	Support noted; the Green Belt is proposed to ensure that the town does not increase. It will require access roads and the impact on farming access will need to be taken into account when they are considered in detail.	
5100 5099	Support	Support the principle that the Green Belt should be extended around Northstowe including green separation beyond private properties.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS6 Green Belt - Preferred Option

Develop the preferred option into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS7 Green Belt - Alternative Option</i>				
3751 - GO-East	Object	<p>NS5, 6, 7 & 8: Green Belt Summary</p> <p>In line with our preferred option of NS2: Site Option B, GO East supports NS6: Green Belt - preferred option. We would also urge the authority to consider the inclusion of the wedge of land north of the settlement and bordered by the guided busway and the B1050 in the submission DPD as this would seem more in keeping with the aim to provide green separation between the settlement and the surrounding villages.</p>	<p>Support for NS6 noted. Agree extending the Green Belt as suggested would be appropriate as it would ensure that Willingham and Over would not merge with Northstowe and the boundary would follow roads as a clearly defined boundary.</p>	<p>Extend Green Belt as in NS6 but also include land so that the outer boundary follows the road between Over and Willingham and the road between Over and Longstanton north of the St. Ives railway.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4401 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3183 - Longstanton Action Group 2192 - Longstanton Parish Council 3075 - Rampton Parish Council 2077 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 2942 2348 3344 1524 1017 1548 1295 1600 1616 1441 2452 1064 1321 2259 4946 942 917 1907 1863 1168 1413 2545 883	Object	This option leaves open the possibility of surrounding the existing villages, contrary to the Structure Plan. It does not provide adequate separation and protection against the growth of Northstowe outside its defined boundaries.	Agree; the Council's Preferred Option is NS6.	Reject this option and confirm the approach set out in NS6.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5328 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to NS7 as this would mean the Green Belt boundary is incapable of delivering development of the new settlement at a scale beyond the 8-10000 dwellings proposed in the Structure Plan.	The Structure Plan sets an ultimate size for Northstowe of between 8,000 and 10,000 dwellings. The whole point of the Green Belt is to limit the ultimate size of the town to somewhere within this range and it is not appropriate to consider a Green belt which would allow uncontrolled development beyond the acceptable ultimate size, which in any case can be no more than 10,000 dwellings although this will be determined by site selection.	The Council's Preferred Option is NS6. This Alternative Option should be rejected.
4834 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	There should be a buffer between the proposed new settlement and the existing village at Longstanton. The buffer is best achieved if it is part of the planning application for the new settlement and is in the form of public open space or playing fields. As such, it becomes manageable and capable of being put into the care of the Parish and Local Education Authority. The need for Green Belt designation would appear superfluous in such circumstances.	The designation of land as a buffer as part of the planning application would not ensure long term protection in the way that Green Belt would, as it is a statutory designation.	No change.
4862	Object	SCDC should consult with CCC, who is one of the biggest landowners in the area, before drawing up the Green Belt boundary. How many of the County's small holdings have been earmarked to be developed? Old and Stripland Farm in Longstanton and March and Mori's in Oakington are surplus to requirements in connection with the Home Farm and Northstowe proposed developments.	The County Council has been consulted.	None needed.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6304 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>It is important to ensure that the purpose of including additional land within the Green Belt is consistent with PPG2 and Cambridge Green Belt and that boundaries endure and are identifiable.</p> <p>Green Belt boundaries should provide comfort on the future extent of Northstowe. The boundaries drawn in Option NS7 and on Map 5 provide the certainty sought in PPG2. They prevent any risk of Northstowe merging with Cottenham, Rampton or Willingham. In particular the Cambridge-St Ives railway line provides an enduring and clearly identifiable boundary consistent with PPG2 and will safeguard the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>The boundaries proposed define a compact development area consistent with Option B and would not prejudice. It is suggested that the inner boundary of the Green Belt be defined in common with the site area shown on Plan 2 for Option B.</p> <p>Gallagher has reservations regarding washing over the areas of green separation with Green Belt designation. The approach in NS7 and south of the B1050 (were Option B to be pursued) is not objected to subject to clarifications.</p>	Noted that this would be the appropriate Green belt boundary if Site B were chosen. However it is recommended that Site B is not chosen.	None needed.

Decision on NS7 Green Belt - Alternative Option

This option is rejected.

Other action proposed:

Extend Green Belt as in NS6 but also include land so that the outer boundary follows the road between Over and Willingham and the road between Over and Longstanton north of the St. Ives railway.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS8 Green Belt - Rejected Option</i>				
4863	Object	SCDC should consult with CCC, who is one of the biggest landowners in the area, before drawing up the Green Belt boundary. How many of the County's small holdings have been earmarked to be developed? Old and Stripland Farm in Longstanton and March and Mori's in Oakington are surplus to requirements in connection with the Home Farm and Northstowe proposed developments.	The County Council has been consulted.	None required
5336 - The Fairfield Partnership	Support	Objections are made to NS8 on the grounds that no attempt has been made to identify a Green Belt boundary to the north of the proposed CGB and the inconsistency of approach when considering of approach when considering Site Option C identified on Map 7.	It is a problem inherent in Site Option C that there are few clear boundaries to follow to determine a Green Belt in this area. Site C is not recommended and therefore this would resolve the problem.	None needed.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4403 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3185 - Longstanton Action Group 2193 - Longstanton Parish Council 3076 - Rampton Parish Council 3752 - GO-East 7282 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 6313 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 2078 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 2978 3369 1549 1296 1601 1617 1442 1323 2260 4947 943 918 1864 1169 2548 5618 884	Support	Supports the rejection of this option which keeps the boundary in its current position. This is because it does not provide adequate separation for villages and protection against the growth of Northstowe outside its defined boundaries.	Support for the Council's rejection of this Option noted.	

Decision on NS8 Green Belt - Rejected Option

This option is rejected.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 6. Town Centre				
<i>NS9 Town Centre: Objectives - Preferred Approach</i>				
1143	Object	<p>I object to Clause 6.5. There is no reason to believe that any of the existing barracks buildings will be incorporated into the centre of Northstowe. There is nothing there of any merit. No site visits have taken place by members.</p> <p>I object also to 6.6 because I do not see why the centre of Northstowe should be very close to Rampton Drift. Instead, I believe it should be some distance to the East of Rampton Drift</p>	<p>In order to be located in a location which meets the Structure Plan requirements for the location of Northstowe and to make the town centre convenient for the approximately 20,000 people that will live in the town, the town centre at Northstowe needs to be relatively central and well connected by internal public transport, cycleways and footpaths with the rest of the town.</p> <p>Clarification could be added that the town centre is likely to be located to the east of Rampton Drift.</p> <p>The existing buildings at Oakington Barracks will lie on the edge of Northstowe and are unlikely to be well located to serve Northstowe as a whole and a location to the east of Rampton Drift is likely to be better placed. Some temporary uses may be appropriate within the present building complex at Oakington Barracks during the very early years of Northstowe's development, but not for the long term and should not inhibit an early start on the development of the town centre.</p>	<p>The policy approach in the Area Action Plan will be to locate the town centre to the east of Rampton Drift.</p>
2637 - East of England Development Agency	Object	<p>The report needs to be more positive about integrating urban design of the town centre with that for the main employment area.</p> <p>The report notes a preference for locating the main employment area immediately adjacent to (adjoining) the southern end of the new town centre. It is important that the planning and design of these two areas is well integrated, otherwise it will be extremely difficult to develop an attractive built environment with a good sense of place.</p>	<p>Agreed. In order to ensure a satisfactory physical relationship between employment and town centre uses the planning and design of these two areas will need to be well integrated.</p>	<p>Ensure that the layout design policies for the town centre the proposed adjoining employment uses provide for a high degree of integration between the two.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3231 - Longstanton Action Group 2194 - Longstanton Parish Council 1611 1297 2272 1414	Object	Clauses 6.5 and 6.6 place the town centre much too close to Longstanton, Rampton Drift, Toad Acre and the conservation area. The character of these parts of our community would be destroyed by putting a major town centre so close to them. The centre must explicitly be away from existing residences and cannot be determined until the site for Northstowe has been decided.	In order to be located in a location which meets the Structure Plan requirements for the location of Northstowe and to make the town centre convenient for the approximately 20,000 people that will live in the town, the town centre at Northstowe needs to be relatively central and well connected by internal public transport, cycleways and footpaths with the rest of the town. Impacts of the town centre and its activities on Longstanton and Oakington villages and presently outlying development will be minimised by locating the town centre within rather than on the edge of Northstowe and similarly by locating the main access roads away from any the properties. As Rampton Drift lies relatively central to the area of search for the site of Northstowe, the statement in paragraph 6.6 is correct - they will have a bearing on the location of the town centre if the objective is indeed to avoid the town centre having an adverse impact on the residents of Rampton Drift. However, clarification could be added that the town centre is likely to be located to the east of Rampton Drift.	Develop a policy from the Preferred Option NS10 by adding a requirement that any adverse impacts of the town centre and its activities on Longstanton and Oakington villages and presently outlying development will be minimised by locating the town centre within rather than on the edge of Northstowe, to the east of Rampton Drift and similarly by locating the main access roads away from any the properties.
4845	Object	Para 6.1 The Structure Plan has for many years allocated the area as a development corridor. The population is already over 33,000 and would rise to over 50,000 with Northstowe. The town centre needs to provide facilities for at least 50,000. It is not clear why the Structure Plan seeks to limit these local facilities because they may be used by other sub-region residents.	The Structure Plan policy is very clear concerning the function and catchment of Northstowe's town centre. The Structure Plan proposes that the "town centre and local facilities will be limited in size to cater for the needs of the settlement and the immediate surrounding area rather than the wider Sub-Region." It is not necessary to consider the merits of a town centre of a size to serve the wider sub-region. However, even serving its immediate catchment, Northstowe could be serving a population of up to 40,000 people - albeit that most of those people will still have service and facilities available in their own villages.	No change in the approach to the size and role of the town centre at Northstowe.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6325 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 3430 - English Partnerships	Object	<p>Agree with most of the objectives of the preferred approach. The exception is the fifth objective in relation to provision of retail floorspace for any individual retail unit. Strongly object to this as such a restriction prevents high quality national food retailer from taking space and investing in town centre thereby undermining role and effectiveness of the town centre.</p> <p>A quality food store of sufficient size and range of offer is needed to stand up to competition from other foodstores within easy travelling distance by car and to act as an anchor trader to provide the catalyst for further investment in the town centre.</p> <p>Without such provision the development and investment in the town centre will be significantly impaired and significant concerns regarding sustainability are raised. Suggest the following revised wording of the fifth bullet:</p> <p>"To ensure that no single store sells such a range of comparison and convenience goods that it would threaten the development of the remainder of the town centre."</p>	<p>The town centre will come to be the defining feature of Northstowe and should have a very important part to play in the social life of people living and working in the town. The format of the town centre will therefore be crucial and a careful balance will need to be struck between planning for successful retail formats and creating an attractive and vibrant centre accommodating a wide range of buildings and uses.</p> <p>In order to ensure that a town centre with a range and variety of buildings is developed rather than a just few large stores which will provide for a poor town centre environment, some form of guidance on store format will be necessary. The greatest 'threat' to this objective will be the large supermarket/hypermarket retailing a wide range of convenience and comparison goods from within a single building. Whilst providing a highly efficient retail format this will provide a poor quality town centre.</p> <p>Early estimates of the retail floorspace which have been produced since the Preferred Options Papers were agreed in summer 2004 suggest that that about 25,000 square metres (250,000 square feet) of total retail floorspace will be needed for the whole town centre (roughly equivalent to the size of St Ives town centre). Limiting maximum store size to just 250 square metres (25,000 square feet) would for example result in a convenience store smaller than Morrison's at Cambourne.</p> <p>The suggestion to limit the range of goods sold in any single store such that it would not threaten trading opportunities for a range of other shops in the town centre is certainly within the spirit of the proposed objectives for the town centre, but may</p>	<p>1. Amend the objective concerning store sizes as recommended by the objector to read:</p> <p>"To ensure that no single store sells such a range of comparison and convenience goods that it would threaten the development of the remainder of the town centre."</p> <p>2. Include a policy in the Northstowe AAP proposing that a Supplementary Planning Document be prepared to provide more detailed guidance on the town centre.</p> <p>3. Amend the Local Development Scheme to include a Supplementary Planning Document for Northstowe town centre.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6636 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	p.31 / Bullet point 5 - no large retail stores to be within the town centre. Presumably this means that there will be no M&S, no John Lewis, no Boots, Dixons, W.H.Smith or any of the large chains or food stores. As the large chains are generally the only ones able to afford the high rents and rates charged by Cambridgeshire, I can't see that the town is going to be very well provided with shops. This means residents travelling out of town to do essential shopping which rather defeats the object of building a self sufficient town.	<p>be problematic to define. Ultimately, any such limitations will need to be incorporated into a suitable planning application condition/Section 106 Agreement and therefore a suitable policy will need to developed from the objective for members to consider at their meeting on 23rd March. In addition, it would be appropriate to carry out further detailed work on the quantity of retail floorspace, retail formats and the physical form of the town centre as a Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The Structure Plan proposes that Northstowe town centre and local facilities be limited in size to cater for the needs of the settlement and the immediate surrounding area rather than the wider sub-region. It is likely that Northstowe town centre will have an amount of shopping floorspace equivalent to St Ives town centre. The national retailers listed in the objection are unlikely to be attracted to such a small town centre. Some of these retailers could operate very satisfactorily from a store of 250 square metres (25,000 square feet). However, it would for example result in a convenience store smaller than Morrison's at Cambourne. Another objector has suggested a limitation the range of goods sold in any single store such that it would not threaten trading opportunities for a range of other shops in the town centre rather than a floorspace limit. This would certainly be within the spirit of the proposed objectives for the town centre, but may be problematic to define. Ultimately, any such limitations will need to be incorporated into a suitable planning application condition/Section 106 Agreement and therefore a suitable policy will need to developed from the objective for members to consider at their meeting on 23rd March.</p>	Amend the objective concerning store sizes as recommended by the objector to read: "To ensure that no single store sells such a range of comparison and convenience goods that it would threaten the development of the remainder of the town centre."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1527 919	Support	General support the objectives, but concerned that the planning and legal authorities will lack the power to enforce them	Support noted. The planning objectives for the town centre are admittedly ambitious. Much of the future success of Northstowe as a place will depend upon the service and facilities that are available in the town centre. Certain of the objectives are within the direct control of the District Council e.g. design and accessibility. Encouraging other public service providers who share the Council objectives to provide their services in the town centre. The greatest challenge will be in encouraging the private sector to provide commercial services and facilities. Maximising and varying custom is likely to have the greatest impact on the attractiveness of Northstowe's town centre to investors, retailers and other service providers. The plan can help by locating the town's main employment area close to the town centre. Making certain of the town centres key facilities 'trigger points' which are tied to the occupation of houses will help (if help is needed) to encourage the developers of Northstowe attract commercial uses into the town centre.	Investigate which of the town centres key facilities 'trigger points' should be tied to the occupation of houses to encourage the developers of Northstowe attract commercial uses into the town centre.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1945 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	The objectives set out for town centres (NS9), the local centres (NS13) and local employment (NS21), while acceptable in themselves, will only achieve the planned objectives if they are available early in the development. Early representation is implied by NS117 (Timing/Order of service provision) but this has signally failed to work in other local developments. (Cottenham Tenison Manor/Cambourne) In no small part due to the unwillingness or inability of the Planning Authority to force developers to meet their obligations under S106 Agreements.	This representation is principally concerned with the timely delivery of services and infrastructure at Northstowe. Cambridgeshire Horizons (formerly the Cambridge Sub-Region Infrastructure Partnership) has an important role in co-ordinating the service and infrastructure planning of all of the agencies which will be involved in the development of Northstowe. Most of those service and infrastructure providers are already planning for the provision of their services and such organisations as the Local Strategic Partnership have reinforced the need for early participation. On the developer perspective, much of the services and facilities to be provided at Northstowe will be funded from the development. The District Council and its partners have learnt lessons from all the developments that it has permitted, including at Cottenham and at Cambourne. Particular lesson from Cambourne which has already been applied at Arbury (north Cambridge) is to improve the conditions/agreements relating to the delivery of services and infrastructure by key stages in the development (e.g. 2 trigger points for each services both tied to occupation of dwellings - the first being the approval of plans and the second being the availability of the service).	Continue to explore with Cambridgeshire Horizons, service and infrastructure providers and the developers (once a site has been agreed) how early and guaranteed delivery of services and facilities can be secured.
2981	Support	Support this. However, in order to create a vibrant town centre which is located at the heart of Northstowe, it is essential that the railway line (mis-guided bus) is central to it and not at one side. One does not have to look far to see how badly a town works when the main railway line is not in the centre.	It is not intended that Northstowe town centre will be well connected to a wide catchment area which would require access by a railway station. Indeed, the Structure Plan specifically proposes that Northstowe will have a "town centre and local facilities limited in size to cater for the needs of the settlement and the immediate surrounding area rather than the wider Sub-Region." The proposed guided bus will provide good access from a relatively limited catchment area and will be consistent with the Structure Plan policy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3815 - English Heritage	Support	We welcome bullet point 3 stating that the town centre will serve the needs of Northstowe and the surrounding area, and will not undermine neighbouring centres.	Support noted.	
4404 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the town centre objectives for Northstowe.	Support noted.	
4342	Support	Support the principle of a town centre of Northstowe being attractive to residents of Longstanton, and welcome footpath, cycleway and vehicular links to it.	Support noted.	

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD*****Decision on NS9 Town Centre: Objectives - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Amend 5th bullet to read "To ensure that no single store [within the town centre provides more than 10% of the total retail floorspace or] sells such a range of comparison and convenience goods that it would threaten the development of the remainder of the town centre." [Deleted text]

Other actions proposed:

Investigate which of the town centres key facilities 'trigger points' should be tied to the occupation of houses to encourage the developers of Northstowe attract commercial uses into the town centre.

Continue to explore with Cambridgeshire Horizons, service and infrastructure providers and the developers (once a site has been agreed) how early and guaranteed delivery of services and facilities can be secured.

Develop a policy from the Preferred Option NS10 by adding a requirement that any adverse impacts of the town centre and its activities on Longstanton and Oakington villages and presently outlying development will be minimised by locating the town centre within rather than on the edge of Northstowe, to the east of Rampton Drift and similarly.

Ensure that the layout design policies for the town centre and the proposed adjoining employment uses provide for a high degree of integration between the two by locating the main access roads away from any properties.

Include a policy in the Northstowe AAP proposing that a Supplementary Planning Document be prepared to provide more detailed guidance on the town centre. Amend the Local Development Scheme to include a Supplementary Planning Document for Northstowe town centre.

No change in the approach to the size and role of the town centre at Northstowe.

The policy approach in the Area Action Plan will be to locate the town centre to the east of Rampton Drift.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS10 Town Centre: Location - Preferred Approach</i>				
1018	Object	The Town Centre should take into account the land to be used North of the railway - this is not a Motorway so surely viable crossing can be provided - and move away (North) from Longstanton.	If Option C is chosen as the site for Northstowe, the town centre would be better located between Rampton Drift and the edge of the Guided Busway edge of the new town to serve the majority of the new town residents.	
1145	Object	Further to my earlier comment, the route of the local transport loop should be modified to travel through the town centre, rather than the other way round!	The County Council has secured funding and is in the process of delivering an express Guided Busway using the disused St Ives railway line. The St Ives railway line alignment has now been scrutinised at a Transport and Works Order Inquiry which did not consider any other route alignments. The proposed service which will operate on the disused St Ives railway line will be a high speed service with few stops and surface crossings in order to offer a speed of service which will be attractive to users. Between St Ives and Cambridge there will be just 4 stops. The County Council advises that it would make the service unattractive to users from villages and towns along the remainder of the route to run the service at slower speeds through parts of Northstowe. Unlike the Expressway, the route of the local transport can be varied through the new town such that it best serves the local centres and the town centre.	
1733 1732 1326	Object		The town centre needs to be located where it can best serve the inhabitants of the new town and at the same time minimise any impacts on existing communities. The best such location will not be on the outer edge of Northstowe but will be found by a combination of geography, routing of the local transport loop and avoidance of existing homes (including by having intervening non-town centre development).	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2079 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	While welcoming the provision of facilities currently unavailable in Longstanton (in the 2004 Parish Plan Survey many residents were keen for Northstowe shopping facilities to be sited near to Longstanton) LPPC object to locating shops due south east of Longstanton at the Oakington barracks site. Walking/cycling access to Northstowe centre must be available for the largest number of our residents - only 0.4% asked for direct motor access to Northstowe; "rat running"/access traffic problems is one of the biggest concern over Northstowe, held by the overwhelming majority. LPPC object to options making walking/cycling to Northstowe less feasible.	There is evidently a conflict in the aspirations of Longstanton residents for access to the services and facilities of the town centre. All other representations have been concerned that the town centre be located well within Northstowe and away from existing residents preferring to have the activity associated with a town centre at some distance rather than having its services and facilities nearby.	
3431 - English Partnerships	Object	The precise form location and design of the Town Centre should be determined through the strategic masterplan process.	Agreed. The AAP will however set the criteria for selecting a location which will then be identified with precision through the strategic masterplan process.	
2277	Object	I object to this site; I fear it is geographically preparing the ground for turning Longstanton into a natural enclave of Northstowe in a loop.	This appears to be an objection to Northstowe site Option B which members are advised elsewhere in the report not to pursue for reasons which include its relationship with Longstanton village.	
5337 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to NS10 on the grounds that by stating the preferred approach to the location of the town centre on the dedicate public transport loop excludes alternative locations that better achieve the objectives in NS9 when including the land to the north of the disused railway line within the settlements boundaries.	If Option C is chosen it would still be possible to locate the town centre on the local transport loop, quite simply the alignment of the loop would be configured differently as would the location of stops. It may, however, not provide for the most convenient access for the majority of the towns residents as it would be likely to be located between Rampton Drift and the edge of the town bounded by the Express Guideway.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3240 - Longstanton Action Group 2195 - Longstanton Parish Council 5109 - Toad Acres Park Home Residents Association 3355 3050 2945 2355 3376 2148 2144 1525 1366 1358 1298 1258 1244 1618 1749 1443 944 920 1980 1979 1170 1098 1533 1415 1121 2560 1144 1264 1105	Object	Object to the Town Centre being located close to existing housing at Rampton Drift, Toads Acre and Longstanton; upon which its' effect will be detrimental.	In order to be located in a location which meets the Structure Plan requirements for the location of Northstowe and to make the town centre convenient for the approximately 20,000 people that will live in the town, the town centre at Northstowe needs to be relatively central and well connected by internal public transport, cycleways and footpaths with the rest of the town. Impacts of the town centre and its activities on Longstanton and Oakington villages and presently outlying development will be minimised by locating the town centre within rather than on the edge of Northstowe and similarly by locating the main access roads away from any the properties. As Rampton Drift lies relatively central to the area of search for the site of Northstowe, it will have a bearing on the location of the town centre if the objective is to avoid the town centre having an adverse impact on the residents of Rampton Drift. Clarification could be added that the town centre is likely to be located to the east of Rampton Drift and dependent upon which option is chosen will depend the degree to which it is possible to separate Rampton Drift from the town centre by residential or other development.	Provide clarification that the town centre is likely to be located to the east of Rampton Drift and dependent upon which option is chosen will depend the degree to which it is possible to separate Rampton Drift from the town centre by residential or other development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4849	Object	Map 7 provides evidence that the new town is no longer confined within the Oakington Barracks and Airfield. How can the Authorities decide where is appropriate to have the town centre, when the town is expanding in all directions? The proposed public transport would not be convenient to serve the town centre and would be required to be more flexible, and other infrastructure is needed if the town is to function as a town to provide for the needs of local people.	This point is dealt with under option NS10. The option is sufficiently general to accommodate any of the site options. If option B or C is chosen as the site for Northstowe, the most accessible location and therefore the principle area of search for the town centre is likely to lie in the narrow area of land between Rampton Drift and the disused St Ives railway line. The flood plain along the Beck Brook prohibits a location further east.	
6503 - English Partnerships	Object	Para 6.12 The residents of Oakington & Longstanton should be given every opportunity to access town centre facilities in a sustainable way through extensive cycle and footpath networks with the provision of facilities in the Town Centre to encourage these forms of movement.	Agreed, this is reflected in paragraph 6.12.	
3738 - GO-East	Support	In keeping with our earlier representation regarding our preferred site option B, NS2 and in line with the suggestion set out in the Initial Sustainability Report that planning for an enlarged settlement should begin from the outset, we would trust that the "geographical town centre" would be varied in relation to the chosen option in order to maximise accessibility for the town's residents as set out in NS10: Town centre location.	If option is chosen as the site for Northstowe, the most accessible location and therefore the principle area of search for the town centre is likely to lie in the narrow area of land between Rampton Drift and the disused St Ives railway line.	
4948	Support	The principle set out is supported but only if it is some way north and east of Rampton Drift and to lessen any impact of goods traffic on Rampton Drift, Toad Acres, and the Conservation Area of St Michaels.	Support noted. However, if option B or C is chosen as the site for Northstowe, the most accessible location and therefore the principle area of search for the town centre is likely to lie in the narrow area of land between Rampton Drift and the disused St Ives railway line. The flood plain along the Beck Brook prohibits a location further east.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4405 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the location of the town centre. It also notes that if site option C was chosen a geographically central location would not be as practical as for site option A or B.	Support noted. However, if option B or C is chosen as the site for Northstowe, the most accessible location and therefore the principle area of search for the town centre is likely to lie in the narrow area of land between Rampton Drift and the disused St Ives railway line.	
6237 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	As phrased, NS10 is supported. The detailed location of the town centre will be identified through further guidance and/or a planning application for Northstowe. In defining the location it is important to note that the town centre will embrace a number of land uses. In addition to the provision made for retail uses, there will be significant opportunities for residential development and employment uses plus facilities for recreation, leisure and community uses. As such there is significant flexibility within which more detailed master planning work will be able to address the relationship with Rampton Drift and Toads Acre for instance.	Support noted. Much of the remainder of the representation concerns how the town centre in whatever location is chosen will relate to existing development.	

Decision on NS10 Town Centre: Location - Preferred Approach

Provide clarity that the town centre is likely to be located to the east of Rampton and dependent upon the site option which is chosen will depend that degree to which it is possible to separate Rampton Drift from the centre by residential or other development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS11 Town Centre: Form - Preferred Option</i>				
3432 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships believes both these options are premature at this stage and a flexible policy position should be taken with the Town Centre form and function determined through the strategic masterplan process as part of an integrated structure with the whole development.	It is important to establish the general character of the settlement at an early stage. If a linear market town high street style is the most appropriate option, this must be determined early in the development process, in order to be a central principle in the design process.	
4850	Object	Map 7 provides evidence that the new town is no longer confined within the Oakington Barracks and Airfield. How can the Authorities decide where is appropriate to have the town centre, when the town is expanding in all directions? The proposed public transport would not be convenient to serve the the town centre and would be required to be more flexible, and other infrastructure is needed if the town is to function as a town to provide for the needs of local people.	This point is dealt with under option NS10. The option is sufficiently general to accommodate any of the site options. If option B or C is chosen as the site for Northstowe, the most accessible location and therefore the principle area of search for the town centre is likely to lie in the narrow area of land between Rampton Drift and the disused St Ives railway line. The flood plain along the Beck Brook prohibits a location further east.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6247 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher disagrees with the Council's approach to promoting the form of the town centre within the AAP (either in a linear or concentrated form) as the work to inform the best approach has yet to be completed. The suggested approach is not therefore justified.</p> <p>It is not appropriate at this stage to fix the form of the town centre. The best form (to address both urban design and commercial objectives) has yet to be fully resolved. The form of the town centre and design objectives should be addressed in due course in more detailed guidance for the town centre.</p> <p>Although a complementary relationship between town centre and secondary school should be developed, a location for the secondary school within the town centre is likely to be incompatible with the other objectives for the town centre (including high density residential and employment). Reference to such a possibility should be deleted.</p>	<p>It is important to establish the general character of the settlement at an early stage. If a linear market town high street style is the most appropriate option, this must be determined early in the development process, in order to be a central principle in the design process.</p> <p>With regard to locating the secondary school in the town centre. It is agreed that it may not be appropriate to provide it at the town centre, but it must instead be located at a local centre, providing an opportunity for additional services at that local centre reflecting the role of the secondary school.</p>	Develop policy that requires secondary school to be located at a local centre, providing an opportunity for additional services at that local centre reflecting the role of the secondary school.
4406 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2080 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 4949 1089 1756	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS11 Town Centre: Form - Preferred Option

Develop the preferred option into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Develop policy that requires secondary school to be located at a local centre, providing an opportunity for additional services at that local centre reflecting the role of the secondary school.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS12 Town Centre: Form - Alternative Option</i>				
3433 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships believes both these options are premature at this stage and a flexible policy position should be taken with the Town Centre form and function determined through the strategic masterplan process as part of an integrated structure with the whole development.	It is important to establish the general character of the settlement at an early stage. If a linear market town high street style is the most appropriate option, this must be determined early in the development process, in order to be a central principle in the design process.	
4851	Object	Map 7 provides evidence that the new town is no longer confined within the Oakington Barracks and Airfield. How can the Authorities decide where is appropriate to have the town centre, when the town is expanding in all directions? The proposed public transport would not be convenient to serve the the town centre and would be required to be more flexible, and other infrastructure is needed if the town is to function as a town to provide for the needs of local people.	This point is dealt with under option NS10. The option is sufficiently general to accommodate any of the site options. If option B or C is chosen as the site for Northstowe, the most accessible location and therefore the principle area of search for the town centre is likely to lie in the narrow area of land between Rampton Drift and the disused St Ives railway line. The flood plain along the Beck Brook prohibits a location further east.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6252 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher disagrees with the Council's approach to promoting the form of the town centre within the AAP (either in a linear or concentrated form) as the work to inform the best approach has yet to be completed. The suggested approach is not therefore justified.</p> <p>It is not appropriate at this stage to fix the form of the town centre. The best form (to address both urban design and commercial objectives) has yet to be fully resolved. The form of the town centre and design objectives should be addressed in due course in more detailed guidance for the town centre.</p> <p>Although a complementary relationship between town centre and secondary school should be developed, a location for the secondary school within the town centre is likely to be incompatible with the other objectives for the town centre (including high density residential and employment). Reference to such a possibility should be deleted.</p>	<p>It is important to establish the general character of the settlement at an early stage. If a linear market town high street style is the most appropriate option, this must be determined early in the development process, in order to be a central principle in the design process. With regard to locating the secondary school in the town centre. It is agreed that it may not be appropriate to provide it at the town centre, but it must instead be located at a local centre, providing an opportunity for additional services at that local centre reflecting the role of the secondary school.</p>	<p>Develop policy that requires secondary school to be located at a local centre, providing an opportunity for additional services at that local centre reflecting the role of the secondary school.</p>
4407 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>A more concentrated pattern of development may be more effective in enabling trips. The County Council considers that the alternative option has at least equal advantages in terms of the form of the town centre.</p>	<p>It is important to establish the general character of the settlement at an early stage. A linear market town high street style is the most appropriate option, and must be determined early in the development process, in order to be a central principle in the design process.</p>	

Decision on NS12 Town Centre: Form - Alternative Option

This option is rejected.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 7. Local Centres				
<i>NS13 Local Centres: Objectives - Preferred Approach</i>				
3739 - GO-East	Object	The submission DPD should provide more clarity and certainty about when a decision will be made about the number and location of local centres. It is particularly pressing to provide details in relation to development of the two local centres identified as the points at which development of the settlement will begin. This applies equally to community, recreational and other facilities referred to elsewhere in the AAP.	Agreed. Once Council has made a decision on the preferred site and the ultimate size of Northstowe it will be able to determine the number of local centres. The location of local centres will be determined at a later stage as part of the detailed masterplanning. However, the Northstowe Area Action Plan will provide the locational criteria to be applied by the masterplanners in determining where local centres will be located (see bullet points 3 and 4 - located on dedicated public transport route and ensure that all residents are within 400 metres walk of local or town centre).	Decide number of local centres once location and size of Northstowe has been determined by the Council. Incorporate the number of local centres and the criteria for their location in a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan to be presented to Council on 23rd March.
4336	Object	We welcome the local centre approach within the AAP but consider that these facilities should also be located such that they are convenient for residents of Longstanton. Careful planning needs to be undertaken to ensure they have access to those facilities.	Northstowe's local centres must be placed in the best location to serve the future residents of the town. Longstanton itself is likely to have a similar range of services and facilities to be found in the local centres in Northstowe and therefore access to the local centres may not be crucial. Nevertheless, that need not preclude providing accessibility from Longstanton and Oakington, albeit that there will be limited access by car to Northstowe from its neighbouring villages.	Ensure that the masterplanning guidelines include providing adequate accessibility to Northstowe from nearby villages without encouraging increased car traffic using local village roads.
4838	Object	The Authorities need to establish how large Northstowe will be allowed to grow, what role it will play in connection to the sub-region and what role it provide to meet the needs of people that would live and work in the area before this can be considered.	Agreed. Council will determine the ultimate size and role of Northstowe during the preparation and submission stage of the Area Action Plan to be completed by June 2005.	Determine the size and role of Northstowe when considering representations on Options NS1, NS2 & NS3 (size), NS9 (town centre), NS9 (employment) and NS25 (community services, facilities, leisure, art and culture).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6619 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6253 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	There appears to be a conflict with the preferred approach to public transport which suggests that all development will be within 600m of a stop on the Local Bus Loop (NS34).	Noted. Whilst locating local centres (and public transport stops) at an average spacing of 800 metres will ensure that the vast majority of Northstowe's future residents will be within 400 metres of a local centre or the town centre, the preferred approach to public transport (NS34) takes account of the ability of a single high quality public transport route through Northstowe to serve the entirety of the town's population.	Amend the objective which will be included in the Area Action Plan to ensure that all of Northstowe's future residents are within 600 metres of a local centre which will be located at 800 metres spacings along the main public transport spine. When read with the policy objective for higher densities around the town centre, local centres and public transport stops, this will ensure that almost all of the future residents of Northstowe will actually be within 400 metres of a local centre or the town centre.
6623 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The fourth bullet would benefit from clarification. While the local centres could include local shops, it is not envisaged that all the day to day needs of residents could be met within the local centres. This would detract from the town centre.	The objective does not state that ALL day to day needs for convenience shopping and services will be met in local centres. As a compact new town with a proposed high quality public transport route travelling the length of the town travel to other local centres within Northstowe or the town centre should be easy and convenient.	Amend the fourth bullet point to read: "To ensure that local centres collectively located along a public transport spine together with the town centre provide for all the day to day needs of local residents for convenience shopping and service provision."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1946 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Please refer to comments made under NS9 Town Centres.	This representation is principally concerned with the timely delivery of services and infrastructure at Northstowe. Cambridgeshire Horizons (formerly the Cambridge Sub-Region Infrastructure Partnership) has an important role in co-ordinating the service and infrastructure planning of all of the agencies which will be involved in the development of Northstowe. Most of those service and infrastructure providers are already planning for the provision of their services and such organisations as the Local Strategic Partnership have reinforced the need for early participation. On the developer perspective, much of the services and facilities to be provided at Northstowe will be funded from the development. The District Council and its partners have learnt lessons from all the developments that it has permitted, including at Cottenham and at Cambourne. Particular lesson from Cambourne which has already been applied at Arbury (north Cambridge) is to improve the conditions/agreements relating to the delivery of services and infrastructure by key stages in the development (e.g. 2 trigger points for each services both tied to occupation of dwellings - the first being the approval of plans and the second being the availability of the service).	Continue to explore with Cambridgeshire Horizons, service and infrastructure providers and the developers (once a site has been agreed) how early and guaranteed delivery of services and facilities can be secured.
4408 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3434 - English Partnerships	Support	Support the preferred approach to local centres in Northstowe	Support noted.	

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD*****Decision on NS13 Local Centres: Objectives - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Amend the objective (3rd bullet) which will be included in the Area Action Plan to ensure that all of Northstowe's future residents are within 600 metres of a local centre which will be located at 800 metres spacings along the main public transport spine. When read with the policy objective for higher densities around the town centre, local centres and public transport stops, this will ensure that almost all of the future residents of Northstowe will actually be within 400 metres of a local centre or the town centre.

Amend the fourth bullet point to read: "To ensure that local centres COLLECTIVELY LOCATED ALONG A PUBLIC TRANSPORT SPINE TOGETHER WITH THE TOWN CENTRE provide for all the day to day needs of local residents for convenience shopping and service provision."

Other actions proposed:

Continue to explore with Cambridgeshire Horizons, service and infrastructure providers and the developers (once a site has been agreed) how early and guaranteed delivery of services and facilities can be secured.

Decide number of local centres once location and size of Northstowe has been determined by the Council. Incorporate the number of local centres and the criteria for their location in a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan to be presented to Council on 23rd March.

Ensure that the masterplanning guidelines include providing adequate accessibility to Northstowe from nearby villages without encouraging increased car traffic using local village roads.

Determine the size and role of Northstowe when considering representations on Options NS1, NS2 & NS3 (size, NS9 (town centre), NS9 (employment) and NS25 (community services, facilities, leisure, art and culture).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS14 Local Centres: Employment - Preferred Approach</i>				
1873	Object	cloud cuckoo land again - the people who live here will inevitably work in Cambridge or the existing city edge high tech centres. This will drive both their salaries, and the prices of houses they will buy or rent.	Not everyone living in Northstowe will work in Cambridge or the existing city edge high tech centres. Providing employment opportunities in Northstowe will provide the opportunity for some people to live and work in the town. There is no reason to believe that aspiration for local centres to provide 'small scale local employment' for example by providing the very local employment which is being provided in numerous barn conversions around the district.	Include policies in the Northstowe Area Action Plan for the development of small scale local employment uses at local centres.
4839	Object	The Authorities need to establish how large Northstowe will be allowed to grow, what role it will play in connection to the sub-region and what role it provide to meet the needs of people that would live and work in the area before this can be considered.	Agreed. Council will determine the ultimate size and role of Northstowe during the preparation and submission stage of the Area Action Plan to be completed by June 2005.	Determine the size and role of Northstowe when considering representations on Options NS1, NS2 & NS3 (size, NS9 (town centre), NS9 (employment)and NS25 (community services, facilities, leisure, art and culture).
6254 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher supports the preferred approach described in NS14. Nevertheless in framing detailed policies for submission, the content of NS14 is considered superfluous and is appropriately addressed in NS13.	NS14 clarifies the nature of employment that it is proposed will be provided at local centres.	Include policies in the Northstowe Area Action Plan for the development of small scale local employment uses at local centres.
4409 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports local centres acting as a focus for small scale local employment uses. This would be complementary to the proposed approach to main employment areas of NS22 and NS23.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS14 Local Centres: Employment - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred option into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Other actions proposed:

Determine the size and role of Northstowe when considering representations on Options NS1, NS2 & NS3 (size), NS9 (town centre), NS9 (employment) and NS25 (community services, facilities, leisure, art and culture).

Include policies in the Northstowe Area Action Plan for the development of small scale local employment uses at local centres.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 8. Housing				
<i>NS15 Housing Objectives - Preferred Approach</i>				
3174	Object	There are however optimistic elements in this option: the developers will start with the cheaper housing to secure sales; there is no guarantee that the economy will be that good to guarantee the expansion, re-employment and house purchase and consequently the delivery of the promised amenities. A few thousand houses with few amenities, congested accesses and no money to maintain the site. Is this the reason why the infrastructure is so piecemeal for this project, because no one really knows whether it will be worth spending too much on it? Are we witnessing something of a 'wait and see' experiment?	The development of Northstowe is proposed as a key part of the development strategy to meet projected housing needs in the Cambridge area. This has regard to predicted demographic changes in the area as well as in-migration as part of the economic success of the area. The phasing of the development will be crucial to ensure that adequate and appropriate infrastructure and supporting services and facilities are brought forward in parallel with housing and employment development and the Area Action Plan will include policies requiring this to be secured as part of any planning permission.	
3548 - Stannifer	Object	The build rate of 650 dwellings/annum will not be achieved at Northstowe, and delays in commencing of the development are likely.	The Council is endeavouring to plan for Northstowe in order to allow for a start on site in 2006. The targets must remain in place in order to reflect requirements of the Structure Plan. As achieving the required building rate is a material planning consideration, it is correct that the Council requires information on how it will be met at the planning application stage. The method statement will require monitoring. Where development falls short of the target, developers will be required to demonstrate why they cannot meet the target, and how the shortfall will be made up in later years.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4665 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	We consider that the proposed Northstowe AAP is not sound in the context of PPS12 para 4.24 (ix) because the plan is not sufficiently flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances, and in particular the likely shortfall in new housing that will arise at Northstowe.	The Structure Plan targets would have taken account of variations in market demand when developing the housing numbers requirement. Achieving the required building rate is a material planning consideration, therefore it is correct that the Council requires information on how it will be met at the planning application stage. The method statement on achieving the required rate will require monitoring. Where development falls short of the target, developers will be required to demonstrate why they cannot meet the target, and how the shortfall will be made up in later years.	
1870	Support	What do you mean by affordable - in plain English, nothing in Cambridge, its surrounding villages and towns is affordable to people wanting to get on the property ladder, and this statement applies far more widely than to publicised key groups alone. House prices in this new town will be far out of reach (a.k.a. current developments in local villages), and there will still be plenty of buyers for them.	Support noted. The three types of housing encompassed by the term Affordable Housing are set out at paragraph 8.9 of the Preferred Options Report, i.e. low cost market housing (such as shared equity), social rented housing and supported housing. These will be available to any household that meets the eligibility criteria for affordable housing. This has regard to income in relation to house prices for suitable accommodation for that household. The Core Strategy will define Affordable Housing for use District wide, including in all the Area Action Plans. This definition will be included in the Glossary of the Northstowe AAP.	
2130	Support	The objectives and vision are supported on the basis that they create a balanced and affordable new settlement.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3435 - English Partnerships 2283	Support	Support the principle of an adequate and continuous supply of housing to meet strategic requirements for the provision of 6000 dwellings by 2016. English Partnerships also requests that the Local Authority plans infrastructure as part of the strategic masterplanning process to meet Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan objectives for a development between 8000-10,000 dwellings beyond 2016.	Support noted. The Area Action Plan will plan for the overall needs of the town, including development beyond 2016.	
4410 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the objectives for housing within Northstowe, (which is in conformity with P5/3 and P9/3 of the adopted Structure Plan). However, specific reference should be made to key worker housing at part of the locally identified housing need (reference to key worker housing is made in the 3rd bullet point of P9/3 of the adopted Structure Plan). Amendment to NS15, 3rd bullet point - To ensure the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable housing and key worker housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community.	Support noted. The term Affordable Housing includes housing for key workers and it is therefore not necessary to list it separately. However, for clarity and consistency with the Structure Plan, it will be referred to specifically in the objectives, whilst making clear that it is not a separate form of housing.	Amend NS15, 3rd bullet point: - To ensure the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community, INCLUDING KEY WORKERS.

Decision on NS15 Housing Objectives - Preferred Approach

Amend NS 15, 3rd bullet point to read: "- To ensure the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable housing, to meet the identified needs of all sector of the community, INCLUDING KEY WORKERS."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS16 Housing Density - Preferred Option</i>				
7301	Object	The success of the Cambridge economy is based on hi-tech industry which requires a highly qualified work force. This workforce will not want high density housing nor use the guided bus link.	Higher residential densities are not incompatible with high quality design and it is likely that an appropriate solution will include apartments and town houses, potentially up to 3-4 storeys in the town centre, which is consistent with existing Cambridgeshire market towns. The Area Action Plan will require provision of high quality open spaces in Northstowe which will be important for landscape and amenity as well as recreation. Higher density development will not be at the cost of providing adequate open space.	
1368	Object	Higher density housing would only be desirable if it was achieved by quality high rise and attractive town house design allowing more room for open spaces within the town.	Higher residential densities are not incompatible with high quality design and it is likely that an appropriate solution will include apartments and town houses, potentially up to 3-4 storeys in the town centre, which is consistent with existing Cambridgeshire market towns. The Area Action Plan will require provision of high quality open spaces in Northstowe which will be important for landscape and amenity as well as recreation. Higher density development will not be at the cost of providing adequate open space.	
1481	Object	I strongly object to housing densities above an average 40 dwellings per hectare.	Structure Plan Policy P5/3 states that in planned new communities densities "significantly higher" than 40 dph will be sought. Preferred Option NS16 is therefore consistent with the Structure Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2081 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to paragraph 8.3 option NS16 because in the Parish Plan Survey, while 36% of those who responded would like more affordable housing in the village of Longstanton, thought is given about the impact on the Longstanton community of the social environment generated by cheaper housing and high density in the shape of 'high rise buildings' in Northstowe. If in clusters throughout Northstowe this concern is justified.	A key part of the vision for Northstowe is for it to combine the "best of modern and innovative urban design with the best traditions of a fen edge Cambridgeshire market town". Also that housing will be "well designed" and of "high quality". There may be some taller residential buildings in Northstowe, particularly in the form of apartments in the town centre, potentially up to 3-4 storeys which is consistent with existing Cambridgeshire market towns. There may be opportunities for landmark buildings to rise above this general level in order to reinforce the identify of the town, including contributing to an interesting skyline in the landscape. The effect of taller buildings both individually and cumulatively will be a key part of the masterplanning process.	
5338 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to NS16 on the grounds that average densities some way above 40 dph across the settlement undermine the preferred approach for the vision of the new settlement set out in NS4 and compromise the high quality of housing sought. The fact that the Council is seeking these densities highlights that the size of the site is too small and land from north of the railway line needs to be included in the site.	Higher densities should not have an adverse effect on quality and are not considered to be in conflict with the vision for the town. Higher densities are consistent with the Structure Plan. The density Preferred Option is not influenced by the choice of site and is considered appropriate for the development of Northstowe, whatever site is chosen.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6255 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher supports the intention to secure average densities of 40 dwellings per hectare in the new town,</p> <p>Gallagher does not consider that the approach set out reflects Structure Plan advice.</p> <p>Prescribing an average density target for Northstowe that is significantly higher than 40 dwellings per hectare at the outset in the AAP, is too prescriptive and would conflict with Structure Plan guidance which seeks densities in excess of 40 dwellings per hectare only in town centres and locations particularly well served by public transport within planned communities and not across the new communities as a whole. Density issues should be addressed through the application process and through more detailed design guidance. NS16 is therefore opposed.</p>	<p>A policy based on the Preferred Option could be drafted to aim for an average density above 40 dph to act as an aspirational target subject to a design-led approach, with a minimum requirement of 40 dph average density across the development. This would not be prescriptive, but would be more likely to achieve the Structure Plan target. Gallagher's interpretation of the Structure Plan policy is not accepted. The Structure Plan policy P5/3 says that "in appropriate locations in or close to the centres of cities and Market Towns and in planned new communities, and in locations with access to high quality public transport services, significantly higher densities should be sought." It therefore seeks higher densities in new communities as a whole. It does not talk about specific locations within new communities as suggested in the representation. The detailed determination of densities will be a matter for the masterplanning and planning application processes, however, it is a key development principle for this new settlement which is appropriately addressed through a policy in the Area Action Plan.</p>	
3740 - GO-East	Support	<p>NS16 & 17: Housing Density</p> <p>Whilst GO East broadly agrees with the approach set out in NS16: Housing Density, we take the view that a prescriptive limit should not be built into any policy at this stage but the approach should be a design-led one, which seeks to make the most efficient and effective use of land across the development.</p>	<p>Support noted. The intention of NS16 would be to include a target figure higher than 40 dph. This would be in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P5/3, which seeks "significantly higher densities" than 40 dph in planned new communities. Further work would be required to identify an appropriate figure. This would not be a ceiling on density levels and this would be made clear in a policy. It is agreed that the approach to the development of Northstowe should be design-led but this must be in the context of higher densities than have been typical in South Cambs and a density policy is a key part of achieving that objective.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4411 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Whilst the preferred option appears to have a greater chance of achieving the Structure Plan targets in regard to housing density, it is not clear how different the two approaches would be in practice.	Support noted. The main difference between the Preferred Option and the Alternative Option is that the Preferred Option has potential to secure residential densities notably higher than an average of 40 dph across the new town, consistent with Structure Plan policy P5/3, whilst the Alternative Option is less challenging and may see only a 40 dph average achieved.	

Decision on NS16 Housing Density - Preferred Option

There is little support for Option NS16 which would require a specific average housing density target which would be higher than 40 dph.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS17 Housing Density - Alternative Option</i>				
1146	Object	This should read: "The housing density will be an average of at least 40..."	Agreed that the option intends that the AVERAGE density across the town would be 40 dph. There is no need to amend the option, but this would be taken into account in drafting any policy in the Area Action Plan.	
1482	Object	I strongly object to housing densities above an average 40 dwellings per hectare.	Structure Plan Policy P5/3 states that in planned new communities densities "significantly higher" than 40 dph will be sought. Preferred Option NS17 would therefore be consistent with the Structure Plan only if the average density were above 40 dph. This is allowed for in the option but is not a requirement of it.	
2290	Object	High density of above 40 dwellings per hectare, near bus stops and a few primary schools, to quickly provide cheap housing for the Sub-Region is all very well but it spells big trouble if these are built before shops, amenities and employment in place. Young families won't stay at home in a little flat in the middle of nowhere every evening... On what kind of social environment is Northstowe going to build its regional reputation, I wonder. It does not sound promising for Longstanton.	The phasing of the development will be crucial to ensure that adequate and appropriate infrastructure and supporting services and facilities are brought forward in parallel with housing and employment development and the Area Action Plan will include policies requiring this to be secured as part of any planning permission.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3741 - GO-East	Object	<p>NS16 & 17: Housing Density</p> <p>Whilst GO East broadly agrees with the approach set out in NS16: Housing Density, we take the view that a prescriptive limit should not be built into any policy at this stage but the approach should be a design-led one, which seeks to make the most efficient and effective use of land across the development.</p>	<p>Support noted. The intention of NS16 would be to include a target figure higher than 40 dph. This would be in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P5/3, which seeks "significantly higher densities" than 40 dph in planned new communities. Further work would be required to identify an appropriate figure. This would not be a ceiling on density levels and this would be made clear in a policy. It is agreed that the approach to the development of Northstowe should be design-led but this must be in the context of higher densities than have been typical in South Cambs and a density policy is a key part of achieving that objective.</p>	
5339 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	<p>Object to NS17 as setting a minimum density requirement is too prescriptive.</p>	<p>Setting out in policy a minimum average density across the whole of the town is necessary both to ensure the best use of land, but also to ensure that the town yields the dwellings required of it by the Structure Plan. Site area and density are closely intertwined and both are relevant policy requirements. The minimum density proposed remains below the aspirations of the Structure Plan for "planned new communities" to achieve "significantly higher densities" than 40 dph.</p>	
4412 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>The County Council agrees that this option gives less certainty that the new town would make the most effective use of land and provide for sustainable patterns of living.</p>	<p>The County Council's view is noted.</p>	
4941	Support	<p>There is no consistency of approach, and I believe that the density should be maintained at an average of 40dph.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6256 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	NS17 is supported. The wording appears consistent with Policy 5/3 and in particular with the explanation offered in paragraph 5.13 of the Structure Plan. This will deliver the higher densities sought in the Structure Plan. Gallagher does not understand how the approach taken in NS17 would not provide the certainty that the Structure Plan policy would not be met, particularly coupled with the control provided by the development control process and the opportunity to prepare design guidance.	Support noted. The Structure Plan requires in Policy P5/3 that "planned new communities" achieve "significantly higher densities" than 40 dph. NS17 would set a minimum average density of 40 dph and the average density could therefore be higher, but there is no certainty that the significantly higher densities desired by the Structure Plan would be achieved.	

Decision on NS17 Housing Density - Alternative Option

Take the alternative approach to housing density at Northstowe (an average of at least 40 dph across the town, with higher densities achieved in and around the town centre, local centres and public transport stops).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS18 Housing Types - Preferred Approach</i>				
971	Object	I object to use of emotive language (such as "imaginative"). It is all motherhood and apple pie, but provides no substance upon which to base (or object to!) a specific implementation of the aspirations.	The use of "imaginative" rather than, for example, "high quality" is intended to convey the need for design of housing at Northstowe to be something other than the standard suburban housing and to be forward looking and innovative, including designs which embrace sustainable living, so which is energy efficient for example. The language used for the policy in the Area Action Plan will aim to be as clear as possible, without being prescriptive on design style.	
973	Object	The section heading refers to Quality, but the actual proposal only really addresses housing type. Given the densities, I would like specific language that referred to sound insulation in homes. Sound pollution is a major factor in reducing quality of life in built up areas and must be addressed to provide for a harmonious community	Government's very firm advice is that planning should not seek to control matters which are controlled by other legislation/regulations. Noise insulation between dwellings is controlled by the Building Regulations and not by planning controls. The Building Regulations for noise transmission between dwellings have been recently revised and reduced permitted noise levels from 52dBa between 1992 and 2003 to 40dBa from 2003. As this standard is very recent, only a few hundred houses will have been built in South Cambridgeshire to this new standard to date. 40dBa is described as the noise emanating from a neighbouring 'quiet living room'.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1127	Object	Although I accept that a range of housing types should be provided, the density levels are the result of developers' greed and government indifference. There should be no high-rise units, which would be totally out of character with the local environment. Low-cost affordable units of not more than two stories are desirable, in addition to larger 'family' properties.	The principle behind higher densities is to make best use of land and minimise the amount of fresh land taken by development. This is enshrined in government policy. Higher densities do not mean a reduction in quality. There may be some buildings taller than 2 storeys, in the form of apartments in the town centre. These could be potentially up to 3-4 storeys which is consistent with existing Cambridgeshire market towns, as this will be very much an urban development. There will be variation in building heights across the town and the height, design and impact of buildings on the edge of the town will be a key issue at the planning application stage. Affordable units will be distributed throughout the site and therefore their storey height will follow the design brief for that part of the town.	
1329	Object	Though I agree there should be a range, they should not be cramped/high rise areas that cause social problems. I would like self build provision also included.	Higher densities must not be at the expense of quality and a key part of the vision for Northstowe is to create a balanced and socially inclusive community. The inclusion of a range of housing, including self build, is desirable. However it is not possible in planning policy to make this a requirement of the development. A reference to self build will be included in the supporting text.	Include reference to the desirability of including land for self build projects in the supporting text.
1385	Object	The option as worded does not give enough detail about the requirements of truly sustainable building. "Imaginative" developments must set high standards for energy conservation (e.g. by excellent insulation) and water conservation (e.g. by greywater recycling schemes).	The issues of energy and water conservation are important aspects of building design for all uses, not just residential, and are dealt with separately in the Report (see Options NS97, NS102 and NS103).	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2292	Object	I object because I understand here that the intention is to build 'housing blocks' first: see NS17.	There will be a variety in house types built throughout the course of development. There is no intention in the Preferred Options Report for apartments to be constructed ahead of other house types, but for these to be integrated as appropriate as part of the wider development	
6257 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher supports the need for imaginative developments but also for imaginative design and layout of developments. This will include the need to create developments with mixed housing types and to this extent it should not be assumed that it will be just apartments close to the most accessible locations or that apartments should not be appropriate in less accessible locations.	Agree that imaginative design and layout of development is required for Northstowe. Also that there will be a variation in house types in all locations. The Preferred Approach is intended to indicate that in general terms the more accessible locations in the town will be appropriate places to locate apartments but this would not be exclusively apartments and does not intend that apartments may not be appropriate in other locations.	
3080 - Rampton Parish Council	Support	Rampton Parish Council supports this option	Support noted.	
4413 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the preferred approach to housing types in Northstowe.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS18 Housing Types - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Other action proposed:

Include reference to the desirability of including land for self build projects in the supporting text.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS19 Affordable Housing - Preferred Approach</i>				
1219	Object	More consideration should given to Affordable housing as the current market trends show that house sales are slowing and prices dropping. Do not leave us with a white elephant on our doorsteps!	There is a high level of need for affordable housing in South Cambs and Northstowe will play a key part in responding to that need. There is currently a high backlog of unmet housing need and the gap between house prices and household incomes in South Cambs is such that there would have to be a very significant drop in house prices before it resolved the problem of access to the housing market. The Housing Needs Survey will be reviewed every 5 years, with more frequent updates as necessary, and the Area Action Plan will be monitored annually which will identify the need for any review in the affordable housing target.	
2791 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	The commentary on low cost housing makes reference the fact this category can include key workers. SCDC and others have carried out research and have evidence that shows that the lack of key worker housing is a serious problem in Cambridge and the surrounding area. The Trust objects to the weak reference to the need for key worker housing in this section of the options report.	The importance of providing affordable housing for key workers is recognised by the Council. Whilst this is encompassed by the term affordable housing and this is made clear in the Preferred Options Report, the need to provide housing for key workers in appropriate locations will be emphasised in the Area Action Plan, including reference to levels of key worker housing needs identified in recent reports, in particular for Addenbrooke's.	
3078 - Rampton Parish Council	Object	Rampton Parish Council supports the principle of affordable housing of up to 50%, but this housing should be assimilated throughout the development with no 'ghetto' areas	The support to the principle of 50% affordable housing is noted. A key part of the successful provision of affordable housing will be the integration of relatively small groups of affordable housing into the development as a whole. This will be made clear in the Area Action Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1908 5619	Object	A 50% affordable housing target is acceptable where there is further building in an already established community. However, if 50% of the housing in Northstowe is affordable it is unlikely to make for a balanced town.	<p>The development strategy for the Cambridge area has regard to the high level of housing need in the area, as identified in the 2002 Housing Needs Survey which also recommends a 50% target for affordable housing in new developments. If the affordable housing need is not addressed in the major new developments, this would undermine the development strategy to provide for the housing needs of the Cambridge area and would provide market housing which would be taken up by those living and/or working outside the Cambridge area, for example commuting to Stansted or London. It is therefore appropriate for Northstowe to play its part in providing significant levels of affordable housing. The key to ensuring that the affordable housing element is consistent with securing a balanced and sustainable community overall, will be the mix of tenure and dwellings sizes.</p> <p>In terms of tenure, this will revolve around the balance between social rented housing and various types of intermediate housing for others who cannot afford to access market housing, including key workers. There is a high level of need for social rented properties in South Cambs. However, this needs to be tempered to ensure that developments provide for balanced communities with no overemphasis on one social group. Looking at recent local examples, at the new village of Cambourne the proportion of social rented to shared ownership on two recent schemes is 77%:23% and 69%:31%. At Arbury Camp on the northern fringe of Cambridge, the split between social rented and key worker housing (with both rented and shared ownership properties) is 50:50. These are both in the context of an overall target of 30%. Given the scale of Northstowe and the</p>	Provide an indicative tenure mix in the supporting text to the affordable housing policy of 50:50 social rented to intermediate housing, an element of which will be for key workers.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
		<p>absolute number involved, particularly with a 50% overall affordable housing target, it is felt that the Arbury example is more likely to be appropriate for Northstowe. Whilst the AAP should not set prescriptive policies on tenure mix which is best determined at the time of detailed schemes coming forward having regard to need at that time, it is considered helpful to provide an indicative tenure mix in the supporting text. Therefore the indicative proportions of affordable housing would be 50:50 social rented to intermediate housing, an element of which will be for key workers.</p> <p>Turning to mix of houses sizes, whilst affordable housing over recent years has tended to focus on smaller units, this is addressing an historic emphasis on larger family units and rectifying this imbalance. In a new major new community, a more balanced mix will be appropriate. It is particularly important that the housing mix responds to needs at the time the scheme comes forward, so no targets will be set in the AAP. However, as an indication of what might be achieved, at Arbury Camp the affordable housing mix is 64% 1&2 bed properties, 22% 3 bed properties and 10% 4 or more bed (the residue being for special needs), despite the development having a bias towards smaller units. At Cambourne, recent schemes have seen a mix of 66:31:3 and 55:45:0.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5341 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to NS19 as there should be a particular affordable housing target for Northstowe and not the district-wide policy being put forward in the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report. Taking into account the substantial costs associated with delivering the new settlement, then the proportion of affordable housing needs to reflect this. The level of provision should be 30% including key worker housing.	Consideration has been given to whether it is appropriate to apply the District wide targets to the new community of Northstowe. The Preferred Approach put forward the Council's view that it is. The major developments are key to addressing the affordable housing requirements in the area. It is recognised that there are significant infrastructure requirements on the development of the new town. No evidence has been put forward to support the request for a lower proportion of affordable housing. The planning application process is the appropriate vehicle for considering the final level of affordable housing at Northstowe when the full package of infrastructure provision is known and can be considered holistically. In policy terms, the 50% target is considered reasonable and appropriate. The Structure Plan says that at least 40% of all new housing in the Cambridge Sub Region will be affordable. The major developments will be crucial in seeking to meet that target. The objector's suggestion that the target should be 30% is therefore also contrary to the Structure Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4837 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 3280 - W A Fairhurst & Partners	Object	The imposition of a 50% affordable housing target is contrary to adopted Structure Plan policies and would not appear to reflect emerging guidance from Regional Spatial Strategy. To ensure the delivery of the development within the timeframe as stipulated by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan the provision of affordable housing should be reduced to 30%, in accordance with East of England Regional Assembly and RPG14. With the requirement that the exact number of affordable houses is to be determined at the planning application stage.	The adopted Structure Plan requires "40% or more of the new housing in the Sub Region" to be affordable (Policy P9/1). The draft RSS14 published December 2004 says that "affordable housing must constitute at least 30% of housing supply in all local authority areas, though the overall aspiration is to secure at least 40% where housing stress warrants higher provision. Provision in excess of 30% will be defined and justified in local development documents and housing strategies, informed by local housing needs assessments". In the Cambridge Sub Region section, paragraph 5.114 says that "40% or more" of new housing needs to be affordable. If this overall target of all new housing development is to be achieved, affordable housing provision on qualifying sites towards the heart of the Cambridge Sub Region where need is highest will need to be higher than 40%. The Housing Needs Survey 2002 identifies a high level of housing need in South Cambs and recommends a target of 50%. The Preferred Approach towards affordable housing is therefore consistent with both the adopted Structure Plan and the emerging draft RSS14.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6628 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	The recognition that the level of affordable housing will need to reflect the viability of any schemes welcomed but nevertheless the starting point of 50% appears to have no justification vis a vis current or emerging planning policies.	The adopted Structure Plan requires "40% or more of the new housing in the Sub Region" to be affordable (Policy P9/1). It does not set an upper limit. The draft RSS14 published December 2004 says that "affordable housing must constitute at least 30% of housing supply in all local authority areas, though the overall aspiration is to secure at least 40% where housing stress warrants higher provision. Provision in excess of 30% will be defined and justified in local development documents and housing strategies, informed by local housing needs assessments". In the Cambridge Sub Region section, paragraph 5.114 says that "40% or more" of new housing needs to be affordable. If this overall target of all new housing development is to be achieved, affordable housing provision on qualifying sites towards the heart of the Cambridge Sub Region where need is greatest will need to be higher than 40%. The Housing Needs Survey 2002 identifies a high level of housing need in South Cambs and recommends a target of 50%. The Preferred Approach towards affordable housing is therefore consistent with both the adopted Structure Plan and the emerging draft RSS14.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6258 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The recognition of the significant infrastructure requirements of building a new town is welcomed although this does not appear to be reflected in proposing that the District targets for affordable housing be applied to Northstowe. Those district targets are inappropriate for a new town project developed on brownfield land and subject to the detailed infrastructure and town building considerations described in the main representations. Unrealistic requirements (as are set out in the core strategy) will mean market and affordable housing will not be viable. The targets proposed in the core strategy are not justified.	Consideration has been given to whether it is appropriate to apply the District wide targets to the new community of Northstowe. The Preferred Approach put forward the Council's view that it is. The major developments are key to addressing the affordable housing requirements in the area. It is recognised that there are significant infrastructure requirements on the development of the new town. No evidence has been put forward to support the request for a lower proportion of affordable housing. The planning application process is the appropriate vehicle for considering the final level of affordable housing at Northstowe when the full package of infrastructure provision is known and can be considered holistically. In policy terms, the 50% target is considered reasonable and appropriate. The Structure Plan says that at least 40% of all new housing in the Cambridge Sub Region will be affordable. The major developments will be crucial in seeking to meet that target. The objector's suggestion that the target should be 30% is therefore also contrary to the Structure Plan.	
1879	Support	Socially, this is a reasonable policy. However, local councils need to recognise that many beyond the named "key" groups are hit by the high local property prices - we aren't all nurses, police etc, yet still need to be able to live somewhere around here in order to work. I find it hard to believe that middle to long term market forces will not be able to drive prices further upwards, even in the so called affordable market.	Support noted. The term Affordable Housing includes a variety of types of low cost home ownership which will be available to those whose household income is insufficient to secure suitable housing on the open market. This will include housing for key workers but will also be available for others who meet the qualifying criteria.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2131	Support	<p>I support the provision of affordable housing as long as there is a range and type of provision.</p> <p>I propose that the Northstowe should set out clearly the level and % of affordable housing to be achieved.</p> <p>I propose that this should contain a minimum 40% affordable housing of which this is made up of 30 % affordable rent and 10 % shared equity/ownership.</p>	<p>Support noted. The Area Action Plan will set a target for the provision of 50% affordable housing. It is proposed to give an indication of possible tenure mix in the supporting text of 25% social rented and 25% intermediate tenures, to help ensure a balanced community. However, the decision on this will be best addressed at the time of a planning application having regard to the circumstances and identified need at that time.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3436 - English Partnerships	Support	<p>Whilst English Partnerships recognises the Local Authority's desire for 50% affordable housing in support of local housing need as outlined in the Local Authority's Core Strategy document. We would emphasise the necessity to undertake robust development analysis and sensitivity testing to take into account development constraints, other policy considerations, development phasing and market conditions relating to the Northstowe development. The policy should be flexible and be able to respond to emerging policies on affordable housing. It should also have the ability to respond to potential future changes in funding mechanisms over the plan period.</p>	<p>Support noted. The policy will aim to be robust to ensure that appropriate levels of affordable housing are secured to meet housing needs: a key driver behind the development strategy for the Cambridge Sub Region. Account will be taken of the affordable housing policy alongside other requirements of the development in determining planning applications. A process for undertaking and testing the final package of infrastructure provision will need to be set out for the major developments and Cambridgeshire Horizons will have an important role in implementing this. Options CS32 and CS33 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report address the issue of funding of affordable housing. An appropriate approach to funding at Northstowe will be included in the Area Action Plan. The Core Strategy identified that option CS33 for off-site provision would not be appropriate at the major developments such as Northstowe. Option CS32 putting forward the possibility of developer contributions being used to fund a lower percentage of affordable housing in the case of insurmountable funding issues e.g. Housing Corporation grant could be relevant district wide. In the case of Northstowe, which would be developed over a long period of time, it is not possible to predict subsidy arrangements over the development period, and therefore this approach would not apply when setting the affordable housing requirement at the outline planning stage. At the time of a detailed application, there would need to be very clear evidence provided by the developer to the satisfaction of the planning authority that subsidy was not available if this policy were to be relevant. A balance will need to be struck between achieving a robust policy to secure appropriate provision of affordable housing in the</p>	<p>Include appropriate policy on affordable housing funding at Northstowe, which rules out contributions for off site provision, and requires very clear evidence to be provided by the developer to the satisfaction of the planning authority of insurmountable funding issues at the time of a detailed application developer e.g. Housing Corporation grant not being available. In such cases, contributions may be able to be used to fund a lower percentage of affordable housing on site. The Area Action Plan will make clear that this approach would not apply at the outline planning stage when setting the affordable housing requirement.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3905 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Although the County Council supports this option there is no specific mention of key worker housing in the approach (although It is mentioned in the supporting text - paragraph 8.9). Affordable AND key worker housing is specifically mentioned in Policy P9/3 of the 2003 Adopted Structure Plan and therefore NS19 should be amended to reflect its importance. Amendment to NS19 The but will include key worker housing, social rented housing and a significant proportion of intermediate tenure	context of an evolving policy context with the current review of PPG3. Support noted. Key worker housing is not a specific tenure, it could be housing of a variety of intermediate tenures that are made available for those defined as key workers. For clarity and to reflect the Structure Plan wording, it is agreed that the policy in the Area Action Plan should refer specifically to housing for key workers.	Include specific reference to key workers: "...but will include social rented housing as well as a significant proportion of intermediate tenures, INCLUDING HOUSING FOR KEY WORKERS.

Decision on NS19 Affordable Housing - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Amend NS19 to include a specific reference to key workers: "...but will include social rented housing as well as a significant proportion of intermediate tenures, INCLUDING HOUSING FOR KEY WORKERS.

Other actions proposed:

Provide an indicative tenure mix in the supporting text to the affordable housing policy of 50:50 social rented to intermediate housing, an element of which will be for key workers.

Include appropriate policy on affordable housing funding at Northstowe, which rules out contributions for off site provision, and requires very clear evidence to be provided by the developer to the satisfaction of the planning authority of insurmountable funding issues at the time of a detailed application developer e.g. Housing Corporation grant not being available. In such cases, contributions may be able to be used to fund a lower percentage of affordable housing on site. The Area Action Plan will make clear that this approach would not apply at the outline planning stage when setting the affordable housing requirement.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

NS20 Housing Mix - Preferred Approach

5342 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to NS20 on the grounds that by applying the district wide housing mix (CS23) this will not achieve a balanced community at Northstowe and further research is required in order to determine the most appropriate mix of housing types and sizes before determining appropriate percentages. Further, no affordable housing mix is prescribed in the Core Strategy Options, it is therefore inconsistent for the market houses should be set out when this policy will be determined largely by market demand.	Having regard to representations, the district wide targets in the Core Strategy for bedroom sizes are proposed to be altered from the Preferred Approach to the proportions 50%:25%:25% (CS26). These are considered appropriate for development in villages where development is adding to existing communities. Policies requiring a mix of housing types and sizes, including smaller dwellings, were included in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans. However, around half of all new dwellings provided by the market over the last 10 years or so have been of 4 or more bedrooms. Targets are therefore proposed to address this. The Housing Needs Survey 2002 assessed need within market housing and took account of both what people would like and what they expect in terms of house size. It identified a high level of need for 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings of 89% of all market dwellings. The original Core Strategy Preferred Option CS23 identified targets for 1&2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedroom dwellings in the proportions 40%:30%:30%. These are considered to be an appropriate policy approach for Northstowe. This would help address the high level of need identified for 1&2 bedroom properties whilst not compromising the creation of a balanced community in an entirely new settlement. It would be for a developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate for social or economic reasons. However, this would be an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need identified and the need to respond to past trends.	Include targets for market housing mix for 1&2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedroom dwellings in the proportions 40%:30%:30%.
----------------------------------	--------	---	---	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6259 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher does not believe that the District wide approach for the mix of housing is necessarily appropriate for Northstowe although it may be. Gallagher understands the need to provide a higher proportion of 1 and 2 bedroom accommodation throughout the District but nevertheless a more balanced approach needs to be taken to address social and community objectives for a new settlement. Therefore a housing mix that reflects County averages is considered to be more appropriate. The justification for this approach is set out in representations on the Core Strategy (CS 23 - CS24).	Having regard to representations, the district wide targets in the Core Strategy for bedroom sizes are proposed to be altered from the Preferred Approach to the proportions 50%:25%:25% (CS26). These are considered appropriate for development in villages where development is adding to existing communities. Policies requiring a mix of housing types and sizes, including smaller dwellings, were included in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans. However, around half of all new dwellings provided by the market over the last 10 years or so have been of 4 or more bedrooms. Targets are therefore proposed to address this. The Housing Needs Survey 2002 assessed need within market housing and took account of both what people would like and what they expect in terms of house size. It identified a high level of need for 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings of 89% of all market dwellings. The original Core Strategy Preferred Option CS23 identified targets for 1&2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedroom dwellings in the proportions 40%:30%:30%. These are considered to be an appropriate policy approach for Northstowe. This would help address the high level of need identified for 1&2 bedroom properties whilst not compromising the creation of a balanced community in an entirely new settlement. It would be for a developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate for social or economic reasons. However, this would be an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need identified and the need to respond to past trends. The County average of 35:30:35 achieved in new developments over the last 10 years or so is not considered to be appropriate for a new town which is proposed specifically to meet housing needs in	Include targets for market housing mix for 1&2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedroom dwellings in the proportions 40%:30%:30%.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			the Cambridge area. The County figure reflects a period where the market was failing to meet housing needs in Cambridgeshire with very high levels of larger properties being delivered despite high house prices and increasing problems of affordability. The aim now must be to ensure that local needs are met as far as possible and that an inappropriate mix does not simply encourage those who do not need to live or work in the Cambridge area to move in and commute to areas such as Stansted and London to the south. This would not deliver the development strategy.	
2307	Support	I support this option but not at the expense of a really varied housing mix: small dwellings tend to change hands quickly and if Northstowe is based mainly on this it will never evolve into an integrated community and Longstanton will pay the price for this.	Support noted. The key is to strike a balance between the housing needs of the Cambridge Area which the town is designed to meet and still achieving a balanced community.	
3438 - English Partnerships	Support	The Local Authority's proposal to define housing mix should consider and ensure a flexible approach in its application, taking into account development phasing, funding and market constraints. This should also be viewed in context of affordable housing aspirations and the development industry's ability to deliver to these levels of market house types. This is a potentially critical issue in determining market viability and delivery. This must consider socio/economic factors when considering local needs, long-term sustainability requirements and use of community facilities and schools to facilitate long-term sustainable growth.	Support noted. Socio/economic factors are relevant issues in ensuring the delivery of sustainable communities. These have been taken into account in drafting the approach to the AAP and will also be relevant at the time of deciding a planning application.	
3082 - Rampton Parish Council	Support	Rampton Parish Council supports this option	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4414 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the District wide housing mix policy suggested in CS36 for Northstowe.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS20 Housing Mix - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Include targets for market housing mix for 1&2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedroom dwellings in the proportions 40%:30%:30%.

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD******Chapter 9. Employment******NS21 Employment Objectives - Preferred Approach***1882
5358

Object

This will be a dormitory town. No matter how much you try and incorporate employment in new developments, the people living in that area will drive in their cars to another area and people living outside Northstowe will travel to work there.

The prime reason behind the proposed new town is to meet the high level of housing needs in the Cambridge area, in particular in relation to the imbalance between jobs and housing created by the success of the high tech employment. However, there is a balance to be struck to ensure that the town does not become purely a dormitory to Cambridge. Therefore it is important that the town has its own employment provision and other services and facilities in order to create a sustainable community. However, the planning system can do no more than provide the opportunity for people to choose to live and work in close proximity. Even if there were an absolute balance between jobs and housing at Northstowe, there would be people who choose to live in Northstowe and work in or around Cambridge and vice versa.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4836	Object	Para 9.1 Object to the first two sentences, which propose providing employment to avoid Northstowe becoming a dormitory town. This will create through traffic, and outward and inward commuting, adding to the traffic problem through the whole area.	There is a balanced to be struck between meeting housing needs in the Cambridge area and ensuring that the town does not become purely a dormitory to Cambridge. Therefore it is important that the town has its own employment provision and other services and facilities in order to create a sustainable community. However, the planning system can do no more than provide the opportunity for people to choose to live and work in close proximity. Even if there were an absolute balance between jobs and housing at Northstowe, there would be people who chose to live in Northstowe and work in or around Cambridge and vice versa. Traffic movements and securing appropriate infrastructure will be a key issue for the development.	
6260 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The first sub-bullet of the fourth main bullet suggests a narrower articulation of Policy P9/7 of the Structure Plan. This is presumably the consequence of summarising the text rather than any deliberate intent. It is suggested that the AAP policy should be consistent with P9/7.	Agree. The objective should be reworded to reflect the wording in Structure Plan policy P9/7.	Replace 4th bullet, 1st sub bullet to read: "high technology and related industries concerned primarily with research and development including development of D1 educational uses and associated sui generis research institutes, which can show a special need to be located close to the Universities or other established research facilities or associated services in the Cambridge area."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1947 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Please also see comments made at NS9 Town Centres. It is felt that unless local employment and shopping opportunities are provided from the earliest opportunity residents will be encouraged to travel to, for example, Cambridge in disproportionate numbers to seek them there. Once these patterns are established it may be difficult to reverse them, to the detriment of the traffic situation and to any new businesses that may have been set up in Northstowe.	Support noted. The need to ensure that housing and supporting development come forward in parallel is key in creating a sustainable community from the outset.	
2794 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Support	The Trust welcomes the fact that the strategy for Northstowe is to address the shortage of housing in and around Cambridge. Development of Northstowe will therefore help to redress the shortage of housing in relation to the number of jobs in the Cambridge area. And also help to resolve the affordable/key worker housing problems in the area.	Support noted.	
4415 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the preferred approach to employment for Northstowe. The adopted Structure Plan, indicates that the purpose of the new town is to provide housing for workers in and near Cambridge, provide jobs directly related to the provision of services in Northstowe, and as an alternative location for high technology and research based business needing to expand within the sub-region. This has been reflected in NS21.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS21 Employment Objectives - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS22 Employment: Main Location - Preferred Approach</i>				
1051	Object	Whereas an employment area near the conservation area of St Michaels might be acceptable if it is made up of properly landscaped quality "Research Park" type facilities. The prospect of bland arrays of huge warehouses is very, very worrying. This would greatly degrade the Village character in its most attractive area. There would also be implications for heavy goods traffic and noise. We need to know asap what type of "work related area" is envisaged?	The main employment area would be located to the south of the town centre. There is no intention that it would be located on the edge of the town close to existing village communities. The employment area will most appropriately be embedded within the town, in particular from the local public transport loop which will pass through the heart of the town.	
1428	Object	NS22 In view of heavy vehicles, site should be well away from Longstanton areas.	The main employment area would be located to the south of the town centre. There is no intention that it would be located on the edge of the town close to existing village communities. The employment area will most appropriately be embedded within the town, in particular from the local public transport loop which will pass through the heart of the town.	
3402	Object	I object to the statement because it does not exclude the possibility that the employment centre with much light and noise pollution will be placed near existing parts of Longstanton. It should be at least halfway from town's boundary to the railway. I suggest just to the East of the town centre.	The main employment area would be located to the south of the town centre. There is no intention that it would be located on the edge of the town close to existing village communities. The employment area will most appropriately be embedded within the town, in particular from the local public transport loop which will pass through the heart of the town. A location to the south of the town centre most effectively provides for this.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2297	Object	What is described in paragraph 9.3 is initially a dormitory community of commuters to Cambridge, not a new vibrant market town community. It is unrealistic to describe the vision for Northstowe as a 'vibrant market town' elsewhere when the reality appears to be grim indeed.	The prime reason behind the proposed new town is to meet the high level of housing needs in the Cambridge area, in particular in relation to the imbalance between jobs and housing created by the success of the high tech employment. However, there is a balance to be struck to ensure that the town does not become purely a dormitory to Cambridge. Therefore it is important that the town has its own employment provision and other services and facilities in order to create a sustainable community. The objective is to create a vibrant market town is considered to be crucial and a realistic part of the strategy for the town.	
5343 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Para 9.4-9.7 Object to these paragraphs as they are too prescriptive.	It is considered that paragraphs 9.4-9.8 provide an appropriate context for the key issue of employment. The location and nature of employment will be crucial to ensuring that Northstowe does not become simply a dormitory town.	
5013 - Sport England	Object	Sport England objects to the preferred approach, because apart from its broad location, no reference is made to the development principles relating to the form of Northstowe's main employment area. To address this objection, it is requested that guidance is provided in policy NS22, or in a new policy, on the form of the main employment area. This should include guidance requiring provision to be made for appropriate sport/active recreation facilities to meet the needs of the employment area. Sport England would expect such provision to be made within the employment area, unless the area is located and designed to enable convenient access to facilities in adjoining area, eg town centre.	The employment area is proposed to be located in and adjoining the town centre in order to maximise the benefits of being in close proximity to a range of services and facilities, including sport and recreation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3249 - Longstanton Action Group 2197 - Longstanton Parish Council 5110 - Toad Acres Park Home Residents Association 3052 2947 2363 3383 2149 2143 1526 1370 1233 1550 1299 1245 1619 1753 1444 1336 4950 945 921 1171 1088 1535 1416 1128 2567 1147	Object	There needs to be an explicit statement that, as with the town centre, employment areas should not be near existing residences and conservation areas (including Rampton Drift, Toad Acre, and St Michael's).	The main employment area would be located to the south of the town centre and therefore away from Rampton Drift. There is also no intention that it would be located on the edge of the town close to existing village communities. The employment area will most appropriately be embedded within the town to maximise accessibility to it from within the town, in particular from the local public transport loop which will pass through the heart of the town.	The Area Action Plan will specify that the employment area will be located within the town, to the south of the town centre and away from existing village communities.
4416 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the preferred location of the town's main employment area being in and adjoining the town centre. This is the most sustainable location for this type of employment and will be accessible for residents using sustainable modes of transport.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS22 Employment: Main Location - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Other actions proposed:

The Area Action Plan will specify that the employment area will be located within the town, to the south of the town centre and away from existing village communities.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS23 Employment: Uses Not Appropriate in the Town Centre - Preferred Approach</i>				
1372	Object	It should be stated that these employment areas should not be close to any houses in Longstanton.	The main employment area will be located adjacent to the town centre and within the town, so not adjacent to the villages of Longstanton or Oakington. The second employment area adjacent to the park and ride site by the B1050 will be close to some of the sporadic dwellings along the B1050. There are already more employment than residential uses in that area. The employment area will lie adjacent to residential properties in Northstowe, and suitable buffer treatment will be required as necessary in order to protect residential amenity.	
6261 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher supports the location of employment uses not appropriate in the town centre adjoining the proposed park and ride facility. However, this may require provision to be made explicitly for small scale uses within the Use Classes of B2 and B8 adjoining the park and ride facility. It would be inappropriate for the land adjacent to the park and ride to be devoted solely to uses not appropriate to the town centre. There should be flexibility to accommodate B1 uses also in the northern employment area. The location will be highly accessible to the CGB system and should not be devoted solely to activities that have lower job generation potential.	Agree in principle that some small scale general employment uses (B2) would be appropriate and also storage and distribution facilities (B8), however these should be limited to a scale serving Northstowe and its immediate hinterland.	Add to end of option: "and general employment (B2) and storage & distribution uses (B8), limited to those serving Northstowe and its immediate hinterland."
856	Support	Establish a retail park. Attract a range of new retailers to the area.	Support noted. However, if any retail warehousing were demonstrated to be required, this would be on a scale appropriate to the scale of Northstowe and be located in or adjacent to the town centre, in accordance with the sequence of locations for retail development in Planning Policy Guidance note 6.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2083 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Support	LPPC support option NS23 because in the Parish Plan Survey only 12% of those who responded preferred a Northstowe business park (rather than residential or shopping/leisure) to be closest to Longstanton (given adequate separation in all cases!).	Support noted.	
4417 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3907 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3252 - Longstanton Action Group 2198 - Longstanton Parish Council 3083 - Rampton Parish Council 3053 3388 1300 1620 1445 1337 2299 946 1172 1417 2568 1148	Support	This seems an entirely appropriate proposal.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4418 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Para 9.6</p> <p>There is a need for Household Waste Recycling Centre, to be accommodated on general industrial land (probably on site adjacent to Park and Ride facility). Therefore needs to be an allocation for B2 land, in order to accommodate waste management uses.</p> <p>Amendment paragraph 9.6, add new sentence to end of paragraph: "...land. In order to provide a household waste recycling centre at Northstowe it will also be necessary to allocate some employment sites as general industrial (B2) land, as these are capable of accommodating waste management uses."</p>	<p>It is recognised that the Waste Local Plan 2003 states that Northstowe (by virtue of being a new settlement) may be a suitable location for a Household Waste Recycling Centre, and is an area of search for such a facility. The County Council as the waste planning authority would determine any planning application for this facility. If such a facility were to be provided at Northstowe, the most suitable location for it would be in the area for general employment area adjoining the park and ride site. To facilitate this, that second employment area would need a policy context which permitted general employment uses (B2). Other general employment which may come forward under this policy would need to be limited in scale to that which serves a local function for Northstowe and its immediate hinterland.</p>	<p>Option NS23 be amended to allow for general employment uses (B2), limited in scale to that which serves a local function for Northstowe and its immediate hinterland. The supporting text advise that this location could be suitable for a Household Waste Recycling Centre to serve the needs of Northstowe and its immediate hinterland.</p>

Decision on NS23 Employment: Uses Not Appropriate in the Town Centre - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Add to end of option: "AND GENERAL EMPLOYMENT (B2) AND STORAGE & DISTRIBUTION USES (B8), LIMITED TO THOSE SERVING NORTHSTOWE AND ITS IMMEDIATE HINTERLAND"

Other action proposed:

The supporting text advise that this location could be suitable for a Household Waste Recycling Centre to serve the needs of Northstowe and its immediate hinterland.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS24 Employment: Range of Uses - Preferred Approach</i>				
4419 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	There is a need for Household Waste Recycling Centre, to be accommodated on general industry land (probably on site adjacent to Park and Ride facility). Therefore needs to be an allocation for B2 land, in order to accommodate waste management uses. Amendment to NS24, 4th bullet point - Light industry and general industry (sufficient to accommodate waste management use);	It is recognised that the Waste Local Plan 2003 states that Northstowe (by virtue of being a new settlement) may be a suitable location for a Household Waste Recycling Centre, and is an area of search for such a facility. The County Council as the waste planning authority would determine any planning application for this facility. If such a facility were to be provided at Northstowe, the most suitable location for it would be in the area for general employment area adjoining the park and ride site. To facilitate this, general employment uses (B2) need to be added to the range of uses appropriate at Northstowe, but limited specifically to the employment area adjacent to the park and ride. As other general employment may come forward under this policy it is necessary to limit the scale of general employment to a scale which serves a local function for Northstowe and its immediate hinterland.	Option NS24 be amended to allow for general employment uses (B2), limited in scale to that which serves a local function for Northstowe and its immediate hinterland. The supporting text advise that this location could be suitable for a Household Waste Recycling Centre to serve the needs of Northstowe and its immediate hinterland.
6262 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	In setting out the full range of employment uses to be accommodated in Northstowe the policies submitted should refer also to research and educational institutes. In order to encourage a diverse range of employment opportunities and to recognise the potential for Northstowe to accommodate cluster requirements reference should also be made to small scale pilot manufacturing (B2) uses and storage and distribution activities, albeit on a limited scale.	Agree to include provision for research and educational institutes. Also agree in principle that some small scale general employment uses (B2) would be appropriate and also storage and distribution facilities, however the latter should be limited to a scale serving as a local distribution point for Northstowe.	Add new bullet following first bullet: "research and educational institutes" Add new bullet following "light industry": "in the employment area adjacent to the park and ride site, small scale pilot manufacturing" Add new bullet to end of option: "in the employment area adjacent to the park and ride site, storage and distribution uses (B8) limited to those serving as a local distribution point for Northstowe."
3908 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 9.7 - Add to last sentence 'and be well served by routes designed for use by cyclists and pedestrians.'	Support noted. Agree that the amplification provided would help to make employment uses more accessible by other sustainable modes of transport.	Add to end of para 9.7: "...and be well served by routes designed for use by cyclists and pedestrians."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3182	Support	I support this option: it is only if jobs opportunities are provided from the outset (high tech particularly) that something resembling a community may develop. However, Cambourne is not a model to follow here: soulless place, empty from within, will need decades to evolve.	<p>Support noted. It is important that the phasing of Northstowe ensures that a wide range of supporting infrastructure is provided alongside residential development. This will be key to creating a sustainable community as early as possible in the development. Whilst this has not historically included employment development, and there may be limitations on what can be required, the objective of delivering employment development alongside residential development is appropriate. This is best addressed at option NS117 which deals with the timing of service provision.</p> <p>The employment provided at Northstowe will be higher density developments than have tended to take place in the recent past, including at Cambourne, in order to make better use of land and to make them more accessible places without relying on the private car.</p>	<p>Add to end of Option NS117:</p> <p>"...It is also desirable for employment development to be provided alongside residential development in order to create a sustainable community as early as possible in the development."</p>

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD*****Decision on NS24 Employment: Range of Uses - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Option NS24 be amended to allow for general employment uses (B2), limited in scale to that which serves a local function for Northstowe and its immediate hinterland.

Add new bullet following first bullet: "RESEARCH AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTES"

Add new bullet following "light industry": "IN THE EMPLOYMENT AREA ADJACENT TO THE PARK AND RIDE SITE, SMALL SCALE PILOT MANUFACTURING" ADD NEW BULLET TO END OF OPTION: "IN THE EMPLOYMENT AREA ADJACENT TO THE PARK AND RIDE SITE, STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION USES (B8) LIMITED TO THOSE SERVING AS A LOCAL DISTRIBUTION POINT FOR NORTHSTOWE."

Other actions proposed:

Add to end of para 9.7: "...AND BE WELL SERVED BY ROUTES DESIGNED FOR USE BY CYCLISTS AND PEDESTRIANS."

The supporting text advise that this location could be suitable for a Household Waste Recycling Centre to serve the needs of Northstowe and its immediate hinterland.

Add to end of Option NS117: "...IT IS ALSO DESIRABLE FOR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT TO BE PROVIDED ALONGSIDE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN ORDER TO CREATE A SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE IN THE DEVELOPMENT."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

Chapter 10. Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture including Community Development

NS25 Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture Objectives - Preferred Approach

3742 - GO-East	Object	As with our representation on local centres, the submission DPD should indicate with more certainty the type and scale of community facilities to be provided. It will also be necessary to show in the submission DPD more detail as to what will be required in the first phase of development, i.e. the two identified local centres.	At this stage it would be difficult for the AAP to come up with a definitive list as more detailed work needs to be undertaken. However, the approach in paragraph 10.10 does indicate in general terms the minimum that is likely to be required. Cambridgeshire Horizons should be approached to undertake further work to establish in more detail what is required.	Retain a minimum indicative list of facilities required. Request Cambridgeshire Horizons to undertake further work to feed into the masterplanning process. Ensure that the AAP includes a policy which sets out criteria for specifying facilities which developers will be expected to contribute towards of provide in full.
5905 - Sport England	Object	With reference to paragraph 10.7: Sport England supports the requirement for the provision of Community Development Workers to help establish a vibrant and sustainable community from the outset of development. However, the paragraph is objected to because reference should specifically be made to the need for the team of community development workers to include a sports development officer. Such an officer would be involved in co-ordinating initiatives such as preparing community sports development strategies, establishing new community sports clubs, developing school/club links, maximising the community use of school/private sports facilities, sports coaching/training schemes etc.	Support; reference to sports development should be added.	In referring to Community Development workers add indication that this would include sports development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6263 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher supports the principle of facilitating a range and mix of community services and facilities appropriate to a town the size of Northstowe. Such facilities assist in creating a vibrant, sustainable and socially inclusive community.</p> <p>Provision of services and facilities should be proportionate to population size as NS25 suggests. Gallagher questions the overall population estimates for the town. Gallagher does not support a new town of 10,000 dwellings believing the practical outworking of this to be inconsistent with Structure Plan policy and diminishing to the new town concept. NS25 should be revised to refer to a population estimate of around 18,000 to 20,000.</p> <p>The reference to a 'small' catchment is imprecise, the size of the catchment will need to be determined. If any qualification is required 'appropriate' should replace 'small'.</p>	<p>At this stage it is agreed that it would be difficult for the AAP to specify a definitive list as more detailed work does have to be done. However, the approach in paragraph 10.10 does indicate in general terms the scale of what is likely to be required. Cambridgeshire Horizons should be approached to undertake further work to establish in more detail what is required.</p>	<p>Retain an indicative list of facilities required. Request Cambridgeshire Horizons to undertake further work to feed into the masterplanning process.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6334 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Para 10.10</p> <p>Gallagher recognises its obligations to make provision for community services and facilities within the new town.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to comment in detail on the list of services and facilities in paragraph 10.10 at this stage as these are matters that are being addressed by service providers and will no doubt be considered further through ongoing discussions.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to the level of detail that will be appropriate in the AAP. It may not be possible to provide detail by the time that the AAP is submitted and inappropriate to include a list in the style of para 10.10 in any event.</p>	The AAP should give an indication of the level of provision. The list in para 10.10 is indicative of what should be expected as a minimum requirement. The policy should note that the list is subject to refinement as work progresses.	Note; ensure that policy includes reference to minimum requirements and that work is continuing to refine the list of required services and facilities.
1978 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Community and Church facilities are vitally important to a local community.	Support noted.	None needed.
3439 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships supports the principles for community facilities, leisure, arts and culture and would stress the need for high quality design for such facilities, which can act as demonstrator projects, and landmark features. These facilities should also be integrated with high quality public realm and demonstrate the highest achievable accredited environmental considerations in their construction management and operation.	Support noted. Agree need for high quality, landmark features in the public realm will add to the local distinctiveness of the new town. This is part of the Vision set out in NS4 and will need to be carried forward into masterplanning and more detailed planning stages.	None needed.
2795 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Support	The Trust welcomes the collaboration process proposed in paragraph 10.5 and also welcomes the proposal to establish a health campus which would be able to provide a wider range of services than would be made available for a conventional "Health centre".	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4420 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5012 - Sport England 2033 - Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council 2309 1762 2571 830	Support	Support; leisure and other community facilities should be provided at a very early stage in the development, both to reduce the need to travel and also to provide much needed leisure facilities for the existing local communities.	Support noted.	None needed.
6483 - Royal Mail Group	Support	The requirement to expand services will be a direct result of the major development area at Cambridge East. RMG will be seeking financial and/or other planning contributions to meet the direct impact of the development and need to expand capacity or other implications that result from this scheme.	Support noted. The issue of appropriate developer contributions is set out at NS26 and NS27.	None needed.

Decision on NS25 Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture Objectives - Preferred Approach

Confirm Preferred Approach but amend as follows:

- include sports development as an integral part of community development
- request Cambridgeshire Horizons to undertake further work on services and facilities needed to inform Masterplanning
- retain list of likely services and facilities needed but clarify that this is a provisional minimum requirement

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS26 Public Provided Community Services, Facilities, Leisure Art and Culture - Preferred Approach</i>				
7283 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	When people start to occupy dwellings they will need to be assigned to particular parish for electoral, Council Tax and other purposes.	Noted; this is why paragraph 10.10 (g) covers the issues surrounding community development and governance. This will need to be developed in more detail beyond the AAP.	Note for future work.
4824 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	The primary school in Oakington is "church aided". It is important to give due consideration when deciding the status of new primary schools. On the one hand the absence of church aided ones could make the one at Oakington more attractive and so lead to it being overloaded, and create additional car journeys into the bargain. Equally, the opportunity for Oakington residents to choose a non church aided primary school could lead to an under utilisation of our local school, and additional car journeys into the bargain.	This is not a matter for the AAP but one which the County Council as local education authority needs to consider at more detailed planning stages.	Draw to attention of County Council.
6264 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 3440 - English Partnerships	Object	As well as developer contributions this policy should ensure developer contributions are reasonable and take into account other possible funding streams and finance achieved through government fiscal taxation policies.	Agreed; the policy should reflect the opportunity to draw down funds from as many sources as possible, whilst also ensuring developer contributions as appropriate.	Take into account in policy drafting.
1763	Support	The current proposals do not suggest a preferred way of providing education and out of school care. I would support a "wrap around" system of provision, so that out of school care is available within the local primary school	This is a matter of detail which is not appropriate for the AAP.	None.
2310	Support	I support this option as the way forward for Northstowe provided that developers are made accountable as to the delivery of these amenities.	Support noted. The issue of developer contributions is set out at NS 26 and NS27.	None needed.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1902 - Cambridgeshire ACRE	Support	There is no specific mention that there will be a provision for a large community hall. This would be important for a community of this size and would provide local groups such as playgroups and drama groups with a venue to meet.	Support noted. Paragraph 10.10 does list a Community Centre as a requirement of the development and this could include a large meeting hall, which it is agreed is likely to be needed by a community as large as Northstowe. Paragraph 10.5 indicates that a venue for performing arts and larger community events could be partly co-located with an ecumenical centre. An alternative might be to locate the performing arts facility at the secondary school.	Discussions with service providers needed to ensure adequate land allocations made to accommodate this within the AAP.
4422 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the general approach to the securing of developer contributions, and the list of key facilities to be secured (paragraph 10.10), however there are a number of omissions from the list which should be rectified, notably transport, waste management and access to the countryside.	Support noted; the additional items suggested are dealt with elsewhere in the Options. It is accepted that there will be planning obligations in respect of these matters.	
3084 - Rampton Parish Council 4637 - Sport England	Support	General support.	Support noted.	None needed.
4721 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Support	Provision of a burial ground needs greater emphasis.	Support noted; a burial ground is listed as a requirement at paragraph 10.10 (f). It is not possible to be more specific at this stage.	
6484 - Royal Mail Group	Support	The requirement to expand services will be a direct result of the major development area at Cambridge Northstowe. RMG will be seeking financial and/or other planning contributions to meet the direct impact of the development and need to expand capacity or other implications that result from this scheme.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS26 Public Provided Community Services, Facilities, Leisure Art and Culture - Preferred Approach

Confirm Preferred Approach but amend as follows:

- include sports development as an integral part of community development
- request Cambridgeshire Horizons to undertake further work on services and facilities needed to inform Masterplanning
- retain list of likely services and facilities needed but clarify that this is a provisional minimum requirement

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS27 Commercially Provided Services, facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture - Preferred Approach</i>				
3003	Object	No provision is being made for travellers. A permanent site should be included as all the other villages in the area have to make such provision so should Northstowe have a site for at least 50 travellers and their families.	This is a matter subject to the findings of the Travellers' Needs Survey and the Travellers' Development Plan Document. It is unlikely that the new town itself will bring forward a site which is suitable.	None needed.
7284 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The provision of services and facilities should be proportionate to population size as NS25 suggests. Gallagher questions the overall population estimates for the town. NS27 should be revised to refer to a population estimate of around 18,000 to 20,000.	Not agreed; the average household size in South Cambridgeshire is 2.4. If Northstowe is 8,000 dwellings this would give 19,200, but experience in other new communities is that households size is above the average (Cambourne is an example). Therefore a range of 20,000 - 24,000 would be appropriate.	No change.
7285 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 6265 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The range of commercial facilities that will be appropriate to the new town will be determined by the market, by definition, and while every effort can be made by the developer to encourage such uses, this will be beyond his control. To this extent provisions requiring the provision of commercial services and facilities are likely to be inappropriate. Instead there is scope to explore arrangements regarding the marketing of sites for such developments at appropriate stages of the process.	Noted; it is accepted that market forces will play an important role in determining the level of commercial facilities. Nevertheless developer contributions can be used to aid the provision of buildings and infrastructure to ensure an appropriate level of facilities commensurate with the size of the town.	
857	Support	Provision of music venue Provision of meeting rooms	Support noted; paragraph 10.10 sets out the need to provide a community centre/meeting place. Design of such facilities will be at a later stage in the planning process.	None needed.
2312	Support	I support this option and I trust that this will done in close consultation with Longstanton Parish Council and other local councils. I trust that transparency and accountability will be the norm.	Support noted; it is agreed there will need to be the continuing involvement of local parish councils as planning and development of Northstowe proceeds.	None needed.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4424 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3086 - Rampton Parish Council 4638 - Sport England	Support	General support.	Support noted.	None needed.
6482 - Royal Mail Group	Support	The requirement to expand services will be a direct result of the major development area at Cambridge Northstowe. RMG will be seeking financial and/or other planning contributions to meet the direct impact of the development and need to expand capacity or other implications that result from this scheme.	Support noted.	None

Decision on NS27 Commercially Provided Services, facilities, Leisure, Art and Culture - Preferred Approach

Confirm Preferred Approach but amend as follows:

- include sports development as an integral part of community development
- request Cambridgeshire Horizons to undertake further work on services and facilities needed to inform Masterplanning
- retain list of likely services and facilities needed but clarify that this is a provisional minimum requirement

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 11. Addressing Transport Needs				
<i>NS28 Transport Objectives - Preferred Approach</i>				
875	Object	Less emphasis should be placed on connecting the new development to the existing villages by developing cycle paths and footpaths. Longstanton and Oakington will be trying to preserve their identity as separate villages.	<p>The green separation is designed to retain the separate identity of Northstowe from surrounding villages and maintain a physical and visual separation.</p> <p>However, it is important that a network of pedestrian and cycle links are provided to allow residents access to the facilities and services at Northstowe without the need to use their car. This approach is in accordance with the district-wide approach in the Core Strategy Travel Chapter. For example, CS82 seeks to provide cycle links to connect villages with facilities and services.</p>	
1954 1955	Object	Any road bypassing Oakington from Cottenham to the A14 should not go through the green space as if it were a corridor.	Noted. The route of any access roads is a matter of detailed design which will be considered in the Area Action Plan.	
1437 1910	Object	Infrastructure needs to be defined and in place before not after construction of town. Traffic measures should be solved and bypasses built before any work is carried out.	There are no proposed bypasses as part of the Northstowe development, only access roads. The Northstowe Transport Assessment indicates that an additional study is needed to determine whether a Willingham Bypass is justified as part of the Northstowe development. The district council will look to Cambridgeshire County Council, as the highways authority, for clarification on this issue. The Area Action Plan will detail the phasing requirements for all services, facilities, and infrastructure, including roads, to ensure they are implemented alongside development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1913	Object	How can you even try to pretend that a town of 20,000 people, with no significant improvement to local roads, can have anything other than a massive transport impact on road users from existing local communities? With reference to cyclists, the B1050 is dangerous, there are no real cycle routes currently (and these will never take many people in real terms). If cycleways use the Cambridge model (shared pavements) they will be shunned and no real advantage.	<p>The Northstowe Transport Assessment considers the wider travel implications for Northstowe. In addition, it is recognised that many villages close to the A14 already suffer with traffic rat-running to the A14. Many are already being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.</p> <p>Cycle provision is considered in NS36 (and CS82). The detailed design and routes of cycleways will be a matter for the Area Action Plan.</p>	
2236	Object	There is inadequate provision for countering the car-culture. For Northstowe to be truly sustainable you need a more radical approach. A blanket speed limit of 20 mph max throughout Northstowe and its access routes. High quality, frequent (7-day) community transport links not only to/from Cambridge/St Ives but also the villages surrounding Northstowe, who will use its facilities. Priority for pedestrians and cyclists.	Chapter 11 of the report outlines a series of measures for addressing the travel needs of Northstowe and providing sustainable alternatives to the car. These include the provision of High Quality Public Transport, and quality walking and cycling networks. The details will be developed in the Area Action Plan.	
3884 - Network Rail (Town Planning Team)	Object	Para 4.16 refers to the new town benefiting from the guided bus and contributing towards the costs. This should be expanded to set out that the new town, along with any other development that feeds more people through Cambridge Station, should contribute to any necessary upgrade to station capacity.	The proposed Guided Bus scheme will provide a direct link to a proposed new station/interchange facility at Chesterton sidings. The LDF will include a policy safeguarding land for the station/interchange and seek developer contributions towards its development, similar to that set out in the Area Transport Plans (SPG). It could be appropriate for the development to contribute towards the costs of developing of such facility, which could help address the capacity issues at Cambridge Station.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3528 3527	Object	The residents of Station Road, Longstanton will find the traffic problems near impossible. What we need is a bypass.	The Northstowe Transport Assessment undertaken by Atkins on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council indicates that an additional study is needed to determine whether a Willingham bypass is justified as part of the Northstowe development. The district council will look to the County Council, as the local highways authority, to undertake such a study.	Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether a Willingham Bypass can be justified as part of the Northstowe development.
3682 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Development at Northstowe should be strictly phased and be dependent upon: -the Guided Bus or alternative transport system becoming operational; and -there being a clearly defined programme of improvements to the A14 as specified in the CHUMMS report; and -the local distributor road network is in place.	Agree. The Area Action Plan will detail the phasing requirements for all services, facilities, and infrastructure, including roads, to ensure they are implemented alongside development.	
3870	Object	There are NEW PLANS put a main road into the Development along this part of the Oakington side of the Dry Drayton Road. This road is already stretched, if this becomes a major road to the new town it will in fact make houses along it unliveable.	NS29 and NS30 propose a series of primary access roads into Northstowe, and both include a link from Dry Drayton Road. This link is proposed to disperse traffic wanting to access the A14 onto two routes, the other being along Hattons Road, rather than relying upon a single access road which may become overburdened. The Northstowe Transport Assessment considers the travel implications for Northstowe and its recommendations include both access routes to the A14. It is recognised that many villages close to the A14 already suffer with traffic rat-running to the A14. Many are already being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3194 2317 1960 1799 1961 5334 1605	Object	The Northstowe development should not be allowed to go ahead prior to the much needed improvements to the A14.	<p>Agree that the upgrade of the A14 is vital for the full development of Northstowe, given the existing traffic conditions along the corridor. The district council will require guarantees that the A14 upgrade will be implemented. The Highways Agency have indicated a start date for the improvement works in 2008 and the district council will seek assurance that the first phase of works will be between Bar Hill and Girton, the most congested stretch.</p> <p>Some development may be able to proceed before the A14 upgrade is completed as it will take more than a year after the development commences before houses will be available for occupation and completion rates will take a year or two to get up to full speed.</p> <p>The Area Action Plan should indicate that any planning application for Northstowe should be able to demonstrate that travel conditions will not significantly worsen the existing conditions, even if this means the developers putting in infrastructure in advance of the Highways Agency. For example, this could be the provision of a parallel distributor road, improvements to junctions and the links to the parallel road.</p>	Seek assurances that the A14 upgrade works will begin to be implemented in 2008 and that the first phase will be the stretch between Bar Hill and Girton.
4433 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Para 11.9</p> <p>The Council considers that the B1050 may have a role as a long term route between Cambridge Sub-Region and the Fens including a Willingham by-pass. This will require further investigation. The road layout for Northstowe should provide a junction or spur with potential to be linked into a future Willingham by-pass.</p>	<p>The Northstowe Transport Assessment undertaken by Atkins on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council indicates that an additional study is needed to determine whether a Willingham bypass is justified as part of the Northstowe development. The district council will look to the County Council, as the local highways authority, to undertake such a study. The road layout, and any potential spur for a Willingham Bypass, is a matter of detailed design for the Area Action Plan.</p>	Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether a Willingham Bypass can be justified as part of the Northstowe development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1869 - Cambridgeshire ACRE 5217 - Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council 4833	Object	Consideration needs to be taken into account of the potential increase in the amount of through traffic in surrounding villages.	A Northstowe Transport Assessment has been undertaken, which considers the wider travel implications for Northstowe. In addition, it is recognised that many villages close to the A14 already suffer with traffic rat-running to the A14. Many are already being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.	
5670 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	With regard to paragraph 11.9: Para 11.9 of the Northstowe Area Action Plan states that it is not appropriate for a Willingham by-pass to be considered as a requirement of the development of Northstowe. Whilst it is true that the existing volume of rush hour traffic through the village is dangerous and unacceptable, it is a nonsense to suggest that the construction of more than six thousand homes, one or two miles south of Willingham, will not place more pressure on the B1050. The LDF should address traffic issues more completely.	The Northstowe Transport Assessment undertaken by Atkins on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council indicates that an additional study is needed to determine whether a Willingham bypass is justified as part of the Northstowe development. The district council will look to the County Council, as the local highways authority, to undertake such a study.	Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether a Willingham Bypass can be justified as part of the Northstowe development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1365	Support	There needs to be greater consideration given to limiting the impact of Northstowe traffic running through surrounding fen roads. If the A14 does not get upgraded or becomes congested all Northstowe traffic will simply fight its way through the surrounding B roads. There is no consideration of the traffic increase which will want to travel to Ely/A10. Much of this commuter traffic will run through surrounding villages unless the Northstowe proposal take this into account.	<p>Agree that there is already a problem of traffic running through villages close to the A14. This is why many villages are being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Village Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan. The schemes to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the local Parish Council.</p> <p>The upgrade of the A14 is vital for the full development of Northstowe, given the existing traffic conditions along the corridor. The district council will require guarantees that the A14 upgrade will be implemented. The Highways Agency have indicated a start date for the improvement works in 2008 and the district council will seek assurance that the first phase of works will be between Bar Hill and Girton, the most congested stretch.</p>	
1766	Support	Public transport must be of a high quality; people moving to Northstowe must have faith that 2 or even 3 car ownership is not required and that alternatives are easily available.	Support noted. This is addressed in more detail in NS34.	
2985	Support	Agree strongly with the part about the main road network links minimising the impact of traffic generation on surrounding communities. In particular there should be no direct road connection from the New Town to Oakington; there is already a significant amount of commute traffic that goes through Oakington on a daily basis.	Support noted. This issue is dealt with in more detail in NS31-NS33.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3441 - English Partnerships	Support	This policy should refer to the Core strategy policy CS78, the fourth bullet point should be amended to state that development should be within a reasonable distance of a high quality public transport stops/good quality public transport stop. This accessibility requirement should not be restricted to residential development. Further detailing can be achieved through the masterplan and transport assessment process.	Support noted. The issue of accessibility to public transport and distance to stops for all development is dealt with in more detail in NS34.	
4426 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the transport objectives for Northstowe, as set out in the preferred approach. However, suggest following amendments; - Amendment to NS 28 first bullet point Add schools to main areas of activity. - Amendment to NS28 second bullet point Add "open countryside and the existing public rights of way network". - Amendment to NS28, final bullet point To identify the appropriate stages in the development when transport infrastructure and services will be provided.	General support noted. NS28 sets out the overarching objectives for travel at Northstowe and the detail is provided in subsequent policies. Therefore, it is not necessary to list all of the "main areas of activities". Agree, the second bullet should be amended to include access to the wider Rights of Way network. Agree, the last bullet should be amended to include phasing of services as well as infrastructure.	Amend the 2nd bullet to read "to develop an improved RIGHTS OF WAY network of paths..." Amend final bullet to read "...when SERVICES and transport infrastructure will need to be provided".
4639 - Sport England	Support	Sport England supports the first three objectives relating to the provision of walking routes and cycleways, as they would encourage active physical recreation, which would accord with Sport England's objective of encouraging greater participation in physical activity. The second objective would also promote increased access to the countryside, which is consistent with Sport England's policy (Policy Objective 21 in Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy statement, November 1999) on access to the countryside.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6415 - The Countryside Agency	Support	We welcome the objective to develop an improved network of paths for walking and cycling to connect the town to neighbouring villages and the open countryside.	Support noted.	
6266 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	<p>In large part the transport objectives set out in NS28 are supported by Gallagher.</p> <p>The following clarifications may however be helpful and reflect the work of the Transport Topic Group.</p> <p>In bullet one reference should in addition be made to linkages from homes to public transport interchanges and waiting facilities.</p> <p>In bullet three a caveat might be helpfully introduced to refer to a reasonable level of secure cycle parking facilities appropriate to each land use. It would be misleading to create the impression that secure cycle parking would be appropriate at all destinations or origins. Provision for cycle parking at all homes, for instance, would not be appropriate.</p> <p>In bullets four and six the reference to a loop might be misleading implying a circular local operation. A better approach would simply be to refer to a dedicated bus way linked to the guided bus route.</p>	<p>General support noted.</p> <p>Agree, bullet one should include reference to pedestrian links to public transport as well as service areas.</p> <p>Cycle parking will be in accordance with the Cycle Parking Standards in Local Plan 2004, which it is proposed to roll forward into the Travel Chapter of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Agree that for the sake of clarity that references to the "Local Bus Loop" should instead refer to a dedicated busway linked to the Guided Bus route.</p>	<p>Amend 1st bullet to read "...routes within the town linking homes to PUBLIC TRANSPORT and the main areas of activity..."</p> <p>Roll forward the Local Plan 2004 Cycle Parking Standards into the Core Strategy Travel Chapter.</p> <p>Amend 4th and 6th bullets - references to the "Local Bus Loop" should refer instead to a "dedicated busway".</p>

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS28 Transport Objectives - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Amend 1st bullet to read "...routes within the town linking homes to PUBLIC TRANSPORT and the main areas of activity..."

Amend the 2nd bullet to read "to develop an improved RIGHTS OF WAY network of paths..."

Amend 4th and 6th bullets - references to the "Local Bus Loop" should refer instead to a "dedicated busway".

Amend final bullet to read "...when SERVICES and transport infrastructure will need to be provided".

Other actions proposed:

Seek assurances that the A14 upgrade works will begin to be implemented in 2008 and that the first phase will be the stretch between Bar Hill and Girton.

Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether a Willingham Bypass can be justified as part of the Northstowe development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS29 Sites A and B - Road Access - Preferred Approach</i>				
1283 2477	Object	A road from Northstowe to Dry Drayton road, will leave drivers with the option to turn towards Oakington and Girton to reach Cambridge, and will impact very severely on us.	<p>NS29 and NS30 propose a series of primary access roads into Northstowe, and both include a link from Dry Drayton Road. This link is proposed to disperse traffic wanting to access the A14 onto two routes, the other being along Hattons Road, rather than relying upon a single access road which may become overburdened. The Northstowe Transport Assessment considers the travel implications for Northstowe and its recommendations include both access routes to the A14.</p> <p>Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running.</p> <p>It is recognised that many villages close to the A14 already suffer with traffic rat-running to the A14. Many are already being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.</p>	
2089 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 1916	Object	Willingham needs a bypass.	<p>The Northstowe Transport Assessment undertaken by Atkins on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council indicates that an additional study is needed to determine whether a Willingham bypass is justified as part of the Northstowe development. The district council will look to the County Council, as the local highways authority, to undertake such a study.</p>	<p>Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether a Willingham Bypass can be justified as part of the Northstowe development.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2092 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 1220 1792	Object	The A14 must be improved before the development of Northstowe commences	<p>Agree that the upgrade of the A14 is vital for the full development of Northstowe, given the existing traffic conditions along the corridor. The district council will require guarantees that the A14 upgrade will be implemented. The Highways Agency have indicated a start date for the improvement works in 2008 and the district council will seek assurance that the first phase of works will be between Bar Hill and Girton, the most congested stretch.</p> <p>Some development may be able to proceed before the A14 upgrade is completed as it will take more than a year after the development commences before houses will be available for occupation and completion rates will take a year or two to get up to full speed.</p> <p>The Area Action Plan should indicate that any planning application for Northstowe should be able to demonstrate that travel conditions will not significantly worsen the existing conditions, even if this means the developers putting in infrastructure in advance of the Highways Agency. For example, this could be the provision of a parallel distributor road, improvements to junctions and the links to the parallel road.</p>	Seek assurances from the Highways Agency that the A14 upgrade works will begin to be implemented in 2008 and that the first phase will be the stretch between Bar Hill and Girton.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2090 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to bullet point 1 of option NS29 in so far as it makes no recommendations for the implementation of provisions for Longstanton's pedestrians and cyclists' safety at any future Longstanton/Hattons road junction layout: the Parish Plan Survey already records a very high level of concern from a majority of residents concerning the present speed, volume of traffic and dangerous spots for pedestrians, children and cyclists on Longstanton's Hattons Road.	These comments are a matter of detailed design to be addressed in the Area Action Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2086 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to paragraph 11.3/NS29 in so far as the majority of respondent think the Parallel Road to the A14 should be built even before the Home Farm development in Longstanton, let alone the Northstowe development. Many residents expressed grave concerns about the lack of a properly integrated road infrastructure prior to development - quote: To build Northstowe without the infrastructure in place before is madness.	<p>Agree that the upgrade of the A14 is vital for the full development of Northstowe, given the existing traffic conditions along the corridor. The district council will require guarantees that the A14 upgrade will be implemented. The Highways Agency have indicated a start date for the improvement works in 2008 and the district council will seek assurance that the first phase of works will be between Bar Hill and Girton, the most congested stretch.</p> <p>Some development may be able to proceed before the A14 upgrade is completed as it will take more than a year after the development commences before houses will be available for occupation and completion rates will take a year or two to get up to full speed.</p> <p>The Area Action Plan should indicate that any planning application for Northstowe should be able to demonstrate that travel conditions will not significantly worsen the existing conditions, even if this means the developers putting in infrastructure in advance of the Highways Agency. For example, this could be the provision of a parallel distributor road, improvements to junctions and the links to the parallel road.</p> <p>The Home Farm development already has planning permission, and will provide the Longstanton West Bypass. The bypass will form part of the integrated road infrastructure for Northstowe, to help alleviate traffic impact on the village.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3442 - English Partnerships	Object	The preferred status of (Option A) should not preclude the use of the B1050 north of the railway as a potential future access to the development.	Site A is contained to the south of the former St Ives railway line. The Northstowe Transport Assessment does not consider it necessary, nor is it desirable, to include a primary road access from the B1050 north of the railway line. Given that Cambridgeshire County Council would not want any further breaks in the Guided Bus guideway, as this would undermine the Guided Bus proposals, this would require the construction of a bridge over the line, which would need to be high enough to clear double-decker buses. This would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area, which would be difficult to mitigate.	
3188	Object	Access should be direct from A14 - no encouragement should be made for Northstowe traffic to use village access roads apart from the detrimental affect on residents living on Dry Drayton with regard to increase noise, traffic, pollution and safety issues it will also provide alternative 'rat run' access routes to Northstowe and adjoining villages.	<p>The A14 is part of the trunk road network and upgrading work will be undertaken by the Highways Agency, beginning in 2008. As part of the upgrading works, it is likely that there will be a programme of junction rationalisation. Therefore, it is unlikely that the Highways Agency will permit any further access points directly onto the A14.</p> <p>The details for the proposed primary access routes in NS29, onto Hattons Road and Dry Drayton Road will be looked at in more detail in the Area Action Plan. The district council will continue to work closely with the Highways Agency to establish the most suitable means of access for these routes to the A14, which may be via a parallel road.</p> <p>In addition, it is recognised that many villages close to the A14 already suffer with traffic rat-running to the A14. Many are already being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.</p>	Continue to work closely with the Highways Agency to establish the most suitable means of access to the A14.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3754 - GO-East	Object	<p>Paragraph 11.2: Primary Road Access</p> <p>The third bullet point identifies that Longstanton bypass will be provided by Home farm development. It therefore follows that if our preferred Site Option B is pursued, a new alignment will be needed for part of the bypass, and presumably some contribution from Northstowe would be required. This issue will need to be clarified in the submission DPD.</p>	<p>If Site B is chosen, the detailed design of any access roads into the development area west of the B1050 will need to be considered. This may, or may not, require the realignment of the Longstanton West Bypass and developer contributions, and this would need to be clarified in the Area Action Plan.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4831	Object	The proposed road accesses from the new town are not only unsustainable, but would also add to congestion on the local roads in Longstanton and Oakington, causing increased noise and pollution to local communities. The Structure Plan failed to consider existing through traffic generated from north of Willingham to the A14 and from B1049 north of Cottenham through Histon and Oakington to the A14 or Cambridge.	<p>NS29 and NS30 (depending upon the site chosen) propose a series of primary access roads to serve Northstowe. In addition, NS31 - NS33 consider whether further access is desirable north of Oakington. All these access roads have been considered in light of the need to reduce the traffic impact on surrounding villages. For example, an access road north of Oakington could act as an informal bypass to the village and remove rat-running traffic.</p> <p>With regards future levels of traffic from the north, the Northstowe Transport Assessment undertaken by Atkins on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council indicates that an additional study is needed to determine whether a Willingham bypass is justified as part of the Northstowe development. The district council will look to the County Council, as the local highways authority, to undertake such a study.</p> <p>It is recognised that many villages close to the A14 already suffer with traffic rat-running to the A14. Many are already being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4738 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	<p>The point at which the new road would join Dry Drayton Road, Oakington is key. We believe that the only point at which it would be acceptable is directly on to a new junction at, or near to the existing A14 junction, or to a new local road alongside the A14 that is presently being considered as part of the CHUMMS recommendation.</p> <p>We would be very strongly opposed to any new road any closer to Oakington because it would greatly worsen rather than minimise the increasingly problematical rat running through our village.</p>	<p>Agree that the location and design of access road junctions onto the existing highway network needs careful consideration. Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running.</p>	
885	Support	I trust SCDC view on this.	Support noted.	
899	Support	The best route by far.	Support noted.	
1367	Support	<p>I assume this directs traffic to the A14, the document does make this clear. It is vital that measures are adopted to minimise traffic impacts on nearby villages (both speed and size of traffic). The A14 is designed for commuter traffic, the local road network is not.</p>	<p>Support noted. Text at paragraphs 11.2 to 11.5 explain that the links roads are needed to provide adequate access to the A14, avoiding local villages. The surrounding villages are being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Village Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the local Parish Council.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3034	Support	Whilst acknowledging the proposed main access points, one of the obvious and overriding issues is that sufficient progress is achieved with the improvements to the A14. Unless a suitable solution (presumably in line with the CHUMMS Report) is provided then the Northstowe development can surely not proceed.	<p>Agree that the upgrade of the A14 is vital for the full development of Northstowe, given the existing traffic conditions along the corridor. The district council will require guarantees that the A14 upgrade will be implemented. The Highways Agency have indicated a start date for the improvement works in 2008 and the district council will seek assurance that the first phase of works will be between Bar Hill and Girton, the most congested stretch.</p> <p>Some development may be able to proceed before the A14 upgrade is completed as it will take more than a year after the development commences before houses will be available for occupation and completion rates will take a year or two to get up to full speed.</p> <p>The Area Action Plan should indicate that any planning application for Northstowe should be able to demonstrate that travel conditions will not significantly worsen the existing conditions, even if this means the developers putting in infrastructure in advance of the Highways Agency. For example, this could be the provision of a parallel distributor road, improvements to junctions and the links to the parallel road.</p>	Seek assurances from the Highways Agency that the A14 upgrade works will begin to be implemented in 2008 and that the first phase will be the stretch between Bar Hill and Girton.
2526	Support	Local roads are already congested, commute times to and from Cambs & Hunts have already increased. NS29 is a must.	Support noted.	
2990	Support	Support but needs link road off Station Road north of the railway line to. And should bypass Westwick and Oakington.	Support noted. The other links are addressed in NS31-NS33.	
4427 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the suggested approach subject to proposals of the Highways Agency for upgrading the A14.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5440	Support	Most important item in whole document. If don't get access right Northstowe will fail.	Support noted.	
6267 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	The proposals set out in NS29 are supported. Technical appraisals confirm the preferred approach as the most appropriate access arrangement for Northstowe and is consistent with the discussions that have taken place in the Transportation Topic Group. Nevertheless a helpful clarification would be to make clear that the Longstanton West Bypass is a requirement of the Home Farm development and not of the new town.	Support noted. Text at paragraph 11.2, bullet point 3, already states that the Longstanton West Bypass is to be provided by the Home Farm development.	

Decision on NS29 Sites A and B - Road Access - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, if Sites A or B are chosen.

Actions proposed:

Seek assurances from the Highways Agency that the A14 upgrade works will begin to be implemented in 2008 and that the first phase will be the stretch between Bar Hill and Girton.

Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether a Willingham Bypass can be justified as part of the Northstowe development.

Continue to work closely with the Highways Agency to establish the most suitable means of access to the A14.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS30 Site C - Road Access - Preferred Approach</i>				
1031	Object	I object to this because we have trouble enough gaining access to the B1050 from our property (north of the railway-east of B1050). For that reason, more traffic on the B1050 will only be a disaster and turn our frequent (unreported) minor accidents into more serious ones.	The Northstowe Transport Assessment undertaken by Atkins on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council indicates that an additional study is needed to determine whether a Willingham bypass is justified as part of the Northstowe development. The district council will look to the County Council, as the local highways authority, to undertake such a study.	Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether a Willingham Bypass can be justified as part of the Northstowe development.
1079 900	Object	Site C should not be built and therefore neither should access.	Objection noted.	
1284	Object	A road from Northstowe onto the Dry Drayton road will impact VERY severely on us. Increased traffic with resulting noise, pollution, danger to my children who have to cross this road to catch their bus to school. The value of our property will be seriously affected.	NS29 and NS30 propose a series of primary access roads into Northstowe, and both include a link from Dry Drayton Road. This link is proposed to disperse traffic wanting to access the A14 onto two routes, the other being along Hattons Road, rather than relying upon a single access road which may become overburdened. The Northstowe Transport Assessment considers the travel implications for Northstowe and its recommendations include both access routes to the A14. Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running. It is recognised that many villages close to the A14 already suffer with traffic rat-running to the A14. Many are already being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2094 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to NS30: in the parish Plan Survey there is overwhelming support for an integrated solution to the issue of road access, extending to the question of local bypasses.	<p>The Longstanton West Bypass is being provided as part of the Home Farm Development.</p> <p>The Northstowe Transport Assessment undertaken by Atkins on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council indicates that an additional study is needed to determine whether a Willingham bypass is justified as part of the Northstowe development. The district council will look to the County Council, as the local highways authority, to undertake such a study.</p> <p>The provision of an access road north of Oakington can act as an informal bypass for Oakington and help reduce the amount of traffic in the villages. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through the villages, thus exacerbating existing traffic problems.</p>	
3443 - English Partnerships	Object	The preferred status of (Option A) should not preclude the use of the B1050 north of the railway as a potential future access to the development.	Site A is contained to the south of the former St Ives railway line. The Northstowe Transport Assessment does not consider it necessary, nor is it desirable, to include a primary road access from the B1050 north of the railway line. Given that Cambridgeshire County Council would not want any further breaks in the Guided Bus guideway, as this would undermine the Guided Bus proposals, this would require the construction of a bridge over the line, which would need to be high enough to clear double-decker buses. This would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area, which would be difficult to mitigate.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3190	Object	Access should be direct from A14 - no encouragement should be made for Northstowe traffic to use village access roads apart from the detrimental affect on residents living on Dry Drayton with regard to increase noise, traffic, pollution and safety issues it will also provide alternative 'rat run' access routes to Northstowe and adjoining villages.	The A14 is part of the trunk road network and upgrading work will be undertaken by the Highways Agency, beginning in 2008. As part of the upgrading works, it is likely that there will be a programme of junction rationalisation. Therefore, it is unlikely that the Highways Agency will permit any further access points directly onto the A14. The details for the proposed primary access routes in NS29, onto Hattons Road and Dry Drayton Road will be looked at in more detail in the Area Action Plan. The district council will continue to work closely with the Highways Agency to establish the most suitable means of access for these routes to the A14, which may be via a parallel road. In addition, it is recognised that many villages close to the A14 already suffer with traffic rat-running to the A14. Many are already being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.	Continue to work closely with the Highways Agency to establish the most suitable means of access to the A14.
4428 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council cannot support this site boundary and therefore cannot support the site access arrangements.	Noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4832	Object	The proposed road accesses from the new town are not only unsustainable, but would also add to congestion on the local roads in Longstanton and Oakington, causing increased noise and pollution to local communities. The Structure Plan failed to consider existing through traffic generated from north of Willingham to the A14 and from B1049 north of Cottenham through Histon and Oakington to the A14 or Cambridge.	NS29 and NS30 (depending upon the site chosen) propose a series of primary access roads to serve Northstowe. In addition, NS31 - NS33 consider whether further access is desirable north of Oakington. All these access roads have been considered in light of the need to reduce the traffic impact on surrounding villages. For example, an access road north of Oakington could act as an informal bypass to the village and remove rat-running traffic. With regards future levels of traffic from the north, the Northstowe Transport Assessment undertaken by Atkins on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council indicates that an additional study is needed to determine whether a Willingham bypass is justified as part of the Northstowe development. The district council will look to the County Council, as the local highways authority, to undertake such a study. It is recognised that many villages close to the A14 already suffer with traffic rat-running to the A14. Many are already being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4739 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	<p>The point at which the new road would join Dry Drayton Road, Oakington is key. We believe that the only point at which it would be acceptable is directly on to a new junction at, or near to the existing A14 junction, or to a new local road alongside the A14 that is presently being considered as part of the CHUMMS recommendation.</p> <p>We would be very strongly opposed to any new road any closer to Oakington because it would greatly worsen rather than minimise the increasingly problematical rat running through our village.</p>	<p>Agree that the location and design of access road junctions onto the existing highway network needs careful consideration. Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running.</p>	
6268 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Comments relating to NS30 should be read in conjunction with those for Site Option C. Site Option C results in a detrimental physical relationship with the remainder of Northstowe.</p> <p>Crossing the CGB in more than one location presents a fundamental physical barrier, restricting opportunities for access and linkage.</p> <p>The suggested access solution in NS30, providing an additional access point from the B1050 is untested. The impact on local amenity been not been considered. It seems unlikely that there are adequate land controls to deliver this option. It delivers no benefit to the town overall, presents enormous practical difficulties and would be contrary to good planning and town building.</p>	<p>If Site C is chosen, the Northstowe Transport Assessment shows there is a need for an access to serve development from the B1050 north of the railway line. The route, as with all access roads, is a matter of detailed design for the Area Action Plan. By implication, there will need to be internal road connections between development on both sides of the railway line. However, NS30 does not address internal road layouts and this would be a matter of detail to be addressed in the Area Action Plan.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1369	Support	The document does not identify the names of roads but I assume this will direct traffic to the A14. Northstowe will create a lot of commuter traffic and so it is vital local roads are made unattractive to rat running.	Support noted. Text at paragraphs 11.2 to 11.5 explain that the links roads are needed to provide adequate access to the A14, avoiding local villages. The surrounding villages are being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the local Parish Council.	
1949 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	This is a complicated situation, and the impact of Northstowe on traffic flows seems to have been largely ignored in this report. On the one hand, and relating to Willingham, it is stated that "any need for a bypass would not be as a result of the development of Northstowe, but would be caused by traffic travelling to and from the fens irrespective of the development of Northstowe". Cottenham is already a 'rat run' for the A10 to and from the fens, and a significant volume of traffic uses the existing road via Oakington and Westwick.	<p>The Northstowe Transport Assessment undertaken by Atkins on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council indicates that an additional study is needed to determine whether a Willingham bypass is justified as part of the Northstowe development. The district council will look to the County Council, as the local highways authority, to undertake such a study.</p> <p>The provision of an access road north of Oakington can act as an informal bypass for Oakington and help reduce the amount of traffic in the villages. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through the villages, thus exacerbating existing traffic problems.</p>	Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether a Willingham Bypass can be justified as part of the Northstowe development.

Decision on NS30 Site C - Road Access - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, if Site C is chosen.

Actions proposed:

Continue to work closely with the Highways Agency to establish the most suitable means of access to the A14.

Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether a Willingham Bypass can be justified as part of the Northstowe development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS31 Additional Road Access to Station Road, Oakington - Option A - Alternative Option</i>				
2615 - Oakington Riding School	Object	Ponies and cars do not mix. Oakington Riding School have used Station Road to access Westwick fields for 25 years. Westwick fields is the last remaining traffic-free area of open countryside, which has been used by thousands of young people in the riding school, over the years. It must be preserved at all costs. Young people need space and fresh air and countryside for their health, recreation and to improve their riding skills. The riding school could not possibly function without this area being preserved.	The provision of an access road north of Oakington can act as an informal bypass for Oakington and help reduce the amount of traffic in the villages. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through the villages, thus exacerbating existing traffic problems. Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running. The route from Station Road, Oakington would be preferable as it should be less detrimental to the locality than one from Cottenham Road, and it will be for the detailed design to mitigate any potential impacts.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3743 - GO-East	Object	<p>NS 31, 32 & 33: Additional Road Access</p> <p>Without a clear indication of the proposed route of each of these options it is difficult to judge the impact that each would have. This is especially so in regard of NS31, which we feel, contrary to the Initial Sustainability Report's assessment could actually increase traffic through Oakington. However, and in light of your comments at paragraph 11.7 regarding the requirement to offer improvement to the village of Westwick, GO East would support, at this stage, NS32: Additional Road Access to Cottenham Road, Westwick. There will need to be more certainty and justification of the chosen approach in the submission DPD.</p>	<p>Agree that it is difficult to judge the impacts of each route without the details, however, the Preferred Options report only establishes the principles and not the detail. The detail is for the Area Action Plan.</p> <p>The provision of an access road north of Oakington can act as an informal bypass for Oakington and help reduce the amount of traffic in the villages. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through the villages, thus exacerbating existing traffic problems.</p> <p>Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running.</p> <p>The route from Station Road, Oakington would be preferable as it should be less detrimental to the locality than one from Cottenham Road, and it will be for the detailed design to mitigate any potential impacts.</p>	
3692 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Object.	Objection noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1953 - Cottenham Parish Council 3058 3551 2995 3002 2969 3580 2153 2093 1371 1793 1767 4972 2160 4975 1003	Object	This road could have the potential to lead to rat running through the villages and through Northstowe.	<p>The provision of an access road north of Oakington can act as an informal bypass for Oakington and Westwick and help reduce the amount of traffic in the villages. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through the villages, thus exacerbating existing traffic problems.</p> <p>Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running. Likewise, there can be careful consideration and design of the roads within Northstowe.</p> <p>The route from Station Road, Oakington would be preferable as it should be less detrimental to the locality than one from Cottenham Road, and it will be for the detailed design to determine the route and mitigate any potential impacts.</p>	
4740 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	This Option, is ruled out on the basis that when Northstowe was first being considered, and on numerous occasions since, all concerned from Central and through Local Government have assured us at Council and Public Meetings that Northstowe would not significantly increase traffic through our village.	<p>The provision of an access road north of Oakington can act as an informal bypass for Oakington and Westwick and help reduce the amount of traffic in the villages. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through the villages, thus exacerbating existing traffic problems. Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running. The route from Station Road, Oakington would be preferable as it should be less detrimental to the locality than one from Cottenham Road, and it will be for the detailed design to mitigate any potential impacts.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
901	Support	The best route.	Support noted.	
1484	Support	I strongly support this option because it is an alternative route in the event of accidents elsewhere and will reduce volume of traffic on other roads.	Support noted.	
2529 2110 2009 886	Support	The extra access road will reduce traffic movements in other villages.	Support noted.	
4429 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support (subject to further evaluation) In principle this approach is supported. However traffic modelling undertaken on behalf of the Council has indicated that a direct link north of Oakington would tend to attract traffic travelling from Cottenham towards Bar Hill, which would continue the journey through the southern part of Northstowe. Traffic between Oakington and Girton would also be expected to increase significantly as this would provide a convenient route from Northstowe into Cambridge. It would therefore be helpful to indicate that some form of traffic management would be needed to reduce the attraction of this as a through route. The County Council suggests a further joint study of this access option.	General support noted. The provision of an access road north of Oakington can act as an informal bypass for Oakington and help reduce the amount of traffic in the villages. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through the villages, thus exacerbating existing traffic problems. Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running. The route from Station Road, Oakington would be preferable as it should be less detrimental to the locality than one from Cottenham Road, and it will be for the detailed design to mitigate any potential impacts.	
5443	Support	Support.	Support noted.	
6269 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Although not required in terms of access, a link into the street network of the new town from Station Road would be supported. The analysis to date suggests that this link, with appropriate engineering design, would result in significant benefit to Oakington village. Moreover the proposal is deliverable and results in little environmental impact.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS31 Additional Road Access to Station Road, Oakington - Option A - Alternative Option

Develop this option into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS32 Additional Road Access to Cottenham Road, Westwick - Option B - Alternative Option</i>				
1373	Object	The link from Cottenham to Westwick/Oakington and then onto A14 is vital for those sending children to Scallywags nursery and those commuters using the A14. This road should not be used for Northstowe commuters aiming to avoid the A14/public transport. Northstowe traffic will if, not controlled, race through the local fen roads and villages of Cottenham & Histon. Traffic speeds and the size of lorry using this road is already a problem and calming measures should be used so that Northstowe does not make things worse in an area where there are children.	<p>Access to the A14 from Northstowe will be provided via access roads onto Hattons Road or Dry Drayton Road (as detailed in NS29). An access road north of Oakington is also considered appropriate to provide access from surrounding villages, such as Cottenham, who's residents will want to access the facilities and services within Northstowe.</p> <p>Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access roads to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running.</p>	
2688 - Oakington Riding School	Object	Ponies and Cars do not mix. Cottenham road and its continuation is an access road to Westwick Fields used by the Riding School for it's hacks. Westwick field is the last remaining traffic-free area of open countryside left for hacks, which has been used by thousands of young people over the last 25 years. This area must be preserved at all costs. Young people need space and fresh air for their health, recreation and to improve their riding skills. The Riding school could not function without this area being preserved.	The provision of an access road north of Oakington can act as an informal bypass for Oakington and Westwick and help reduce the amount of traffic in the villages. The disadvantages of a route from Cottenham Road would be more detrimental to the locality than one from Station Road, Oakington. A significant factor to consider is the need for the route to cross the Guided Bus route. Given that no further breaks in the guideway would be permitted, as this would undermine the viability of the scheme, it would require construction of a bridge high enough to allow double-decker buses beneath. This would be very difficult to mitigate against, particularly in such a sensitive location.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1963 - Cottenham Parish Council	Object	Refer to comments at NS31. Also, if Oakington is to have a bypass on the grounds of taking traffic away from existing communities, then there should also be one for Cottenham. Why is a bypass necessary at Oakington if Northstowe will not generate extra traffic from the Fens? A traffic survey for Cottenham needs to be requested.	An access road north of Oakington could act as an informal bypass to the village, but will primarily be concerned with providing access from surrounding villages, such as Cottenham, wanting to access the facilities and services within Northstowe. However, agree that the potential traffic impact on Cottenham is something that should be looked into as part of the Northstowe Transport Assessment.	Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council, as the local highways authority, whether there will be traffic impacts on Cottenham resulting from Northstowe that need to be mitigated.
3695 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Object.	Objection noted.	
4430 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council does not support the provision of an access road from Cottenham Road, Westwick. In order to cross the Guided Bus way, without adding a break in the guide way, which would have implications for the express service, a bridge would be required. The bridge would need to be high enough to enable double-decker buses to pass beneath. As in option NS31, traffic travelling between Cottenham and Bar Hill would tend to be attracted to travel through the southern part of Northstowe.	The provision of an access road north of Oakington can act as an informal bypass for Oakington and Westwick and help reduce the amount of traffic in the villages. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through the villages, thus exacerbating existing traffic problems. Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running. However, agree that the disadvantages of a route from Cottenham Road would be more detrimental to the locality than one from Station Road, Oakington. A significant factor to consider is the need for the route to cross the Guided Bus route. Given that no further breaks in the guideway would be permitted, as this would undermine the viability of the scheme, it would require construction of a bridge high enough to allow double-decker buses beneath. This would be very difficult to mitigate against, particularly in such a sensitive location.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4742 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 2979 2096 4973 2162 4976	Object	There is already too much traffic through the villages, encouraging any more would be a total disaster. Northstowe needs to have transport links with minimum impact on existing residents in the area. The disadvantages of an access road in this general locality far outweigh the advantages.	<p>The provision of an access road north of Oakington can act as an informal bypass for Oakington and Westwick and help reduce the amount of traffic in the villages. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through the villages, thus exacerbating existing traffic problems. Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running.</p> <p>However, agree that the disadvantages of a route from Cottenham Road would be more detrimental to the locality than one from Station Road, Oakington. A significant factor to consider is the need for the route to cross the Guided Bus route. Given that no further breaks in the guideway would be permitted, as this would undermine the viability of the scheme, it would require construction of a bridge high enough to allow double-decker buses beneath. This would be very difficult to mitigate against, particularly in such a sensitive location.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6270 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The land required to provide the link road falls outside the control of Gallagher and Defence Estates. The ability to deliver this access road is therefore severely compromised by land ownership issues. These include the need to cross the CGB route.</p> <p>Such an access would also require the crossing of existing flood plain. Clarification would be required as to whether this would be regarded as essential infrastructure. Replacement flood capacity would also need to be made. This and the introduction of additional infrastructure into the open countryside would be likely to raise significant environmental disadvantages over the preferred option described in NS31.</p> <p>This option should not be pursued.</p>	<p>Agree that the disadvantages of a route from Cottenham Road would be more detrimental to the locality than one from Station Road, Oakington. A significant factor to consider is the need for the route to cross the Guided Bus route. Given that no further breaks in the guideway would be permitted, as this would undermine the viability of the scheme, it would require construction of a bridge high enough to allow double-decker buses beneath. This would be very difficult to mitigate against, particularly in such a sensitive location.</p>	
1794	Support	<p>However, this would only make sense as part of an Oakington bypass designed to ensure that all the Ely/Cottenham traffic heading to the A14/Cambridge uses the main trunk roads rather than the village "rat-runs". However, I fear that the A14 will be totally incapable of handling all this extra traffic and the result will be chaos.</p>	<p>Support noted. Oakington is being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council. Provision of an access road into Northstowe in this location could act as a bypass and, coupled with the traffic calming measures, could reduce the amount of traffic rat-running through the villages.</p>	
1995	Support	<p>Diversion of through traffic away from Oakington should be done as soon as possible. Oakington is currently used as a rat-run and should be provided with traffic calming measures such as have been recently done in Dry Drayton. Speed Humps should NOT be used.</p>	<p>Support noted. Oakington is being traffic calmed as part of the CHUMMS A14 Traffic Calming measures being funded through the Local Transport Plan and the details of the scheme to be implemented will be agreed in consultation with the Parish Council.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2012 1589	Support	The need to travel from Northstowe to Cottenham and beyond should be catered for, however, there should be no right turn from this access road to Oakington.	Support noted.	
2830 2018 2916 858 887	Support	The extra access road will reduce traffic movements in other villages.	Support noted.	
2997 3015	Support	Support this option provided it is located on the Cottenham side of Westwick to prevent additional traffic and safety hazards through this narrow hamlet, it is located to the north of Westwick, and the new access is designed also to act as a by-pass to Oakington and Westwick for traffic travelling between Cottenham and the A14.	Support noted. The route of any access road and location of any access points onto the existing road network is a matter of detail which will be addressed in the Area Action Plan.	
3744 - GO-East	Support	NS 31, 32 & 33: Additional Road Access Without a clear indication of the proposed route of each of these options it is difficult to judge the impact that each would have. This is especially so in regard of NS31, which we feel, contrary to the Initial Sustainability Report's assessment could actually increase traffic through Oakington. However, and in light of your comments at paragraph 11.7 regarding the requirement to offer improvement to the village of Westwick, GO East would support, at this stage, NS32: Additional Road Access to Cottenham Road, Westwick. There will need to be more certainty and justification of the chosen approach in the submission DPD.	Support noted. The route of any access road and location of any access points onto the existing road network is a matter of detail which will be addressed in the Area Action Plan.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS32 Additional Road Access to Cottenham Road, Westwick - Option B - Alternative Option

This option is rejected.

Action proposed:

Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council, as the local highways authority, whether there will be traffic impacts on Cottenham resulting from Northstowe that need to be mitigated.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS33 Additional Road Access to Cottenham Road, Westwick - Option C - Alternative Option</i>				
888	Object	Option C is not for the benefit of Rampton.	Agree that a road access should be provided north of Oakington, given that residents from surrounding villages, such as Cottenham, will want to access the facilities and services within Northstowe. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through Oakington and Westwick or through Rampton. Therefore, an access road could ease access into Northstowe and deter traffic from rat-running through Rampton.	
1375	Object	If no additional road access is being provided where is the Northstowe traffic coming from? There is no map for a reader to understand this option. Traffic calming needs to be provided on Cottenham road because it is going to take more traffic once Northstowe is built e.g. how will Northstowe residents travel to Ely/A10. The connections must not be lost from Cottenham to Westwick/Oakington (e.g. jobs and nursery) and A14 (commuter route), but people must be encouraged to use public transport and calming is needed to slow traffic and reduce lorry sizes.	Options NS29 and NS30 provided two alternatives for the primary road connections for Northstowe, for example, providing access to the A14. NS31 and NS32 provided two alternatives for an additional access to the north of Oakington. No maps were provided to accompany these options as the detailed routes for these road links will be determined in the Area Action Plan. Agree that a road access should be provided north of Oakington, given that residents from surrounding villages, such as Cottenham, will want to access the facilities and services within Northstowe. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through Oakington and Westwick onto the Dry Drayton Road access road. Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2097 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object strongly to 11.9/NS33 that it is not appropriate for the issue [of the Willingham bypass] to be considered as a requirement of the development of Northstowe in the Area Action Plan. On the contrary, in the Parish Plan Survey comments have been clearly made about the necessity for a real bypass, as a common aim for the villages close to Northstowe now served by the B1050.	The Northstowe Transport Assessment undertaken by Atkins on behalf of Cambridgeshire County Council indicates that an additional study is needed to determine whether a Willingham bypass is justified as part of the Northstowe development. The district council will look to the County Council, as the local highways authority, to undertake such a study.	Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether a Willingham Bypass can be justified as part of the Northstowe development.
3001	Object	Strongly Object. There is already a serious amount of rat-running through Oakington. Once the traffic calming measures are in place, the current problems will actually get worse - as traffic flow will be (unfortunately) reduced. [Yes it is good that traffic flow is reduced due to lower average speeds for the safety of our children, but unfortunately this will have a counter effect of increasing jams!] Making all New Town traffic from the Cottenham direction pass through Oakington and Westwick will add to the problem that will ensue when the new traffic calming measures are in place.	Agree that a road access should be provided north of Oakington, given that residents from surrounding villages, such as Cottenham, will want to access the facilities and services within Northstowe. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through Oakington and Westwick onto the Dry Drayton Road access road. Therefore, the access road could act as an informal bypass to the villages of Oakington and Westwick. Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3745 - GO-East	Object	<p>NS 31, 32 & 33: Additional Road Access</p> <p>Without a clear indication of the proposed route of each of these options it is difficult to judge the impact that each would have. This is especially so in regard of NS31, which we feel, contrary to the Initial Sustainability Report's assessment could actually increase traffic through Oakington. However, and in light of your comments at paragraph 11.7 regarding the requirement to offer improvement to the village of Westwick, GO East would support, at this stage, NS32: Additional Road Access to Cottenham Road, Westwick. There will need to be more certainty and justification of the chosen approach in the submission DPD.</p>	Noted. The detailed route of any access road is a matter of detailed design for the Area Action Plan.	
2022 5199	Object	This is the ideal opportunity to build a northern bypass of Oakington and Westwick and alleviate the traffic flows.	Agree. NS33, with no provision of an access road, overlooks the opportunity to effectively provide a bypass and alleviate traffic flows through Oakington (Option NS31) or Oakington and Westwick (Option NS32).	
6271 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The provision of no access to, or from, the new town in the direction of Cottenham would leave the new town isolated from the local road network to the east. Whilst such access is not essential in terms of strategic access provision, the opportunities for residents from Cottenham and other local villages to the north to gain access to the new town would seem beneficial.</p> <p>Likewise the benefits that such a connection would provide in terms of a potential bypass for Oakington would also appear to be a significant benefit capable of reducing traffic levels in the village.</p>	Agree that a road access should be provided north of Oakington, given that residents from surrounding villages, such as Cottenham, will want to access the facilities and services within Northstowe. Without an access road, traffic will be forced through Oakington and Westwick onto the Dry Drayton Road access road. Therefore, the access road could act as an informal bypass to the villages of Oakington and Westwick. Measures can be incorporated in the detailed design of the access road to carefully consider junction layout/design, for example, restricted movement junctions, and should be supplemented with appropriate traffic management measures within the villages, to deter rat-running.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1965 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	See comments made at NS30, NS31, NS32. In addition if access is being improved out of Northstowe then it needs to be improved into Cottenham otherwise the route from Rampton Road along the Green and down Histon Road will be used even more as a rat-run. In addition if the facilities at Northstowe are as good as they say they will be more people will want to travel between Cottenham and Northstowe for all sorts of reasons. This already happens as Cottenham people are prepared to travel to Milton, Bar Hill and Histon for various leisure facilities.	Improving the wider local road network could be self defeating, in the it could encourage additional traffic generation. Whilst it is recognised that Northstowe may generate some additional traffic from residents of surrounding villages accessing the town's facilities and services, it is unlikely to be of significant volume from Cottenham to warrant road improvements.	
4744 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 3554 3368 3583 2967 2196 2490 6438 2956	Support	Support. No additional road would reduce the possibility of rat running traffic, noise, light pollution and reduction of the separation.	Support noted.	
2715 - Oakington Riding School	Support	We support no additional road access, since this area is an access point to Westwick Fields, which is the last remaining traffic free area left for Riding School hacks, which has been used by thousands of young people at the Riding school over the last 25 years. It must be preserved at all costs, since young people need space and fresh air for their health, recreation and to improve their riding skills. The Riding School could not possibly function without this area being preserved.	Support noted.	
3696 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Support	Support.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS33 Additional Road Access to Cottenham Road, Westwick - Option C - Alternative Option

This option is rejected.

Action proposed:

Seek clarification from Cambridgeshire County Council as to whether a Willingham Bypass can be justified as part of the Northstowe development.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS34 Public Transport - Preferred Approach</i>				
1918	Object	Get real again, do you seriously think people will walk 400-600m to get a bus?! Also, if "within 600m" is impossible for a location, how can it then be possible to achieve "within 400m"?	<p>400 - 600m walking distance relates to a maximum walk time of 5 - 7.5 minutes for an average person. This is considered acceptable, particularly to access High Quality Public Transport on the Local Bus Loop. Services on this route will be a better quality, not only in terms of frequency, but also the quality of infrastructure etc. than conventional bus services.</p> <p>NS34 recognises that a balance needs to be struck between making all development accessible to the Local Bus Loop and making the route too long and arduous that it defeats its purpose of providing HQPT services. Therefore, any development that wouldn't be within 600m of the Local Bus Loop should be within 400m, and served by, conventional local bus stops.</p>	
3381 1004	Object	References to Guided Bus should be deleted and replace with a suitable alternative based on the railway corridor.	The former St Ives Railway corridor is safeguarded in the Local Plan 2004 for the development of a Rapid Transit system. It is proposed to roll forward this policy into the LDF. If Guided Bus were not developed, the corridor should be utilised for another form of public transportation system.	Roll forward Local Plan 2004 policy TP3 into the Core Strategy Travel chapter.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3061	Object	A bus is just a bus. Only a system that provides faster travel, door to door, than by car can be future proofed and be used in preference to private cars. If workable, why are high speed bus lanes not already in use within the city? If successful there will be logical pressure to build along the entire length of the track, making nonsense of present planning. The running costs will become a huge burden on ratepayers because it will have to compete with normal buses charging normal fares on normal roads.	<p>The Guided Bus proposal is outside the remit of the Area Action Plan and is a matter for Cambridgeshire County Council. Guided Bus will provide people with a travel choice, with direct access into the heart of Cambridge, St Ives and Huntingdon. In terms of door-to-door travel, it may not only prove to be quicker, but more convenient than driving and finding a parking space. On-street running of buses within the towns will be aided by a series of measures including priority bus signals and dedicated bus lanes where there is road space.</p> <p>The development strategy is quite clear as to where future development should be located, and other than at Northstowe, there will be no further development adjacent to the former St Ives railway corridor, other than infill development within the defined village frameworks.</p>	
3883 - Network Rail (Town Planning Team)	Object	The paragraphs 1.46 and 11.10 do not properly set out the link between the new town and the guided bus. While the bus route would still go ahead if the new town wasn't built, the new town wouldn't be acceptable if the guided bus wasn't built. Without the guided bus the residents of the new town would be stranded in a location not served by high-quality public transport. The Structure Plan makes clear that the provision of the guided bus is required for the realisation of the new town. This plan should be clear to reiterate this point in the above mentioned paragraphs and Policy NS34.	Agree that Guided Bus is essential for the development of Northstowe and this should be made explicit in the text of the Area Action Plan.	Add supporting text to make it explicit that Guided Bus is essential for the development of Northstowe.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5345 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to NS34 as 600m distances to the local bus loop appears to be a spurious distance with no clear justification. Further, the option appears to pre-determine the public transport infrastructure requirements of the new settlement before the siting of the new settlement has been determined and more detailed master planning work undertaken.	600m walking distance relates to a maximum of 7.5 minutes walk for an average person. This is considered acceptable, particularly to access High Quality Public Transport on the Local Bus Loop. Services on this route will be a better quality, not only in terms of frequency, but also the quality of infrastructure etc. than conventional bus services. Planning the new town from scratch provides the opportunity to ensure that all the necessary infrastructure is provided at the outset, and in locations where it is needed. Land-use and transportation planning need to go hand-in-hand to ensure the development of a sustainable community, which minimises the need to travel, but provides a choice of mode of travel for the necessary trips, in accordance with PPG13. The Area Action Plan will provide the detailed masterplan for the development.	
3004 1374 5615 2328 3399 2372 1795 1129 892	Object	Various comments relating specifically to the Guided Bus proposals.	The Guided Bus proposal, so far as it relates to the St Ives railway corridor, is outside the remit of the Area Action Plan and is a matter for Cambridgeshire County Council.	
4951	Object	Will residents of Longstanton be able to access the "local loop" by foot, or by bicycle?	NS36 will ensure the development of a network of pedestrian and cycle links connecting with surrounding villages.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6637 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	P.54/11.11 The town is to be served by a dedicated local bus stop off the main express route which follows the railway line. The intention is that this should not be 'guided' as the guide lines would create a barrier to movement within the town. If this is a consideration, then why has this 'barrier to movement' not been applied to Cambridge City itself? I can't see anyone preferring to take two buses - one guided and one local - to using their car.	If the Local Bus Loop were guided it could create a "barrier to movement" across the guideway, given it would be difficult for cyclists and some pedestrians, such as the disabled or people with pushchairs, to negotiate the kerbs. It is proposed that the Loop be a dedicated busway, i.e. a segregated bus-only road. There are no guided sections of bus lane in Cambridge. The buses using the guideway will be conventional buses able to run on guideway and road. Therefore, there will be no need for people to change buses, as buses will be able to go directly into the heart of Cambridge, St Ives and Huntingdon.	
6272 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher supports the provision of High Quality Public Transport, with associated quality infrastructure. Support is also given to the provision of the dedicated Local Bus Loop linked to the CGB. This is better termed dedicated bus way. Objection is raised to the imposition now of a requirement to provide initial subsidies. The proposals described are premature.	General support for the provision of High Quality Public Transport is noted. The inclusion of the requirement to provide initial subsidies is essential as every effort needs to be made to achieve a step change in attitudes towards using public transport from day one. Subsidies will play a significant part in helping to achieve this.	
2134	Support	Support the proposal and obligation on the developer to operate a public transport service subject to the terms of the service being controlled and affordability maintained. Key issue will be regularity, start and close times and cost. These should be clearly established in the legal agreement for the new town. I do though oppose the guided bus and propose that this be a train. Tram based service to enable the capacity to be reached and a physical connection to be made to Huntingdon railway station and not dependent on the existing road network.	General support noted. The Guided Bus proposal is outside the remit of the Area Action Plan and is a matter for Cambridgeshire County Council. These are matters of detail that may need to be drawn into the Section 46 agreement, in negotiation with bus operators.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3444 - English Partnerships	Support	The policy supports the 'Local Bus Loop' should be a high quality route and should have a defined service parameters related to service need.	Support noted.	
4602 - Westbury Homes 4193 - Westbury Homes 859	Support	Proposals to provide access to public transport from within the new town and also to improve linkages to and from outside communities is welcomed. This will improve the sustainability qualities within close proximity of the planned new town.	Support noted.	
4434 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The general approach is supported. High quality Public Transport should be better defined, the use of the Structure Plan definition is recommended (P8/6). There appears to be some confusion between this and NS28 in terms of distance of development to bus stops.	General support noted. High Quality Public Transport is defined in the Glossary, but could be expanded upon. NS28 aspires to all development being within 600m of a HQPT stop, i.e. a stop on the Local Bus Loop. However, NS34 recognises that a balance needs to be struck between making all development accessible to the Local Bus Loop and making the route too long and arduous that it defeats its purpose of providing HQPT services. Therefore, any development that wouldn't be within 600m of the Local Bus Loop should be within 400m, and served by, conventional local bus stops.	Amend definition of HQPT in the Glossary - use the Structure Plan definition.
3087 - Rampton Parish Council 2531 5444	Support	Support.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS34 Public Transport - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified.

Add supporting text to make it explicit that Guided Bus is essential for the development of Northstowe.

Other actions proposed:

Amend definition of High Quality Public Transport in the Glossary use the Structure Plan definition.

Roll forward Local Plan 2004 policy TP3 into the Core Strategy Travel chapter.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS35 Park and Ride - Preferred Approach</i>				
893	Object	With option C Rampton will also become a Park & Ride area as people can cut through via Cuckoo Lane and the Public Byway to access Guided Bus catastrophe.	This should not be an issue, given that no additional stops would be provided on the Guided Bus route. Therefore, people would use the Park and Ride site to access Guided Bus. If Site C were chosen, the issue could be addressed through the detailed design, to preclude this from happening.	
1621	Object	It is vital that there is sufficient parking for those avoiding Cambridge congestion. Parking for this use should not interfere with local residential parking.	Agree. Traffic modelling indicates that a car park with 350 spaces is sufficient initially, but should be able to expand to 700 spaces if required at a future date.	
1796	Object	The park and rides should be for the benefit of residents outside of Northstowe. There is a wonderful opportunity to build a significant facility East of Westwick which could relieve a great deal of traffic fighting its way into Cambridge via Cottenham/Oakington. Why has this not been put forward by the planners?	This is outside the remit of the LDF and Area Action Plan for Northstowe. It is a matter for Cambridgeshire County Council as part of the Guided Bus proposals.	
1032 1919	Object	If we can't drive from the north of the village and PARK in the PARK and ride, what use would that be?	It is not proposed to provide vehicle access from Northstowe into the Park and Ride site as there should be no need for residents to drive to the site, given that they will be able to access the buses on the Local Loop running through the town. NS34 requires all development to be within 600m of a stop on the Local Bus Loop (approximately 7.5 minutes walk for an able bodied person). This is widely considered an acceptable walking distance.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2345	Object	Guided bus stops are far too few and far too far away for most people to consider walking there. If one gets into one's car in Longstanton it will not be to park it on the other side of the village and pay a bus fare. I shan't use (guided) buses unless I can board with my bike. We need really very good cycle lanes for the whole area anyway to reach the stops.	<p>Guided Bus stops along the St Ives Railway line are outside the remit of the Area Action Plan and is a matter for Cambridgeshire County Council to consider as part of the Guided Bus proposals.</p> <p>Within Northstowe, NS34 requires all development to be within 600m of a stop on the Local Bus Loop (approximately 7.5 minutes walk for an able bodied person). This is widely considered an acceptable walking distance.</p> <p>In addition, NS36 requires the development of a comprehensive network of pedestrian and cycle links, which will ensure good connectivity with surrounding villages.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6273 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Support is given to the provision of a park and ride facility closely related to the town and easily accessible by foot, cycle or by high quality public transport. Likewise shared use of the facility is supported.</p> <p>The reference to direct access to the site from the town is however confusing. It may well be appropriate to provide access from the B1050 into Northstowe in the vicinity of the Park and Ride site. Using the access into the park and ride to provide vehicular access into the new town and in particular the employment area adjacent to the park and ride may well be a very sensible approach, minimising the number of direct access points required on to the B1050.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that the text of NS35 be amended to allow for the shared use of a vehicular access to the park and ride to serve Northstowe as well. This would not result conflict with the Council's intent of limiting car journeys from the new town to the park and ride site.</p>	<p>Support for the provision of a Park and Ride site is noted.</p> <p>It is not proposed to provide vehicle access from Northstowe into the Park and Ride site as there should be no need for residents to drive to the site, given that they will be able to access the buses on the Local Loop running through the town. NS34 requires all development to be within 600m of a stop on the Local Bus Loop (approximately 7.5 minutes walk for an able bodied person). This is widely considered an acceptable walking distance. Provision of vehicular access could undermine the attractiveness of using these stops, and could require provision of a larger car park at the Park and Ride site.</p> <p>Vehicular access into the site from the B1050 is addressed in NS29 and NS30, The exact location of access points is a matter of detailed design for the AAP.</p>	
1534	Support	<p>Provided a cycle way and footpath are built along the B1050 between Longstanton village and the railway crossing so residents can access the park and ride.</p>	<p>Support noted. This is outside the remit of the Area Action Plan. It is a matter that should be addressed by Cambridgeshire County Council as part of the Guided Bus proposals.</p>	
3445 - English Partnerships	Support	<p>English Partnerships supports the provision of park and ride facilities and feel the policy should emphasise the need for quality information, the use of real time technology in the provision and operation of these services.</p>	<p>Support noted. The Park and Ride site is situated on the proposed Guided Bus route, which will provide High Quality Public Transport (HQPT). By definition, HQPT includes quality infrastructure, such as Real Time Bus Information, and higher frequency services etc.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3059	Support	Park and ride has been very successful in other parts of outer-Cambridge so I think this is a very good plan. Does it make use of the guided bus, which goes to the wrong parts of Cambridge for people going into the town centre. The present bus service takes a useful route.	Support noted. The Park and Ride site is situated on the proposed Guided Bus route and the Local Bus Loop through the town. Buses using the guideway will be conventional (high quality) buses, which will run on streets into the heart of Cambridge, just like present bus services.	
1768 2597	Support	If public transport works properly then there should be no need for residents of Northstowe to need to access the P&R site. Northstowe residents will be able to access the "Ride" from the Local Loop running through the town	Support noted.	
4197 - Westbury Homes	Support	Welcome the Council's proposals to provide access to public transport from within the new town and to improve linkages to and from "outside" communities. This will improve the sustainability qualities within close proximity of the planned new town.	Support noted.	
3910 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5445	Support	Support.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS35 Park and Ride - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS36 Pedestrian and Cycle Links - Preferred Approach</i>				
876	Object	For the same reason as NS28. Cycle and footpaths within the development are a good idea. To link them with the existing villages and upgrade them with lights would increase through traffic/noise and add further to unnecessary light pollution.	Creating links with the existing villages is intended to provide people with a choice of mode of travel, and thus reduce the need to travel by car, thus reducing through traffic and noise. Agree that lighting will need to be carefully considered to minimise light pollution, in accordance with policies in the Core Strategy Development Principles chapter.	
995	Support	Strongly agree, but the guided buses should have facilities to take bikes on-board.	Support noted.	
1072	Support	There must be many cycle and walkways between Longstanton and Northstowe to reduce traffic.	Support noted.	
1338 1770	Support	Safe cycling and security of bikes is very necessary. Cycleways must have high quality accompanying infrastructure, e.g. cycle storage etc. Houses ought also to be designed in such a way as to store cycles safely and easily.	Support noted.	
1921	Support	But you need to be very realistic in estimating numbers that will use this, it will be far lower than most public claims, and even lower during the long periods of the year when the weather is more inclement. If cycle and pedestrian routes are shared between them (as in Cambridge) rather than separate (as in Holland), there is little incentive for cyclists to use them	Support noted. The LDF concerns itself with land-use planning and creating sustainable places. Whilst the LDF has no direct controls over an individual's behaviour, it can provide them with a choice through the provision of quality infrastructure, for example, to enable walking and cycling.	
2100 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Support	LPPC support 11.22/NS36: in addition, optimal width and appropriate access at intersections with roads should be adopted, for either dual use or dedicated cycle and footways use, to ensure safety. Long-term maintenance of the villages cycle links should be ensured, to encourage attractive alternatives to car travel.	Support noted. These comments are a matter of detailed design to be addressed in the Area Action Plan. Maintenance of cycleways is the responsibility of Cambridgeshire County Council.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3446 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships strongly supports the provision of cycle and footpath networks. We emphasise the need for clear legibility and the provision of quality information to support the provision of these facilities.	Support noted. Agree, there is a need for quality infrastructure, including legible signage and integration with the existing network.	
2287	Support	Suggest that you consult existing urban cycling experts (e.g. Cambridge Cycle Campaign, Sustrans) to avoid repeating mistakes/conflict found within Cambridge system. Appointing a capable local team to promote and advise on "alternative transport" within and to/from Northstowe is a must.	Agree, include representative(s) from cycle organisations in the partnership developing the detailed masterplan for Northstowe.	Include representative(s) from cycle organisations in the partnership developing the detailed masterplan.
2177	Support	Access by bike (and path/bridleway) makes sense and is in support of Government initiatives for us all to get more exercise. I agree with other comments about the need for safe cycle storage. However, in residential parts of Peterborough, cycleways are used as back alleys for vandalism and crime - please take steps to avoid this becoming an issue if you can.	Support noted. Policies in the Core Strategy Development Principles chapter should ensure good design.	
2098 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 2322	Support	Fully support this option and these links should not be simply examined but fully planned and implemented.	Support noted.	
1712 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire) 2590	Support	This option falls short in that it fails to recognise the need to cater for horse riders - bridleways are not covered in this.	Agree, there should be reference to the broader Rights of Way network and the subsequent wider range of users, such as equestrians. With regards potential routes - this is a matter of detail to be worked up in the Area Action Plan.	Amend NS36 "There should be a series of dedicated, high quality, safe, direct, connected and convenient RIGHTS OF WAY, INCLUDING cycle and pedestrian AND HORSE RIDING routes, both within Northstowe and connecting with surrounding villages and the wider network. These would be complemented with quality infrastructure, such as signing, secure cycle parking, seating and lighting (as appropriate)".

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5153 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Support	NS36 & Para 11.22 We strongly support Option NS36 Pedestrian & Cycle links, but wish to see the Policy re-worded to specify that pedestrian and cycle ways should be physically separated to ensure the safety particularly of disabled users. A link to Bar Hill with a new bridle-bridge over the A14 is important.	Support noted. Policies in the Core Strategy Development Principles chapter should ensure good design and that accessibility for all, including the disabled, is considered. With regards potential routes - this is a matter of detail to be worked up in the Area Action Plan.	
3911 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6416 - The Countryside Agency 4200 - Westbury Homes 4640 - Sport England 2102 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Support	We support the Preferred Approach to the provision of pedestrian and cycle links.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS36 Pedestrian and Cycle Links - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Amend NS36 "There should be a series of dedicated, high quality, safe, direct, connected and convenient RIGHTS OF WAY, INCLUDING cycle and pedestrian AND HORSE RIDING routes

Other action proposed:

Include representative(s) from cycle organisations in the partnership developing the detailed masterplan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS37 Car Parking Standards - Preferred Approach</i>				
1962 1964	Object	Steps should be taken to prevent Oakington being used for car parking by passengers picking up to guided bus at Westwick. The high street is narrow and traffic has difficulty getting through when vehicles are parked along the road side.	This is a matter for Cambridgeshire County Council to consider as part of the Guided Bus scheme. It does not fall within the remit of the Northstowe Area Action Plan.	
3347 - Longstanton Action Group 2199 - Longstanton Parish Council 3055 1623 1446 1339 947 1149	Object	There must be sufficient parking for local shopping.	Agree. The maximum car parking standards are in accordance with PPG13. They will also be applied in accordance with PPG13 - minimising car parking in the parts of the new development located close to a range of facilities and services, and in accessible locations, served by High Quality Public Transport and a quality network of walking and cycling routes. For example, such an approach is likely to apply to development in/close to the town centre. There may also be opportunities for shared use car parking in the town centre, which should also be explored. This should not be interpreted to mean that no parking will be provided to support local services and facilities, including shops. Rather, NS37 offers flexibility in its application and a balance will need to be struck to ensure a level of car parking which does not undermine sustainable modes of travel, whilst not encouraging a proliferation of parking in other unsuitable areas, such as on-street parking.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3736 - GO-East	Object	We take the view that because the aim is to create a highly sustainable new settlement that is accessible by high quality public transport, consideration should be given to a challenging approach to the parking strategy (for example, parking standards that are more ambitious than those in PPG13 or those to be applied more generally in the sub-region). This should address all forms of development, including residential, shopping and employment related development. In the latter two cases consideration should also be given to whether parking should be provided and managed as part of the development or as public parking.	NS38 proposes a more challenging approach than simply applying district-wide maximum car parking standards (which accord with PPG13). NS38 identifies locations, such as the town centre, where lower levels of parking could be provided as these locations will be well served by High Quality Public Transport and a quality network of walking and cycling routes. It is also proposed to explore the shared use of parking where suitable opportunities may arise.	
4747 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Unrealistic. With the best will in the world the proposed public transport facilities will not meet the needs of many, simply because they will want to travel to work and for leisure purposes to places that are not adequately served by public transport routes, and at times when there is no service. Additionally, public transport cannot possibly fulfil all the needs of all people. Strongly opposed to the minimisation of car parking.	The LDF seeks to provide people with the choice of means to travel and does not preclude the ownership or use of private cars. It is recognised that alternative transport modes are not always suitable for all types of trips, for all people, or for all times of travel. The maximum car parking standards are in accordance with PPG13. It is not proposed to apply a blanket minimisation of car parking across the whole development, only to the parts of the new development located close to a range of facilities and services, and in accessible locations, served by High Quality Public Transport and a quality network of walking and cycling routes. For example, such an approach is likely to apply to development in/close to the town centre. There may also be opportunities for shared use car parking in the town centre, which should also be explored. NS37 and NS38 offer flexibility in their application and a balance will need to be struck to ensure a level of car parking which does not undermine sustainable modes of travel, whilst not encouraging a proliferation of parking in other unsuitable areas, such as on-street parking.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4435 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Concern over this option as it seems to imply that parking will be provided at the maximum level permitted. The reason for having maximum parking standards is that they are a level that you should not exceed rather than a level that should be met.	The maximum car parking standards are in accordance with PPG13. They will also be applied in accordance with PPG13 - minimising car parking in the parts of the new development located close to a range of facilities and services, and in accessible locations, served by High Quality Public Transport and a quality network of walking and cycling routes. For example, such an approach is likely to apply to development in/close to the town centre. There may also be opportunities for shared use car parking in the town centre, which should also be explored. NS37 offers flexibility in its application and a balance will need to be struck to ensure a level of car parking which does not undermine sustainable modes of travel, whilst not encouraging a proliferation of parking in other unsuitable areas, such as on-street parking.	
2103 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Support	LPPC support NS37, but with the proviso that parking policy and restrictions need to be very clear. Additionally access to Northstowe's facilities by residents of surrounding villages needs to be underpinned by investment in robust public transport systems. Longstanton Parish Plan Survey respondents express great concern about the dangers of inconsiderate on-road parking, and potential parking problems in Northstowe must not impact on Longstanton's streets.	Support noted. This is a matter of detail. NS37 provides flexibility in the application of the maximum car parking standards and car parking provision, whilst minimised where possible, should be sufficient to avoid creating a problem with on-street parking within Northstowe or in surrounding villages.	
3447 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships supports the preferred parking standards. We emphasise the policy should refer to minimum cycle parking standards in safe and secure areas.	Support noted. It is proposed to carry forward the district-wide Cycle Parking Standards from Local Plan 2004 and CS16 - Design of New Development will address design/safety issues.	Roll forward the Cycle Parking Standards from Local Plan 2004 into the Core Strategy Travel Chapter.
2325 5447	Support	Support.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6274 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher supports the proposals to apply the maximum car parking standards in the core strategy, subject to the approach set out in the core strategy in CS80 being pursued, namely continuation of the car parking standards from the adopted Local Plan (2004). These standards produce the best balance between achieving modal shift and reducing the dominance of the car within the town and making appropriate provision to support the viability of key services and facilities including the town centre.	Support noted. NS37 applies the district-wide car parking standards contained in the Core Strategy (CS80), which propose a continuation of Local Plan 2004 standards.	

Decision on NS37 Car Parking Standards - Preferred Approach

Develop a hybrid of NS37 and NS38 into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan. This will require car parking provision in accordance with the maximum standards as set out in the Core Strategy, but will seek to minimise parking in some areas with good accessibility and close to facilities and services, and the exploration of shared use parking in suitable locations.

Other action proposed:

Roll forward the Cycle Parking Standards from Local Plan 2004 into the Core Strategy Travel Chapter.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS38 Car Parking Standards - Preferred Approach</i>				
3737 - GO-East	Object	We take the view that because the aim is to create a highly sustainable new settlement that is accessible by high quality public transport, consideration should be given to a challenging approach to the parking strategy (for example, parking standards that are more ambitious than those in PPG13 or those to be applied more generally in the sub-region). This should address all forms of development, including residential, shopping and employment related development. In the latter two cases consideration should also be given to whether parking should be provided and managed as part of the development or as public parking.	NS38 proposes a more challenging approach than simply applying district-wide maximum car parking standards (which accord with PPG13). NS38 identifies locations, such as the town centre, where lower levels of parking could be provided as these locations will be well served by High Quality Public Transport and a quality network of walking and cycling routes. It is also proposed to explore the shared use of parking where suitable opportunities may arise.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4748 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Unrealistic. With the best will in the world the proposed public transport facilities will not meet the needs of many, simply because they will want to travel to work and for leisure purposes to places that are not adequately served by public transport routes, and at times when there is no service. Additionally, public transport cannot possibly fulfil all the needs of all people. Strongly opposed to the minimisation of car parking.	The LDF seeks to provide people with the choice of means to travel and does not preclude the ownership or use of private cars. It is recognised that alternative transport modes are not always suitable for all types of trips, for all people, or for all times of travel. The maximum car parking standards are in accordance with PPG13. It is not proposed to apply a blanket minimisation of car parking across the whole development, only to the parts of the new development located close to a range of facilities and services, and in accessible locations, served by High Quality Public Transport and a quality network of walking and cycling routes. For example, such an approach is likely to apply to development in/close to the town centre. There may also be opportunities for shared use car parking in the town centre, which should also be explored. NS38 offers flexibility in its application and a balance will need to be struck to ensure a level of car parking which does not undermine sustainable modes of travel, whilst not encouraging a proliferation of parking in other unsuitable areas, such as on-street parking.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6275 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Objection is lodged to the suggestion of more stringent car parking standards than are to be adopted in the rest of the District. Reduced car parking standards are not necessary to achieve the key transportation aims in Northstowe and may well have significant detrimental consequences in terms of design or viability of early services, facilities and in particular the town centre.</p> <p>Reduced car parking standards may lead to greater on and off - street parking and more intrusion from the car.</p> <p>Appropriate parking (the NS37 are expressed as maxima is considered appropriate) are of key importance commercially in establishing viability and in attracting commercial uses.</p>	<p>The LDF seeks to provide people with the choice of means to travel and does not preclude the ownership or use of private cars. It is recognised that alternative transport modes are not always suitable for all types of trips, for all people, or for all times of travel. The maximum car parking standards are in accordance with PPG13. It is not proposed to apply a blanket minimisation of car parking across the whole development, only to the parts of the new development located close to a range of facilities and services, and in accessible locations, served by High Quality Public Transport and a quality network of walking and cycling routes. For example, such an approach is likely to apply to development in/close to the town centre. There may also be opportunities for shared use car parking in the town centre, which should also be explored. NS38 offers flexibility in its application and a balance will need to be struck to ensure a level of car parking which does not undermine sustainable modes of travel, whilst not encouraging a proliferation of parking in other unsuitable areas, such as on-street parking.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2238	Support	Make one of the unique features of Northstowe its bold de-coupling from the car culture. Instead of car parking, specify a community transport system - including regular, 7-day links to local villages - and attract residents who welcome this approach.	Support noted. Whilst NS38 proposes a more stringent approach to car parking, it would not be appropriate to provide no car parking across the development area. Even in locations well served by sustainable modes there will always be some people, whether through personal choice or personal circumstances, who will want or need to own and use their own cars. If no car parking were provided, this would lead to a proliferation of parking in unsuitable locations and could undermine the appearance and function of the development. However, there may be sections of the development, perhaps in the centre of town, close to High Quality Public Transport stops, where some properties could be considered without parking, but not as a blanket approach. NS38 allows flexibility in its application, and provision of areas without car parking is not beyond its remit if this is considered suitable.	
4436 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Parking should be provided at appropriate levels mindful of our policy objectives and mindful that Government is looking at parking through the LTP process more rigorously. The Government in the future may well expect highway and planning authorities to demonstrate that their parking policies and the implementation of those policies are contributing to transport objectives and targets.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS38 Car Parking Standards - Preferred Approach

Develop a hybrid of NS37 and NS38 into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan. This will require car parking provision in accordance with the maximum standards as set out in the Core Strategy, but will seek to minimise parking in some areas with good accessibility and close to facilities and services, and the exploration of shared use parking in suitable locations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 12. Landscape				
<i>NS39 Landscape: Objectives - Preferred Approach</i>				
1923	Object	There is no way, as a professional and senior ecologist, that Northstowe can be argued to have any potential benefits whatsoever to wildlife, biodiversity, or any conservation issues. In plain English, it can only be completely destructive to all of these values	The strategic need for the development of a new town is established in the Structure Plan. A major development will clearly have impacts on its location wherever that it. The landscape objectives seek to minimise harmful impacts by making best use of the landscape that exists locally to enhance the character of the town and create an appropriate setting for it. Also to bring positive mitigation measures which add to existing landscape character.	
3817 - English Heritage	Object	Policies NS39, 41, 42, 43. These policies should refer to the potential of Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) analysis to inform the sensitive landscaping of the new settlement.	The Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database, developed by the County Council, provides a valuable tool in defining the evolution of the landscape and in identifying historic landscapes. Regard will be had to the database in determining whether proposals would have an adverse impact on the historic landscape of Conservation Areas.	Include reference in the supporting text to the use of the Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database.
4979 4981	Object	In addition to minimising visual or landscape impacts on Oakington other essential objectives should be to protect Oakington from noise and nuisance and to maintain a high level of security for properties on the edge of the village.	The issue of nuisance to, and security of, properties on the edge of existing villages and of Northstowe will be an important factor in the design and landscaping of the green separation and landscape treatments on the other edges to the town and public routes through them. They can be addressed through measures such as the type and density of planting. Noise is also an important issue in any new development and policies will be included in the district wide Development Control Policies document which will apply here.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1447	Support	I strongly support the first and second bullet points with its clear statement of support for minimising damage to the villages and their Conservation Areas.	Support noted.	
1713 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	Please add to the 4th bullet "To create a network of (green spaces) and dedicated public rights of way within and around the town which integrate well with the development, contribute to legibility, are pleasant and attractive and link to the wider network"	Support noted. The issue of a network of public rights of way is addressed in Option NS85 in the Recreation chapter. It is not appropriate to include in the Landscape objectives.	
1957 2603 1958	Support	It is essential that bridle paths are included in the green space separating Northstowe from the villages. These should allow riders to travel the length of the green space and also connect up with other off road opportunities.	Option NS85 proposes that a strategy be prepared to link all parts of the town to the wider countryside through an enhanced network of footpaths and bridleways. The issue of such routes also being included in the green separation between Northstowe and Longstanton/Oakington is best addressed in that option.	Option NS85 be amended so that the strategy to link all parts of Northstowe to the wider countryside be expanded to make clear that it will also INCLUDE THE GREEN SEPARATION BETWEEN NORTHSTOWE AND LONGSTANTON/OAKINGTON.
2104 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Support	LPPC support the principles of NS39. In the Parish Plan Survey, many comments stress that Longstanton's conservation areas, wildlife, woodland, ditches, open spaces, footpaths, bridleways and Rampton Drift housing association's park must be protected. Comments are also made about the need for sensitive landscaping and regular maintenance to insure that green spaces are safe for children at all times, including from sexual predators attracted to unkempt green spaces.	Support noted. Management is recognised as an important requirement and addressed in Option NS57.	
2200 - Longstanton Parish Council 2743 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 3396 1301 948 2604	Support	Support the explicit consideration of existing settlements and conservation areas (rather than arbitrarily restricting consideration to a Village Framework that was not defined for that purpose).	Support noted. The consideration of green separation is dealt with in other options.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3914 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>The level of tree resource on site should be maintained and improved; not only maximising use of existing tree resource, but fully compensating where preservation of existing trees is not possible or, due to position or species, inappropriate. This should also allow sufficient space for a number of trees to reach their full stature at maturity to provide feature trees and landmarks.</p> <p>Amendment to NS39, 2nd bullet point</p> <p>- To maintain and improve the existing tree resource on site as a setting for the development. This should include fully compensating where preservation of existing trees is not possible or, due to position or species, inappropriate;</p>	<p>It would not be reasonable or achievable to require full compensatory tree planting, given the level of existing planting on site. However, best endeavours will be made to ensure the retention of existing planting within the site where appropriate and desirable without compromising the quality of the town. Loss of trees will be mitigated by the strategic landscaping proposed on the edge of the town and in the areas of greens separation between Northstowe and the villages of Longstanton and Oakington.</p>	
3916 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Would prefer the use of the word integrated/integration instead of "connectivity" in 5th bullet point.</p> <p>Amendment to NS39, 5th bullet point</p> <p>- To ensure a high degree integration between people</p>	<p>Support noted. However, do not agree that the word integrate is preferable in this context to connectivity, which this bullet is specifically about, i.e. movement between the town and the countryside.</p>	
3917 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>The term 'landscape areas' in the context of providing an environment suitable for mitigation of adverse wildlife impacts and maximise benefits to wildlife may not be appropriate. Would prefer 'landscape and biodiversity areas' or something giving equal weight to value for wildlife as well as landscape.</p> <p>Amendment to NS39, 7th bullet point</p> <p>- To maintain and improve the existing tree resource on site as a setting for the development. This should include fully compensating where preservation of existing trees is not possible or, due to position or species, inappropriate;</p>	<p>Support noted. Biodiversity is recognised as an important issue such that it has its own chapter. It is not appropriate to add biodiversity objectives to the Landscape chapter. However, a reference in the supporting text that there is a clear relationship between landscape and biodiversity could helpfully be added to both chapters.</p>	<p>Include reference in the supporting text to the Landscape and Biodiversity chapters of the Area Action Plan that there is a clear relationship between landscape and biodiversity.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3918 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Maintenance should include a monitoring/recording element to provide comparative records over time and with other new developments. - To effective maintenance and monitoring of the landscape areas.	Support noted. Monitoring would be an issue for the management strategy required in option NS57.	
3057 2374 1551 1625 1150	Support	Particularly support the first bullet point and its commitment to minimise the impact on nearby villages and their Conservation Areas.	Support noted.	
4165 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature support the preferred approach taken in this policy and in particular the following points are welcomed: point 4 – the creation of a network of green spaces; point 5 – ensuring connectivity between green areas; and point 7 to provide an environment suitable for mitigation of adverse impact and maximise benefits to wildlife.	Support noted.	
3912 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6417 - The Countryside Agency 3350 - Longstanton Action Group 3089 - Rampton Parish Council 1340 2347 1421	Support	Support the preferred objectives for the landscape within and around Northstowe.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS39 Landscape: Objectives - Preferred Approach

Include reference in the supporting text to the use of the Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database.

Option NS85 be amended so that the strategy to link all parts of Northstowe to the wider countryside be expanded to make clear that it will also INCLUDE THE GREEN SEPARATION BETWEEN NOTHSTOWE AND LONGSTANTON/OAKINGTON.

Include reference in the supporting text to the Landscape and Biodiversity chapters of the Area Action Plan that there is a clear relationship between landscape and biodiversity.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach</i>				
1048	Object	The village character must be protected, as stated in the County Structure Plan and this should be irrespective of the village framework which is a purely arbitrary definition of the village perimeter.	It is important to have a clear and defensible way of measuring the physical extent of green separation. The village framework boundaries are a clearly defined planning policy boundary established in statutory plans. They identify the consolidated part of the village and are an appropriate and reasonable boundary from which to measure the green separation in the majority of situations. The approach also recognised that there could be groups or individual properties outside the village framework which could potentially contribute to village character and each of these buildings or groups of buildings were assessed individually to establish whether they could be regarded as forming part of the village for the purposes of maintaining village character, and therefore measuring green separation, or whether they were sporadic development in the countryside where this approach was not appropriate. Even in cases where buildings do not form part of the village for the purposes of green separation, a specific treatment appropriate to their role and location is proposed in the Preferred Options Report. With the sensitivity of these additional tests, the use of the village framework as the basis for measuring green separation is considered appropriate.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3367 - Longstanton Action Group 6689 - Longstanton Parish Council 6691 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 6679 6698 2152 6707 2023 2254 1230 1302 1754 2365 6683 2467 1130 1151 1629	Object	Village framework wrong way to measure: - nothing to do with village character, - defined to reduce development outside framework ("regulates ease of development" "perverse to use the definition in order to provide less separation for homes outside the framework"), - doesn't reflect reality on the ground. - Nothing to do with right to separation - Structure Plan does not say "village framework character".	It is important to have a clear and defensible way of measuring the physical extent of green separation. The village framework boundaries are a clearly defined planning policy boundary established in statutory plans. They identify the consolidated part of the village and are an appropriate and reasonable boundary from which to measure the green separation in the majority of situations. The approach also recognised that there could be groups or individual properties outside the village framework which could potentially contribute to village character and each of these buildings or groups of buildings were assessed individually to establish whether they could be regarded as forming part of the village for the purposes of maintaining village character, and therefore measuring green separation, or whether they were sporadic development in the countryside where this approach was not appropriate. Even in cases where buildings do not form part of the village for the purposes of green separation, a specific treatment appropriate to their role and location is proposed in the Preferred Options Report. With the sensitivity of these additional tests, the use of the village framework as the basis for measuring green separation is considered appropriate.	
6708 6706	Object	The approach adopted means that my property, 43 St Michaels, receives less separation than the agreed 200 metres.	43 St Michaels lies within the village framework in the adopted Local Plan 2004 and therefore receives the minimum 200m separation.	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5677 - Ely Diocesan Board 4841 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	200m is arbitrary and takes no account that through landscape measures a much smaller distance can still help separate individual identities of both.	An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe. The physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively is considered to be a minimum of 200m separation. A width of less than 200m is not considered sufficient to ensure that landscape treatment of a character suitable for the areas adjacent to Longstanton and Oakington can be achieved.	
2040	Object	If bus stops at maximum of 400m is "high-class public transport" then how can green separation of only 200m be deemed adequate separation?	There is no direct relationship between walking times to public transport stops and the extent of land necessary to provide adequate green separation to maintain village character.	
6702	Object	All houses with a Longstanton address, who pay rates to the Parish Council should be offered protection. They too are part of this village.	There is a distinction to be drawn between the village for the purposes of defining green separation and the parish which includes other development in the countryside. The approach proposed recognises that there could be groups or individual properties outside the village framework which could potentially contribute to village character and each of these buildings or groups of buildings were assessed individually to establish whether they could be regarded as forming part of the village for the purposes of maintaining village character, and therefore measuring green separation, or whether they were sporadic development in the countryside where this approach was not appropriate. Even in cases where buildings do not form part of the village for the purposes of green separation, a specific treatment appropriate to their role and location is proposed in the Preferred Options Report.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1926	Object	Yet another bit of prose that looks nice on paper and is pure fiction in real English - you cannot seriously think that 200m will provide any sort of long term separation between existing villages and the new town the former will inevitably be sucked into the latter. All your current proposals around Cambridge already prove beyond doubt how irrelevant the green belt classification is, so why should we believe what is claimed here?	200m is a distinct area of separation between 2 built up areas. The green separation will also be designated as statutory Green Belt which has the specific purpose of ensuring that coalescence between built up areas does not occur. The Green Belt review around Cambridge is an exceptional circumstance. Notwithstanding, the issue of providing separation to maintain the village character of those necklace villages around the edge of Cambridge is a key part of those proposals.	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2111 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	LPPC object to NS40: in the Longstanton Parish Plan Survey the majority demand more than 300 metres green separation: residents were not democratically consulted before the distance was formulated.	In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. In the context of a town that will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, it is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character. The purpose of the Preferred Options public participation was to involve the public in considering the appropriate extent and form of separation. The new plan making system requires the Council to consult on its preferred options and the Council considered in some detail its preferred approach to green separation upon which it wanted to consult.	
6692 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	Residents have made clear their understanding that incorporating Rampton Drift and Station Road, outside the framework anyway, into Northstowe will only benefit developers' aims whilst being fundamentally detrimental in maintaining Longstanton identity.	Any site identified in accordance with the Structure Plan tests will inevitably incorporate the outlying area of Rampton Drift into Northstowe. The Preferred Options report considers how that integration can most sensitively achieved whilst protecting the residential amenity of those residents.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6693 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Object	In the Survey residents express repeated and serious concern about planners' lack of answerability; to quote but one: 'SCDC are you listening?'	The Preferred Options report was agreed by the Council as the set of Preferred Options upon which it wanted to consult the public. The options were based on professional and technical advice from officers to Members. The Council will consider representations received in deciding the plan it wishes to submit to the Secretary of State. The plan making system includes an independent examination held by an Inspector which considers the Council's proposals and objections made to them. Under the new system, the recommendations of that Inspector will be binding on the Council.	
6694	Object	Modern creeping urbanization will not come from demand for allotments and scattered sheds, but from pony paddocks and scattered sheds. Green Separation should be large enough to remain in normal commercial agricultural use. Otherwise a new town will create a shedscape from Longstanton to Girton.	Paddocks with horses grazing are a common feature of the countryside adjoining villages in this area. Agricultural use would be appropriate within the green separation.	
6695 6656 6649	Object	Should be no/limited public access to separation - to ensure habitats are undisturbed	A balance needs to be struck between restricting urban related open uses such as playing fields to maintain the countryside character of the area and maintain village character, and providing a high degree of public access for informal countryside recreation. The option says this will be provided "where appropriate" and if there are areas of particularly sensitive habitats, access can be managed accordingly. Access would provide an amenity for residents of the villages as well as Northstowe.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6680 6709 6724 6734 6718 6722	Object	Definition of village frameworks makes no allowance for: - conservation areas (which are important for village character) - listed buildings - transit routes for local wild fauna.	It is important to have a clear and defensible way of measuring the physical extent of green separation. The village framework boundaries are a clearly defined planning policy boundary established in statutory plans. They identify the consolidated part of the village and are an appropriate and reasonable boundary from which to measure the green separation in the majority of situations. The approach also recognised that there are Conservation Areas that extend beyond the village framework and groups or individual properties outside the village framework which could potentially contribute to village character. Each of these areas, buildings or groups of buildings were assessed individually to establish whether they could be regarded as forming part of the village for the purposes of maintaining village character, and therefore measuring green separation, or whether they were sporadic development in the countryside where this approach was not appropriate. Even in cases where land or buildings do not form part of the village for the purposes of green separation, a specific treatment appropriate to their role and location is proposed in the Preferred Options Report. With the sensitivity of these additional tests, the use of the village framework as the basis for measuring green separation is considered appropriate.	
6703 6736	Object	Site of St Michael's Mount house is important historically and environmentally. Is just as important as other sites within conservation area and should have 200m separation.	The issue of St Michel's Mount is addressed at option NS43 under separate representations.	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6733 - Longstanton Action Group 6688 - Longstanton Parish Council 6738 6697 6710 2024 6705 6712 6704 6728 1429 1246 1234 6652 6725 1988 1341 6716 4952 6685 1213 1449 6719 1408 6723	Object	All houses/properties should have 200m minimum separation - wherever practicable - ideally more - unless compelling reason not to - east end of Longstanton highlighted - only then will existing village residents and conservation areas be protected	Green separation is required by the Structure Plan to maintain village character of Longstanton and Oakington which is addressed in option NS40. Other options address the issue of any special landscape treatment that would be required for dwellings or groups of dwellings lying outside the village framework adjoining or within Northstowe in order to protect amenity. However, this is not defined as green separation.	
6690 - Longstanton Parish Council 6739	Object	Most of Longstanton Conservation Areas are outside the framework but most feel they are important part of village character	Conservation Areas are designated for their architectural or historic character or appearance. They often include open areas of land outside villages which is important as part of the setting of the village, but does not contribute to village character as such. Notwithstanding, other options specifically address the parts of the Conservation Area which lie outside the village framework and consider whether they require any additional protection through either an extension to the green separation or a specific landscape treatment.	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6672 - The Fairfield Partnership 6696 6735 6727 6740 6732 6669 6670	Object	Emphasis that green separation should not include urban uses.	The Preferred Approach makes clear that the green separation would not contain any urban related open uses. This would be a specific policy requirement as an additional layer of protection in the separation over and above the proposed designation as Green Belt. The separation will have a high degree of public access for informal countryside recreation where appropriate.	
2146	Object	It is vital for the protection of Longstanton that the spirit as well as the letter of the Structure Plan is observed. Rigid interpretation of the Village Framework is inappropriate in a case where this would threaten well-established properties within Longstanton, such as St Michaels Mount. The over-arching aim to preserve the character of the village of Longstanton should be inviolate.	In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. In the context of a town that will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, it is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character. The issue of separation at St Michael's Mount is addressed at Option NS43.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2181	Object	But you are proposing that its OK for roads to cut through the separation areas. Either they are separate or they are not. Oakington IS separated from Longstanton at the moment. Not much point in having a green belt with roads going through it.	The only road connection which could affect the green separation would be the Station Road, Oakington link. If it is agreed as being appropriate, its function would be as an appropriate link to direct traffic travelling from the Cottenham direction into Northstowe without accessing Oakington. Its route and design would need to minimise impact on the green separation. However, there will be high quality cycle and pedestrian routes provided across the green separation to connect villages to the services and facilities of Northstowe.	
2201 - Longstanton Parish Council 949	Object	Adequate separation is based on result desired for Northstowe, not what is actually required to provide adequate separation.	The Structure Plan states that green separation is required to maintain village character of Longstanton and Oakington. The consideration of the extent and treatment of green separation has been made in this context. It is considered that the proposed minimum of 200m separation is adequate and appropriate to maintain village character.	
2838	Object	The separation between the development and Oakington is given in the Fairfield vision as 800m.	The Council is proposing that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character. The Council made no reference to the potential width of green separation until the Preferred Options Report was being prepared. No distance other than a minimum of 200m has been put forward by the Council or officers. Potential developers have been publicising their own proposals in the area local to Northstowe and there may be some confusion amongst the public between the formal plan making processes being undertaken by the Council and the informal consultation being carried out by potential developers which has no weight in the plan making process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3235 - CPRE Cambridgeshire	Object	Green separation should be designed to respect the character and setting of all designated Conservation areas.	It is important to have a clear and defensible way of measuring the physical extent of green separation. The village framework boundaries are a clearly defined planning policy boundary established in statutory plans. They identify the consolidated part of the village and are an appropriate and reasonable boundary from which to measure the green separation in the majority of situations. The approach also recognised that there are Conservation Areas that extend beyond the village framework and groups or individual properties outside the village framework which could potentially contribute to village character. Each of these areas, buildings or groups of buildings were assessed individually to establish whether they could be regarded as forming part of the village for the purposes of maintaining village character, and therefore measuring green separation, or whether they were sporadic development in the countryside where this approach was not appropriate. Even in cases where land or buildings do not form part of the village for the purposes of green separation, a specific treatment appropriate to their role and location is proposed in the Preferred Options Report.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2184 6674	Object	200m much less from original distance talked about months ago.	The Council made no reference to the potential width of green separation until the Preferred Options Report was being prepared. No distance other than a minimum of 200m has been put forward by the Council or officers. Potential developers have been publicising their own proposals in the area local to Northstowe and there may be some confusion amongst the public between the formal plan making processes being undertaken by the Council and the informal consultation being carried out by potential developers which has no weight in the plan making process.	
6675	Object	The possibility of moving the overall site to enclose the northern railway line should be seen as an opportunity not only to increase the transport access and the ultimate housing capacity of the new town but also to allow for realistic separation between the communities: ideally about 500m. minimum.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington and located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The extent of 'green separation' necessary to protect the village character of Longstanton and Oakington has been the subject of a lengthy report and detailed member site visit. It is not considered that a greater minimum distance for green separation is necessary to maintain village character.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4010	Object	Why is there "no appropriate alternative" to a minimum separation of 200 metres between Northstowe and Oakington? To propose such a minimum (implying that this IS "appropriate") shows utter disregard for the village character of Oakington.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton and Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. In order to develop a new town of 8,000 to 10,000 homes the Structure Plan expects that it will be so close to these two villages that it should specific the need for 'green separation'. That 'green separation' is intended to protect village character and in order that the new town should meet the rest of the Structure Plan policy requirements, should be no more than needed for that purpose. Following consideration of a lengthy report and site visit, the Council concluded at the time that the Preferred Options Report was published that no more than 200 metres was required provided that that 'green separation' was properly treated.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5347 - The Fairfield Partnership 3063 3555 3008 2948 3585 2204 2107 1553 1627 2445 1065 1592 1731 829 4659 2957 5357 4983 4985 1005	Object	200m is inadequate separation: distance should be greater.	In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. In the context of a town that will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, it is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6676 6439 6659	Object	Separation should be ideally 500m	In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. In the context of a town that will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, it is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character.	
6662 6665 6677	Object	Consider 200m to be coalescence.	200m is a distinct area of separation between 2 built up areas. The green separation will also be designated as statutory Green Belt which has the specific purpose of ensuring that coalescence between built up areas does not occur. An additional layer of policy control will be included in the AAP which will limit the nature of uses in the green separation beyond those which are normally appropriate in the Green Belt, so that no urban related open uses will be permitted, including playing fields, cemeteries and allotments, in order to ensure that the green separation does not take on a semi-urban character and reduce the effectiveness of that separation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2108 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 4316 2021 1778	Object	200m inadequate if stated aim to preserve separate identities of existing communities to be achieved. - Longstanton Parish Plan survey showed majority of residents consider that village identity cannot be maintained without a large distance from Northstowe	In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. The Structure Plan makes clear that Northstowe will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, i.e.. "at Longstanton/Oakington". It is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character.	
4331 (Land adjacent to Clive Hall Drive, Longstanton)	Object	We are seeking a minor exclusion of an area adjacent to Clive Hall Drive from the green separation as the land relates to the village.	Land that lies outside of the village framework of Oakington and Longstanton and between the villages and Northstowe will lie within an area that will be defined as green separation unless specified otherwise. There is no justification for taking a different approach to this predominantly open field outside the village framework.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4438 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council does not support the suggestion that playing fields cannot form part of the green separation. This approach would impose undue constraint on the potential land available for development in Northstowe. Provided appropriate landscaping and planting treatment is provided there is no justification for excluding playing fields from the green separation.	Generally urban related uses are appropriate in the countryside, including the Green Belt, adjoining towns and villages. However, they tend to form a transition to open countryside beyond and therefore do not impact upon the urban or village character of those settlements. In the case of Northstowe, there would not be that transition to open countryside on its edges where it adjoins Longstanton and Oakington, in view of its close proximity. If urban related open uses were located in that area of separation they could adversely affect the countryside character of the area which is important in maintaining the village character of Longstanton and Oakington. It is therefore appropriate to restrict the uses within the green separation. It would be possible for playing fields and other such uses to be located on the edge of the town but outside the area of green separation therefore providing a wider open area beyond that specifically required to maintain village character.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4751 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	We were assured there would be no coalescence with adjoining villages. The minimum 200m that is being advocated is widely adrift of our expectations and understanding of what should be considered reasonable in satisfying this undertaking.	200m is a distinct area of separation between 2 built up areas. The green separation will also be designated as statutory Green Belt which has the specific purpose of ensuring that coalescence between built up areas does not occur. An additional layer of policy control will be included in the AAP which will limit the nature of uses in the green separation beyond those which are normally appropriate in the Green Belt, so that no urban related open uses will be permitted, including playing fields, cemeteries and allotments, in order to ensure that the green separation does not take on a semi-urban character and reduce the effectiveness of that separation. The Council made no reference to the potential width of green separation until the Preferred Options Report was being prepared. No distance other than a minimum of 200m has been put forward by the Council or officers. Potential developers have been publicising their own proposals in the area local to Northstowe and there may be some confusion amongst the public between the formal plan making processes being undertaken by the Council and the informal consultation being carried out by potential developers which has no weight in the plan making process.	
6681 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	It needs to be made clear that Option C would make it possible to significantly increase separation.	The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be AT Longstanton/Oakington and located so that it makes best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The extent of 'green separation' necessary to protect the village character of Longstanton and Oakington has been the subject of a lengthy report and detailed member site visit. It is not considered that a greater minimum distance for green separation is necessary to maintain village character.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6643	Object	In my view, 200 metres minimum separation is totally insufficient and threatens the independence of both Longstanton & Oakington.	In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. In the context of a town that will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, it is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character.	
6644	Object	The datum for the measurement of the 200m separation should be all existing housing in the main built up area of Longstanton rather than the Village Framework.	The village framework by definition is defined around the main area of consolidated built development comprising a village. The approach to separation also considers the appropriate approach to any individual houses or groups of houses outside the village frameworks to ensure an appropriate approach which maintains the village character of Longstanton and Oakington.	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6648	Object	As 200m appears to be a fait accompli, I would prefer to see dense woodland at Oakington side to ensure privacy of properties adjoining the site and to promote wildlife, particularly birds.	The preferred approach to landscape treatment in the separation from Oakington is addressed at Option NS44 and proposes carefully designed and positioned tree groups and copses to reflect and enhance the local character whilst providing the screening sought. This is considered more appropriately than dense woodland throughout the whole of the green separation but will have a similar visual effect.	
2106 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 6650	Object	Separation should be ideally 300m. - Longstanton Parish Plan survey shows overwhelming majority of respondents think separation should be more than 300m	In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. In the context of a town that will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, it is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6651	Object	It is a complete nonsense that the "framework" excludes the conservation areas of Longstanton.	The village framework defines the consolidated built up part of a village. It generally excludes open areas on the edge of a village and individual properties in large grounds and sporadic groups of houses in the countryside. Policies allow for infill development within village frameworks. Conservation Areas are defined for a different purpose which is to maintain and enhance the character and appearance of an area of architectural or historic interest. They often include open areas, including countryside which inherently and appropriately lies outside village frameworks.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6678	Object	All houses in Longstanton should have 800m separation.	<p>Option NS40 deals specifically with green separation between Northstowe and the villages of Longstanton and Oakington to maintain village character as required by the Structure Plan. The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton and Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. In order to develop a new town of 8,000 to 10,000 homes the Structure Plan expects that it will be so close to these two villages that it specifies the need for 'green separation'. That 'green separation' is intended to protect village character and in order that the new town should meet the rest of the Structure Plan policy requirements, should be no more than needed for that purpose. Following consideration of a lengthy report and site visit, the Council concluded at the time that the Preferred Options Report was published that no more than 200 metres was required provided that that 'green separation' was properly treated. Other options address the issue of any special treatment required on other edges of Northstowe. However, any site identified in accordance with the Structure Plan tests will inevitably incorporate the outlying area of Rampton Drift into Northstowe. The Preferred Options report considers how that integration can most sensitively achieved whilst protecting the residential amenity of those residents.</p>	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2403 6682	Object	Shows lack of concern for the quality of life of existing residents. - most of whom chose to live in a village because they prefer it to a town or suburb. Seems Council has no concern for welfare of existing residents.	RPG6 and the Structure Plan set the policy requiring the development of a new town at Longstanton and Oakington, and also major urban extensions to Cambridge, as an appropriate policy response to the high level of housing requirements of the Cambridge area. This is a major change from the previous development strategy which saw significant levels of housing in South Cambs villages. The change in strategy relieves pressure for peripheral expansion distributed around a large number of villages, but the major development locations will inevitably have implications for the villages located close by. At Northstowe, the Structure Plan seeks to minimise adverse impacts by requiring green separation to maintain village character.	
6714	Object	Every dwelling within the Longstanton post code viz. St Michael's Mount and Rampton Drift et al deserve full separation protection or compensation.	Option NS40 deals specifically with green separation between Northstowe and the villages of Longstanton and Oakington to maintain village character as required by the Structure Plan. Other options address the issue of any special treatment required on other edges of Northstowe. Option NS43 addresses the appropriate approach at St Michael's Mount. However, any site identified in accordance with the Structure Plan tests will inevitably incorporate the outlying area of Rampton Drift into Northstowe. Option NS45 considers how that integration can most sensitively be achieved whilst protecting the residential amenity of those residents.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6715 6684	Object	Village frameworks defined with no public consultation or democratic scrutiny and as a result are ill-defined.	The village framework boundaries are a clearly defined planning policy boundary established in statutory plans. The current village frameworks for Longstanton and Oakington are included in the adopted Local Plan 2004, which went through a long democratic process including two formal stages where representations on draft plans could be made which then went before an independent planning Inspector at a Public Inquiry. The Inspector made recommendations for changes to the Plan and modifications were published for public consultation before the plan was adopted.	
6638 - Haslingfield Parish Council	Object	200 metres or 220 yards is a wholly inadequate distance to separate Longstanton and Oakington villages from Northstowe. The distance of separation should be at least 880 yards (half a mile) or more. A mere 220 yards separation would be chipped away over the years until Longstanton, Oakington and Northstowe formed one massive block.	In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. In the context of a town that will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, it is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character. The green separation will also be designated as statutory Green Belt which has the specific purpose of ensuring that coalescence between built up areas does not occur.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6646	Object	In order to preserve a villages identity it should be separated from its neighbouring village by at least two miles. There are many examples of this in Surrey where the population density is higher than Cambridgeshire.	<p>The Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton and Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. In order to develop a new town of 8,000 to 10,000 homes the Structure Plan expects that it will be so close to these two villages that it should specific the need for 'green separation'. That 'green separation' is intended to protect village character and in order that the new town should meet the rest of the Structure Plan policy requirements, should be no more than needed for that purpose. Following consideration of a lengthy report and site visit, the Council concluded at the time that the Preferred Options Report was published that no more than 200 metres was required provided that that 'green separation' was properly treated.</p> <p>In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. Distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character.</p>	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6654	Object	Show some real vision and take this unique opportunity to develop a proper Country park between Oakington and Northstowe. At present we do not have enough of these sort of facilities for existing residents. The proposals for green separation/space take into account only the interests of the future residents of Nortstowe.	Option NS84 proposes that a country park be provided in the green separation between Oakington and Northstowe which would be linked by a circular route of footpaths around the outside of Northstowe to a second country park to the west of Station Road, Longstanton. This will provide a recreational amenity to both residents of the villages and of Northstowe.	
6658	Object	In addition copses of tall trees need to be planted to screen the new town from the village. How can you do this with just 200 meters separation? A minimum of at least 400 metres is needed.	An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation is proposed through a series of further options which consider how to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character.	
6661	Object	There is a very real risk of this new town completely overwhelming the villages in its vicinity, with all the problems of traffic, noise and lighting at night. At present, it is possible to see a whole clear sky full of stars at night, and to hear the owls?	It is inevitable that a large development will have some impact on issues of traffic, noise and light. However, the AAP will include policies which seek to minimise the scale and effect of those and other impacts in order that the new town does not overwhelm existing villages and indeed brings some benefits in terms of access to services and facilities. Options are included on these issues.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6664	Object	It would appear that the `need? to get the required number of houses on the site is resulting in a sacrifice of quality of life for the adjacent villages, including noise and light pollution.	It is inevitable that a large development will have some impact on issues such as noise and light in the local area. However, the AAP will include policies which seek to minimise the scale and effect of those and other impacts in order that the new town does not overwhelm existing villages and indeed brings some benefits in terms of access to services and facilities. Options are included on these issues.	
6666	Object	Should not have proviso "if possible".	The preferred approach states that green separation will be a minimum of 200m. There is no qualification of that minimum requirement. Potential developers have been publicising their own proposals in the area local to Northstowe and there may be some confusion amongst the public between the formal plan making processes being undertaken by the Council and the informal consultation being carried out by potential developers which has no weight in the plan making process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6660 6663 2958 6668 6667 6645	Object	Separation should be 800m. - one area has 800m separation: this should be the minimum distance. - original concept said 800m - then down to 400m now 200m object to reduction	<p>In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. In the context of a town that will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, it is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character.</p> <p>The Council made no reference to the potential width of green separation until the Preferred Options Report was being prepared. No distance other than a minimum of 200m has been put forward by the Council or officers. Potential developers have been publicising their own proposals in the area local to Northstowe and there may be some confusion amongst the public between the formal plan making processes being undertaken by the Council and the informal consultation being carried out by potential developers which has no weight in the plan making process.</p>	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6671 - The Fairfield Partnership 6655 6657 1948 1950	Object	Should be at least 400m if village character is to be maintained - and adequate landscaping possible.	In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. In the context of a town that will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, it is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options. However, a greater minimum distance is not considered necessary to maintain village character.	
6673 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Green separation should not be filled in with new landscaping but that the existing horticultural or agricultural uses should be maintained.	The options propose suitable landscape treatments for different areas of the green separation having regard to the landscape character of those areas. None of those options propose "filling" the green separation with landscaping. Varying degrees of tree cover are proposed depending on the location.	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6701 - Ely Diocesan Board 6700 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	Wrong to presume against public open space/playing fields etc. Such uses offer more opportunity for proper management and permanent control compared to agricultural land, which would be less attractive if unmanaged. Also provide amenity for residents.	Generally urban related uses are appropriate in the countryside, including the Green Belt, adjoining towns and villages. However, they tend to form a transition to open countryside beyond and therefore do not impact upon the urban or village character of those settlements. In the case of Northstowe, there would not be that transition to open countryside on its edges where it adjoins Longstanton and Oakington, in view of its close proximity. If urban related open uses were located in that area of separation they could adversely affect the countryside character of the area which is important in maintaining the village character of Longstanton and Oakington. It is therefore appropriate to restrict the uses within the green separation. A high level of public access will be provided where appropriate to provide amenity for residents in an informal countryside setting.	
6721	Object	Where Northstowe butts onto a road or byroad, 50 metres of dense tree planting should be placed on the Northstowe side of the Road / byroad.	Option NS40 deals specifically with green separation between Northstowe and the villages of Longstanton and Oakington to maintain village character as required by the Structure Plan. Other options address the issue of any special treatment required on other edges of Northstowe. Of those other options, only NS47 includes a proposed buffer of less than 50m on the edge of Northstowe where it proposes a 40m buffer on the B1050 south of the railway. This issue is addressed at that option.	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6647 6729 6717 6686	Object	All conservation areas should have 200m minimum separation unless compelling reason not to.	<p>Conservation Areas may include built parts of villages generally contained within village frameworks and sections of landscape which may lie outside village frameworks. Inclusion within a Conservation Area may be for a variety of reasons and include; architectural interest (eg. those parts that lie within the village framework), historic interest (eg. fields containing "ridge and furrow" or other archaeological interest) or historic parkland setting (eg. Westwick Hall). Village character is essentially concerned with the architectural components and these generally lie within the frameworks.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, other options specifically address both the built and open parts of the Conservation Area which lie outside the village framework and consider whether they require any additional protection through either an extension to the green separation or a specific landscape treatment.</p>	
1173 6731	Object	All parts of villages should be given minimum of 200m green separation.	Green separation is required by the Structure Plan to maintain village character of Longstanton and Oakington which is addressed in option NS40. Other options address the issue of any special landscape treatment that would be required for dwellings or groups of dwellings lying outside the village framework adjoining or within Northstowe in order to protect amenity. However, this is not defined as green separation.	
6687 - Longstanton Parish Council 3060 6711 6713 6653 6726 6737 6741	Object	"Sensitive" areas are not clearly defined.	The areas considered to be "sensitive" are those lying within the Longstanton Conservation Area which extends beyond the village framework. However, a suitable landscape treatment to protect the landscape character of all parts of the green separation is proposed.	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6742	Object	We question the approach to future ownership, use and enhancement of the green separation, this needs to relate in a coherent manner to corresponding policies.	The importance of appropriate future management and maintenance of the green separation along with other public areas is recognised and addressed in option NS57.	
6277 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher acknowledges the need to provide for green separation in accordance with Structure Plan policy. Gallagher has consistently responded positively to the District Councils approach but holds significant reservations regarding the appropriateness and robustness of the linear measurement approach set out in NS40. Gallagher does not accept that a uniform figure of 200m is necessary or desirable to achieve the landscape treatments proposed as is argued.	In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. In the context of a town that will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, it is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered in order to maintain visual separation between the existing villages and Northstowe and then the physical extent of land that would enable that treatment to be implemented effectively. It is considered that a minimum of 200m separation is appropriate in principle. This is not a fixed distance and it would be possible to provide greater separation under the terms of the policy. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made in other options.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6699 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	A high degree of public access within the areas of separation is supported as being consistent with community planning events and the need for a positive relationship between Northstowe and with neighbouring villages. The blanket limitation proposed in relation to active and formal but open recreation uses is a detrimental influence on Northstowe. There is no sustainable argument for precluding all any uses such as playing fields and allotments, so long as they remain open.	Generally urban related uses are appropriate in the countryside, including the Green Belt, adjoining towns and villages. However, they tend to form a transition to open countryside beyond and therefore do not impact upon the urban or village character of those settlements. In the case of Northstowe, there would not be that transition to open countryside on its edges where it adjoins Longstanton and Oakington, in view of its close proximity. If urban related open uses were located in that area of separation they could adversely affect the countryside character of the area which is important in maintaining the village character of Longstanton and Oakington. It is therefore appropriate to restrict the uses within the green separation. It would be possible for playing fields and other such uses to be located on the edge of the town but outside the area of green separation therefore providing a wider open area beyond that specifically required to maintain village character.	
2492	Support	The importance of keeping village atmosphere for Oakington and Longstanton cannot be overstressed. When I was seeking council accommodation, I chose Oakington because it is a village, with its own school, church and post office. I would not want it to swallowed up in new town.	Support noted.	
1966 - Cottenham Parish Council	Support	Support but without a bypass or country park, see NS84, It seems rather ridiculous to propose a separation zone and then fill it with a bypass and a public recreation area.	Support noted. Other issues dealt with at their respective options.	

NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2918	Support	the best option within a set of inadequate green separation proposals. Would like to see dense woodland in separation Oakington side of Northstowe with no/limited public access to protect wildlife	Support noted. The preferred approach to landscape treatment in the separation from Oakington is addressed at Option NS44 and proposes tree groups and copses to provide screening as sought. The option says public access will be provided "where appropriate" and if there are areas of particularly sensitive habitats, access can be managed accordingly. Access would provide an amenity for residents of the villages as well as Northstowe.	
3022	Support	It is vital that the green space is exclusive of any roads which should have additional screening, such as earth bunding, to minimise the impact of traffic noise.	Support noted. It is not proposed that there be direct road access to Northstowe from either Longstanton or Oakington across the green separation. This is partly to ensure that the impact of traffic generation from Northstowe on surrounding communities is minimised. However, there will be high quality cycle and pedestrian routes provided across the green separation to connect villages to the services and facilities of Northstowe.	
4437 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5061 5060	Support	Support minimum distance of 200m	Support noted.	
6640 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1107	Support	Support use of green separation for high degree of public access - public amenity and cycle/walkways to and from Longstanton and Northstowe	Support noted.	
2619 6642 6641	Support	Support separation not containing any urban uses such as playing fields, allotments or cemeteries	Support noted.	

Decision on NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach

See Appendix 2 concerning proposed changes of the extent of 'green separation' at St Michaels Mount (providing 200 metres separation for St Michael's Mount) and the proposed extension to the Conservation Area.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS41 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Longstanton - Preferred Approach</i>				
877	Object	I agree that this form of green space would be preferable but 200 metres isn't sufficient. To try and preserve the village character of Longstanton/Oakington a high degree of public access SHOULD BE DISCOURAGED unless the areas are the dedicated pocket park/s as suggested for the southern sector of the airfield. Perhaps local stock owners could be encouraged to graze sheep/cows or horses on the paddocks created in the buffer zones. At the end of the day your major priority should be the residents of Longstanton/Oakington. We have never asked to have our lives changed.	Support for the proposed landscape treatment noted. The Council has considered the issue of separation carefully at Option NS40 and is of the view that a minimum of 200m is required in order to achieve the landscape characters proposed for both Longstanton and Oakington. It is considered that providing a high degree of public access for informal countryside recreation would provide an amenity for residents of the villages as well as Northstowe. The option says this will be provided "where appropriate" and if there are areas of particularly sensitive habitats or uses such as grazing, access can be managed accordingly.	
3819 - English Heritage	Object	Policies NS39, 41, 42, 43. These policies should refer to the potential of Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) analysis to inform the sensitive landscaping of the new settlement.	The Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database, developed by the County Council, provides a valuable tool in defining the evolution of the landscape and in identifying historic landscapes. Regard will be had to the database in determining whether proposals would have an adverse impact on the historic landscape of Longstanton Conservation Area.	Include reference in the supporting text to the use of the Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database.
4322	Object	An objection must be sustained to the overall approach until the developers and the District Council can explain in coherent manner the plans for ownership, use and maintenance of all these parcels of land to ensure deliverability of the land.	Determining detailed land use and maintenance of land within the areas of green separation will be matters for the planning application and masterplanning stages and are too specific for the planning policy stage. The key at this stage in the planning process is to identify the key requirements of the development and set appropriate criteria against which to judge any planning application. For example, Option NS57 requires that an appropriate management strategy for the landscaped areas be prepared and that this is done with the support of the local communities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6278 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The description in NS41 suggests a singular landscape response for potentially a large area. It also suggests a land use (paddock) rather than a landscape treatment. It is not envisaged that a response that is comprised entirely of paddocks and small copses would be attractive or would offer sufficient public access. The uses are too exclusive and difficult to control.</p> <p>Gallagher suggests that a more varied approach will be appropriate. The Longstanton St Michaels area is laid out as paddocks already. Elsewhere a more generic parkland form would be appropriate within which it would be possible to embrace the smaller landscape units envisaged in NS41 and provide appropriate screening. These would not necessarily be paddocks.</p> <p>NS41 should allow a more varied landscape response that nevertheless retains existing paddocks and ensures sufficient screening. References to paddocks should be replaced by references to smaller landscape units or fields.</p>	<p>The term paddock is intended to portray a pattern of smaller fields rather than a land use. The preferred approach refers to a mix of paddocks and small copses which could provide for a relatively varied landscape character which is appropriate for the historic landscape character adjoining Longstanton, as demonstrated in the Conservation Area in the vicinity of Long Lane. It is not considered that a parkland landscape setting would be appropriate for Longstanton. It implies a level of formality that would not be compatible with the historic landscape character of the village.</p>	
2388	Support	<p>I support this option: paddocks are a pleasant feature of Longstanton. Privately owned paddocks have always been well managed and protected by their private owners, who are best placed to carry on with this tradition as they see fit.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	
2553	Support	<p>It is important to preserve the abundance of bird species already found in these areas - I think that this should apply to all areas not most.</p>	<p>Support noted. The only part of the green separation for Longstanton where an alternative approach is proposed is in this Conservation Area out to Long Lane where fields and paddocks rather than copses would be more appropriate for this area to retain the remnants of the historic ridge and furrow field system, although supplemental planting, including trees and shrubs, is proposed to the north of Long Lane as a buffer to Northstowe.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4439 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5102 5101	Support	Support a landscape character of paddocks, hedgerows and small copses for enhancement.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS41 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Longstanton - Preferred Approach

Include reference in the supporting text to the use of the Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database.

NS42 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, Long Lane, Longstanton - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS42 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, Long Lane, Longstanton - Preferred Approach</i>				
1228	Object	My objection is to 12.14 only. Michael's Mount is built on the site of one of 4 Medieval Manors that existed in the village. This property has been singled out for less separation than any other house. It should receive the same level of protection as other houses in the village. The site could be important archaeologically and is sited within the conservation area. To single out this property is unfair. It should be given 200m protection from its boundary.	The issue of St Michael's Mount is specifically addressed at Option NS43.	
3820 - English Heritage	Object	Policies NS39, 41, 42, 43. These policies should refer to the potential of Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) analysis to inform the sensitive landscaping of the new settlement.	The Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database, developed by the County Council, provides a valuable tool in defining the evolution of the landscape and in identifying historic landscapes. Regard will be had to the database in determining whether proposals would have an adverse impact on the historic landscape of Longstanton Conservation Area.	Include reference in the supporting text to the use of the Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database.
4328	Object	The Conservation Area at Long Lane is supported but explanation needs to be given as to how this would operate within the proposed new town boundary.	The Conservation Area at Long Lane would lie within the area of green separation and not within the built up part of the town. The site option maps for option NS1, 2 and 3 show the boundary of the town going up to the edges of Longstanton and Oakington because it will be for the planning application for the town to also plan for the green separation. It is proposed in Option NS6 that the green separation would be included in the extended Green Belt. Option NS40 explains that the uses within the green separation would be limited to exclude urban related open uses such as playing fields.	

NS42 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, Long Lane, Longstanton - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6279 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher recognises the importance of Long Lane to the character of the Longstanton Conservation Area. Gallagher likewise recognises the potential need to supplement the visual separation offered along Long Lane.</p> <p>However, the requirement for an additional minimum of 50m separation beyond Long Lane to provide supplemental planting is too detailed and specific a requirement to place within a policy context. At present the Barracks to the east of Long Lane does not impact negatively on the village character. The need for and scale of additional planting can only be assessed in the light of a detailed landscape assessment to be undertaken through the master plan process.</p> <p>NS42 should not be prescriptive in terms of a minimum additional strip of land alongside Long Lane but should refer simply to the need to develop appropriate landscape responses to protect the character of the Conservation Area.</p>	In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. An appropriate landscape treatment for the different parts of the green separation was considered. In sensitive areas such as Conservation Areas, site specific proposals are made to ensure that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is protected and enhanced. The Council's view is that a 50m landscaping strip is required to meet this objective and is a reasonable policy requirement in the AAP.	
950	Support	As noted in my objection to NS40, some areas cannot be awarded 200 metres. In the case of Toad Acre (along Long Lane), the provision proposed seems sensible. However, earthworks should be established during construction as a noise barrier.	Support noted. The details of appropriate land form and other landscaping treatment are matters for the detailed planning application and masterplanning stage.	
3921 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>In addition to the remains of ridge and furrow in the St Michael's conservation area, there are also earthwork remains of the shrunken medieval village (HER 09261, 10296, 10857), surrounding the site of the Manor (HER 10305). Amendment to paragraph 12.13 However, demonstrates remnants of the early ridge and furrow field system, and earthwork remains of the medieval settlement.</p>	Support noted.	

NS42 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, Long Lane, Longstanton - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3923 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3378 - Longstanton Action Group 2202 - Longstanton Parish Council 2154 1203 1555 1303 1430 1755 1448 1174 1458 1131 2625 1515 1269	Support	Support the option to protect the Conservation Area and Toad Acres by putting in 50 metres of densely planted trees on the Northstowe side of Long Lane. It is completely unrealistic to expect 200 metres green separation here, because much of the site is heavily-developed barracks buildings.	Support noted.	
3824 - English Heritage	Support	Para 3.5 We welcome the recognition given to All Saints Church, Longstanton, as a key landmark.	Support noted.	
5111 - Toad Acres Park Home Residents Association 3334 1152	Support	Support proposed 50m tree planting as the full 200m green separation is inappropriate here because the area is already heavily developed. This is fully supported by residents of Toads Acre.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS42 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, Long Lane, Longstanton - Preferred Approach

Include reference in the supporting text to the use of the Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database.

NS43 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, St Michael's Mount, Longstanton - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS43 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, St Michael's Mount, Longstanton - Preferred Approach</i>				
1255	Object	This property is likely to end up as the only property in either village which is not given 200m separation although the space is readily available. The County Structure Plan says that Green Separation will be provided between Northstowe and the villages in order to maintain village character. How can this process exclude a Conservation Area? Both NS39 and NS62 make commitments to minimise any impact of Northstowe on Conservation Areas. So failing to give this property the same separation as every other property would seem to be in breach of your own guidelines.	See Appendix 2.	See Appendix 2.
1486	Object	I believe this proposal to be unfair and almost malicious. It can have little to do with geographic logic as the property is contiguous with a row of other houses and must be more to do with the occupant of St. Michael's Mount. To penalise an active representative of the people of the village in this way is reprehensible.	See Appendix 2.	See Appendix 2.
1566 1630 1736 1049 1470	Object	St Michael's Mount forms part of the village even if it is not in the village framework. It is also important to protect the Conservation Area. This is unfair and unjust treatment of St Michael's Mount.	See Appendix 2.	See Appendix 2.
2020 2019	Object	This discriminates against my neighbours' property, my own property, and our conservation area. We deserve the same separation as other properties.	See Appendix 2.	

NS43 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, St Michael's Mount, Longstanton - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2974	Object	This property has been part of Longstanton for generations, and should be treated exactly the same as other properties in St Michaels and be given at least 200m separation. There is no reason not to do this, as the space is available, apart from an apparent discrimination against the owner, who has worked hard to promote the rights of the residents of Longstanton. The wording is deliberately misleading, presumably an attempt to mask this unjust treatment.	See Appendix 2.	
3392 - Longstanton Action Group 1556 1235 1061	Object	This clause implies the separation in respect of St. Michael's Mount shall not deviate from 200m. However, the map clearly shows the property to have a substantially reduced separation. Therefore this clause is illogical and misleading. St. Michaels Mount should be provided with 200m separation. My objection (to this option) is therefore that it will lead to the property being discriminated against. All properties should have the same minimum separation and therefore this "option" is unnecessary.	See Appendix 2.	
2203 - Longstanton Parish Council 951	Object	The property is the last in a contiguous row of homes along St Michaels. It's the only house in the row not granted 200m. It's misleading to imply that the property would be protected by trees. Even accepting the perverse use of the Framework as a justification for excluding the property, it does not explain why 200m were granted to other homes outside the framework. The house is within the green separation zone, violating the principle that green separation should contain no urban uses. Mentioning the property explicitly indicates that a well-rounded approach to separation was not applied.	See Appendix 2.	See Appendix 2.

NS43 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, St Michael's Mount, Longstanton - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1229 1205 2437	Object	To use 200 metres from the village framework is unfair as it penalises only one house within the conservation area. St.Michael's Mount will have less separation than any other house in the village. It is a Victorian house built on the site of a medieval manor(or earlier). The site is undoubtedly full of archeological significance, and the grounds are of high conservation value. This historic site is being threatened in an unfair and discriminatory way. All houses that pay the Parish Council their share of council tax should be given the same protection. St Michaels Mount must be given at least 200m separation to protect this conservation area.	See Appendix 2.	
2159 1998 952 1132 1399	Object	St Michael's Mount should have the same separation as all other properties in the area, ie. 200m. This is unfair and unjust treatment of St Michael's Mount.	See Appendix 2.	See Appendix 2.
2416	Object	This house represents the start of the village of Longstanton as you approach from the Oakington side. As such it should be given at least as much separation from Northstowe as any other house in the village. The fact that it appears to have been discriminated against (and is occupied by our District Councillor) is a scandalous affront to democracy and to the people of Longstanton. What faith can we have in SCDC and its officers with behaviour such as this?	See Appendix 2.	See Appendix 2.

NS43 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, St Michael's Mount, Longstanton - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3821 - English Heritage	Object	Policies NS39, 41, 42, 43. These policies should refer to the potential of Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) analysis to inform the sensitive landscaping of the new settlement.	The Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database, developed by the County Council, provides a valuable tool in defining the evolution of the landscape and in identifying historic landscapes. Regard will be had to the database in determining whether proposals would have an adverse impact on the historic landscape of Longstanton Conservation Area.	Include reference in the supporting text to the use of the Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database.
2559 1431 1250 1160 1066 1342 4953 3117 1175 1516	Object	St Michael's Mount should have the same separation as all other properties in the area, ie. 200m.	See Appendix 2.	See Appendix 2.
1304 1986 1984 5105	Object	St Michael's Mount forms part of the village of Longstanton even if it is not in the village framework and should receive 200m separation.	See Appendix 2.	See Appendix 2.
5106	Object	Gallagher's masterplan incorporates 8,000 houses into Northstowe, whilst giving green separation to Longstanton village, which includes 200m to "The Mount". The Planning Dept's idea of 100m is seen as spite by the villagers.	See Appendix 2.	
3924 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support NS43.	Support noted.	
4321	Support	Support in principle the Conservation Area in this area. However we would reiterate our concerns as to how this conservation area would be enhanced when it is effectively outside of the village of Longstanton within Northstowe parish.	Support noted. The open parts of the conservation area will lie within the green separation and maintenance and management will need to form part of the overall landscape management strategy proposed in option NS57.	

NS43 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, St Michael's Mount, Longstanton - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6280 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	<p>The approach represents a measured and reasonable approach. It recognises the primary importance of the landscape treatment in protecting quality and also the strong existing landscape features that already contribute to that character.</p> <p>Gallagher will work closely with the District Council to determine the most appropriate landscape treatment.</p>	Support noted.	

Decision on NS43 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Conservation Area, St Michael's Mount, Longstanton - Preferred Approach

Include reference in the supporting text to the use of the Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database.

See Appendix 2 concerning proposed changes of the extent of 'green separation' at St Michaels Mount (providing 200 metres separation for St Michael's Mount) and the proposed extension to the Conservation Area.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

NS44 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Oakington - Preferred Approach

3011	Object	The setting of Oakington is of a small village surrounded by paddocks and open fields. This needs to be retained along the side of the New Town. Having a short separation space and shielding the New Town by planting trees would go against this.	Whilst there are some smaller paddocks close to the edge of Oakington, much of the area that will be in the green separation is currently relatively open land in the Oakington Barracks site with a few isolated tree groups and has a more parkland character. The option does not envisage significant changes to the existing landscape character, but instead that it be reinforced and enhanced through careful positioning of new tree planting in groups and copses to filter views between Oakington and Northstowe.	
4753 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Concern about possible inappropriate and antisocial uses of the green separation in close proximity to existing homes. The term green separation can mean many things to many people, whereas woodland is very much more specific. The fact that is acknowledged that one of the primary purposes is to provide a screen, then it follows that it should be referred to as woodland, at least in the vicinity of our village.	The term green separation is used in the Structure Plan for the retention of an undeveloped area between Northstowe and the villages of Longstanton and Oakington. The extent of the green separation is addressed in option NS40. Here we are looking specifically at the landscape treatment of that area which is where the reference to tree planting in groups and copses is relevant. This explains that the character proposed is a mixture of parkland and tree groups, rather than extensive woodland areas to best reflect the existing character of Oakington. The positioning of those tree groups will be designed to restrict views through to Northstowe whilst retaining some open areas around them.	
4992 4993	Object	"Tree planting in groups to shield views through the green separation but at the same time retain an open character" does not address the considerable problem of protecting residents living near the edge of Oakington from the disturbance and security problems that unlimited access would bring.	The design of the green separation and its landscape treatment will need to take account of the issue of noise, disturbance and security of adjoining properties. This could include careful selection of trees and shrubs which guide public access to appropriate parts of the separation and limit access to more sensitive areas as appropriate.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2119	Support	Without seeing details of the planting etc. it is difficult to make an informed comment. What is clear is that the proposed separation is too small and is significantly less than was initially proposed. This reduction is particularly disturbing and almost appears to be a deliberate policy of initially allaying fears and then gradually reducing the separation.	The issue of the extent of separation is addressed in option NS40. Option NS44 deals specifically with landscape character of the area of green separation. The Council made no reference to the potential width of green separation until the Preferred Options Report was being prepared. No distance other than a minimum of 200m has been put forward by the Council or officers. Potential developers have been publicising their own proposals in the area local to Northstowe and there may be some confusion amongst the public between the formal plan making processes being undertaken by the Council and the informal consultation being carried out by potential developers which has no weight in the plan making process.	
3065	Support	It is good to think of the trees and copses, but also of the natural drainage. the north of Oakington into Westwick has suffered deep flooding in recent years, which is already not absorbed by the existing drainage, or the covered surfaces.	Support noted. The issue of land drainage is considered in options NS87 and 88.	
3926 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6281 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Support NS44.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS44 Landscape: Treatment of Green Separation at Oakington - Preferred Approach

Take the preferred approach the the treatment of 'green separation' at Oakington (additional tree planting in groups and copses to reinforce the pastoral parkland nature of this local area).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS45 Landscape: Treatment at Rampton Drift - Preferred Approach</i>				
1135	Object	In addition, the properties on Rampton Road currently overlooking open fields towards the Golf Course should be provided with a higher level of green separation to compensate the loss of this amenity.	There is no right to a view under the planning system. However, the proposed approach to sensitively integrate Rampton Drift into Northstowe will provide an adequate landscape buffer to maintain residential amenity.	
1432	Object	All existing houses should have at least 200m separation.	Rampton Drift will be incorporated into Northstowe in any site option and will therefore be surrounded by urban uses. It is important to ensure that this area is sensitively integrated into the new town whilst maintaining its residential amenity. It is not considered that a specified distance is required in the Area Action Plan in order for this to be appropriately achieved. The landscape treatment will be a matter for the detailed planning application and masterplanning process.	
2443	Object	Rampton Drift should remain a part of Longstanton, with 200 metres green separation and not just the paltry 50 metres Mr Miles said the area would receive at the Public Meeting. If Rampton Drift is integrated into Northstowe, a non-existent community with no elected representation, who will defend their interests for years to come? Will the official change over be when Northstowe has a council in years to come? So Rampton Drift is 'Longstantonian', definitely and should be treated as such.	Reference to 50m separation for Rampton Drift made at the public meeting (incorrectly) was immediately corrected at meeting to make clear that the option the subject of public participation was for no fixed distance of separation but for an appropriate landscape treatment which could include additional planting supplementing the existing nearby mature trees. Rampton Drift will be incorporated into Northstowe in any site option and will therefore be surrounded by urban uses. It is important to ensure that this area is sensitively integrated into the new town whilst maintaining its residential amenity. It is not considered that a specified distance is required in the Area Action Plan in order for this to be appropriately achieved. The landscape treatment will be a matter for the detailed planning application and masterplanning process. The long term issue of governance will be considered alongside but separate from the planning process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3397 - Longstanton Action Group 2205 - Longstanton Parish Council 3064 2422 2163 2150 1528 1305 1259 1247 1757 1343 4954 953 2003 2002 3200 1176 1087 1536 1473 1133 2634 2682 1153 1270 1102	Object	Support this proposal, in particular the commitment given at the Longstanton public meeting on 11 October by Mr Miles to providing 50m of landscaped separation between Rampton Drift and the rest of Northstowe.	Reference to 50m separation for Rampton Drift made at the public meeting (incorrectly) was immediately corrected at meeting to make clear that the option the subject of public participation was for no fixed distance of separation but for an appropriate landscape treatment which could include additional planting supplementing the existing nearby mature trees. Rampton Drift will be incorporated into Northstowe in any site option and will therefore be surrounded by urban uses. It is important to ensure that this area is sensitively integrated into the new town whilst maintaining its residential amenity. It is not considered that a specified distance is required in the Area Action Plan in order for this to be appropriately achieved. The landscape treatment will be a matter for the detailed planning application and masterplanning process.	
2113 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Support	LPPC support NS45 only in so far as the majority of respondents in the Parish Plan Survey do not wish Rampton Drift to be insensitively subsumed into Northstowe, if at all. As far as Toad Acres is concerned, the majority believed that it ought to receive no less green separation than the rest of the village.	Support noted. Toad Acres is addressed in option NS42.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3927 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1632 1451 1517	Support	Support this approach.	Support noted.	
6283 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher supports the sensitive integration of Rampton Drift into Northstowe with the provision of appropriate landscape treatment. The specific location of Rampton Drift in relation to the 'core area' is such that full separation would neither be appropriate nor justified given the potential consequences for progressing the most sustainable development form for the new town.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS45 Landscape: Treatment at Rampton Drift - Preferred Approach

Take the preferred approach the the treatment at Rampton Drift (appropriate landscape treatment which could include additional planting supplementing the existing nearby mature trees).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS46 Landscape: Treatment at Airfield Road - Preferred Approach</i>				
6284 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher believes there is no technical or physical justification to specify what appears to be a very specific minimum distance for landscaping in this location.</p> <p>This is an issue that relates more to landscaping rather than green separation and a more appropriate response would be to assess any landscape or planting requirement as part of the overall master plan process similar to the approach adopted at Rampton Drift. Reference should be made to the need to retain and enhance as necessary the existing tree belt along Airfield Road. A minimum distance required for a landscaping zone is too detailed for inclusion within the AAP.</p>	<p>It is made clear in the Preferred Options Report that this option deals with landscaping and not with green separation of Northstowe from Longstanton and Oakington. The Council has addressed the appropriate landscape treatment on all edges of Northstowe and proposes that a minimum distance is required to achieve a suitable treatment.</p>	
2114 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Support	<p>LPPC support option NS46 provided that the provision of a direct cycle/pedestrian route, between Longstanton and Oakington, through this area is not compromised by additional landscaping.</p>	<p>Support noted. The issue of cycle and pedestrian routes is addressed at option NS36, which will ensure the provision of a network of routes to Northstowe from surrounding villages, including Longstanton and Oakington. A cycle link between two existing villages is not part of the remit of the Northstowe development, but agree, any additional landscaping should not compromise the ability to provide a cycle/pedestrian route in future.</p>	
2185	Support	<p>This is fine and I agree to extra tree planting etc. What won't keep the communities separate is the airfield road itself. If it isn't 'pedestrianised' soon it will become a rat run. I believe it should be closed to all traffic as soon as possible - Start planting trees in the road!</p>	<p>Support noted. The airfield road is currently an access-only route and the district council would not be looking to change its status. However, future use of the road and any measures that may be needed to prevent rat-running, will need to be considered as part of the wider traffic management measures.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2247	Support	I support, so long as wide grass verges to Airfield Road are kept, and managed by occasional mowing to provide (as now) rough grass habitat for the many butterflies that breed there.	Support noted. Option NS57 proposes the preparation of a management strategy.	
3928 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3400 - Longstanton Action Group 2206 - Longstanton Parish Council 2535 3014 2977 1204 1557 1306 1260 1634 1452 1344 2450 4955 954 1177 1475 1154 5449 1518	Support	This proposal is supported - all existing trees and hedges should be retained.	Support noted. The preferred approach proposes that the existing planting be supplemented. This will use appropriate species of trees to enhance its quality.	

Decision on NS46 Landscape: Treatment at Airfield Road - Preferred Approach

Take the preferred approach to the treatment of Airfield Road (50 metre landscape buffer).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

NS47 Landscape: sporadic linear development on the B1050 south of the railway - Preferred Approach

1537 1155	Object	40m will not adequately protect these properties from Northstowe. If that were the case, why do not all properties receive 40m? It is completely inconsistent for these properties to receive 40m, and those north of the railway line to receive 200m under NS48). These properties should receive 200m.	<p>The Structure Plan requires green separation to protect village character. The ribbon of 5 houses in the countryside south of the railway on the B1050 lies outside the established village of Longstanton. It therefore does not read visually as part of the consolidated village and does not require green separation to protect the village character of Longstanton. Notwithstanding, appropriate landscape treatment is proposed in the AAP to ensure protection of residential amenity for those dwellings. The 40m buffer on the east side of the B1050 would read visually together with the road which would provide additional distance from the residential properties.</p> <p>KEITH - WHAT IS THE POINT ABOUT BUSY ROAD???</p>	
--------------	--------	---	---	--

NS47 Landscape: sporadic linear development on the B1050 south of the railway - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2165 1307 1453 1134	Object	First paragraph fine. 200M to Home Farm (still to be built) but only 50M for existing properties is obtuse. those north of the railway (NS48) get 200 metres.	Support for approach in first paragraph for land on east side of the B1050 is noted. With regard to the approach on the west side of the road in the second paragraph, the Structure Plan requires green separation to protect village character. The ribbon of 5 houses in the countryside south of the railway lies outside the established village of Longstanton. It therefore does not read visually as part of the consolidated village and does not require green separation to protect the village character of Longstanton. However, the Home Farm development will be part of the consolidated village of Longstanton and therefore requires green separation under the Structure Plan. This part of the option is only relevant is Site B is chosen, in which case these properties effectively become integrated into Northstowe. Notwithstanding, appropriate landscape treatment is proposed in the AAP to ensure protection of residential amenity for those dwellings.	
2456	Object	This completely aberrant and can not be justified at all. B1050 residents on the south are very, very close to, if not 'on', the flood plain, and it is one the areas in this village where restrictions over green separation should not be imposed. Has SCDC a genius for choosing the WRONG places, either prone to flooding or at conservation areas or on already established natural parkland or on already established golf course to promote development at the expense of character/identity/protection?	The Structure Plan proposes that a new town be built AT Longstanton/Oakington and therefore very close to those villages. It is for the AAP to define the boundaries of the site in this context. Site B for the town (Option NS2) includes land west of the B1050, but not land within the floodplain, as one option for defining those boundaries.	

NS47 Landscape: sporadic linear development on the B1050 south of the railway - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2427 1433 1067 1345 4956 2475 1178	Object	All existing houses should have at least 200m separation.	The Structure Plan requires green separation to protect village character. The ribbon of 5 houses in the countryside south of the railway on the B1050 lies outside the established village of Longstanton. It therefore does not read visually as part of the consolidated village and does not require green separation to protect the village character of Longstanton. Notwithstanding, appropriate landscape treatment is proposed in the AAP to ensure protection of residential amenity for those dwellings.	
2207 - Longstanton Parish Council 2116 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 2564 1558 1635 1758 955 5134 5123	Object	B1050 properties should have 200 metre separation not 50 metre.	The Structure Plan requires green separation to protect village character. The ribbon of 5 houses in the countryside south of the railway on the B1050 lies outside the established village of Longstanton. It therefore does not read visually as part of the consolidated village and does not require green separation to protect the village character of Longstanton. It would be integrated into Northstowe if Site B were chosen. Notwithstanding, appropriate landscape treatment is proposed in the AAP to ensure protection of residential amenity for those dwellings.	

NS47 Landscape: sporadic linear development on the B1050 south of the railway - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6285 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The properties along the B1050 are isolated from the main built up area and the contribution made to the character of the village is limited. Separation of development from these properties will not contribute significantly to the protection of village character (the key test). The issue is the effect on amenity and this is not a strategic issue but one of sensitive treatment.</p> <p>The B1050, with the CGB, park and ride and western bypass will experience a significant change of character regardless of the new town. The new town will add to that change. The position of the properties is analogous to those at Rampton Drift. There is no justification for what appears to be an arbitrary minimum distance landscaping zone in this location.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the properties on the B1050 do not need to receive green separation under the terms of the Structure Plan. Option NS47 addresses an appropriate landscape treatment for this edge of the town as a separate issue. These properties will lie on the edge of but not within the town in Site A, although they will in Site B.</p>	
3930 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4319	Support	Support NS47.	Support noted.	
5452	Support	Support option A, so rules out NS47 2nd paragraph or NS48.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS47 Landscape: sporadic linear development on the B1050 south of the railway - Preferred Approach

Take the preferred approach to the treatment of the sporadic ribbon of development on the B1050 south of the railway (40 metres landscape buffer plus the width of the road).

NS48 Landscape: sporadic linear development on the B1050 north of the railway - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS48 Landscape: sporadic linear development on the B1050 north of the railway - Preferred Approach</i>				
1309	Object	A new development gets 100M (existing communities alongside the railway line don't) and this puts pressure on existing communities' separation as Northstowe must deliver thousands of new homes. It also conveniently compromises Option C, which allows Northstowe to be built while retaining the character of existing communities.	Site Option C would be capable of accommodating sufficient homes to meet the upper end of the Structure Plan range, i.e. 10,000 dwellings and provide 200m separation to properties north of the railway to enable dwellings to read as sporadic development in the countryside.	
1450	Object	Vigorously object to the minimum separation proposed for Station Road Properties north of the Railway not all being granted the 200 m separation such as our neighbour "Stanton Mereway". All properties should be granted the same separation not only the ones in the so called village framework.	This property lies on the east side of the road not far north of the railway line. It was not given 200m landscaping in NS48 on the understanding from the local Member that it was under option from a developer and would therefore not require a specific landscape treatment. However, if this is not the case, it should be provided with 200m measured down to the disused railway line. Land south of the line will be in use as a park and ride site in connection with the Guided Bus and will have significant landscaping.	Extent 200m landscaping treatment for property on east side of the B1050 and north of the railway, as far as the railway line, as shown on Map 1.
5349 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to NS48 on the grounds that this landscape buffer should be increased to 300m commensurate with an increase in the overall area of land to be included to the north of the disused railway.	WHAT IS THIS SAYING?	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3931 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3408 - Longstanton Action Group 2208 - Longstanton Parish Council 2167 1539 2566 1308 1434 1636 1759 1454 1346 1179 1136 5135 5124 5104 1610	Object	Support the separation of 200m for these properties.	Support noted.	
956	Support	As with other areas in the village, I strongly support these homes receiving 200 metres' separation. I would also point out that any other houses nearby that were incorrectly assumed to be optioned must be granted 200 metres.	Support and comment noted. Changes are proposed in response to representations from other parties.	
1033 1034	Support	Alter map 7 as it shows our land as part of the separation whereas you have to provide us with the 200m separation you have shown in all other areas of the study.	This property lies on the east side of the road not far north of the railway line. It was not given 200m landscaping in NS48 on the understanding from the local Member that it was under option from a developer and would therefore not require a specific landscape treatment. However, if this is not the case, it should be provided with 200m measured down to the disused railway line. Land south of the line will be in use as a park and ride site in connection with the Guided Bus and will have significant landscaping.	Extent 200m landscaping treatment for property on east side of the B1050 and north of the railway, as far as the railway line, as shown on Map 1.

NS48 Landscape: sporadic linear development on the B1050 north of the railway - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1156	Support	I support the straightforward idea that all properties should receive 200 metres, wherever this can be achieved. This is in accordance with the County Structure Plan's requirements.	Support noted. However, the 200m separation proposed does not form green separation as required by the Structure Plan to maintain village character of Longstanton and Oakington. It is proposed as a suitable landscape treatment for this area of sporadic outlying development adjoining Northstowe if Site C is chosen.	
2430	Support	I support this option and the same should apply to those properties south of the railway line.	Support noted. Properties south of the railway line are addressed in option NS47 under separate representation.	

Decision on NS48 Landscape: sporadic linear development on the B1050 north of the railway - Preferred Approach

Extend the 200 metre landscape buffer for all the properties on the B1050 north of the railway whose rear gardens would back onto site C.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS49 Landscape: St Ives Railway - Preferred Approach</i>				
1157	Object	Several grounds for objection. This is not the "outer edge of the town" if Option C is adopted. If Option C is adopted, it is heavily compromised because the separation has all been used up. And how can we justify 35Ha for this Option when there are existing properties in Longstanton that do not receive 200m separation?	If Site option C were chosen then this would still be the outer edge of the town for over half of this side of the town. This option responds to the preferred approach to drainage at Northstowe for a linear water park along the outer boundary of the town. The location of the drainage features is dictated by the fall of the land to the north towards the railway land. The 100m width is the best assessment at this time of the land necessary to provide adequate surface water drainage facilities and sufficient associated landscaping to provide an appropriate landscape treatment on this side of the town in long distance views and also provide access routes along the water park so that it can become an attractive amenity for the town and the wider area as part of a circular route around the outer edge of the town linking proposed country parks. It is therefore not providing additional landscaping on the outer edge of the town at the expense of Longstanton and Oakington, because the drainage features cannot be transposed to the south side of the town.	
2253	Object	Tree planting along railway line not always appropriate. Small but significant grassy areas along North side of track (between Rampton Road and eastwards for 1 km) contain locally important wildflower assemblages and associated insect species, and need to be managed sensitively, as grassy mosaic habitat, to maintain biodiversity.	The detailed design of landscaping in this area will have regard to the functioning of the Guided Bus. Land north of the railway will be incorporated into the town only if Site option C is chosen in which case the landscape management plan proposed at NS57 will be relevant.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3885 - Network Rail (Town Planning Team)	Object	<p>With regard to landscaping, Network Rail would ask that trees be sited so as not to overhang Network Rail's boundary since such affords would be trespassers, particularly young children, a means of access on to the railway. In addition, wet fallen leaves create operating difficulties on the railway line, particularly in cuttings, and during the falling season are a major problem and the cause of many delays to services of the Train operating Companies. Accordingly, if deciduous trees are to be planted, they should be well away from the railway boundary.</p> <p>The supporting text in paragraph 12.17 should refer to ensuring buffer creates no conflict with the operational railway.</p>	<p>This route is not an active railway line. The detailed design of landscaping in this area at the planning application and masterplanning stage will have regard to the functioning of the Guided Bus and issues of security. The Guided Bus route itself proposes tree planting within its curtilage.</p>	
3414 - Longstanton Action Group 5350 - The Fairfield Partnership 3017 2433 1559 1638 2015 957 1212 2489	Object	<p>If 100m is available then it should be used to increase the separation between Northstowe and Longstanton/Oakington.</p>	<p>This option responds to the preferred approach to drainage at Northstowe for a linear water park along the outer boundary of the town. The location of the drainage features is dictated by the fall of the land to the north towards the railway land. The 100m width is the best assessment at this time of the land necessary to provide adequate surface water drainage facilities and sufficient associated landscaping to provide an appropriate landscape treatment on this side of the town in long distance views and also provide access routes along the water park so that it can become an attractive amenity for the town and the wider area as part of a circular route around the outer edge of the town linking proposed country parks. It is therefore not providing additional landscaping on the outer edge of the town at the expense of Longstanton and Oakington, because the drainage features cannot be transposed to the south side of the town.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6286 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher supports the provision of a Water Park to the south of the St. Ives railway line (Options A + B). The water park will provide an opportunity for both formal and informal recreation and function as an important water attenuation feature for Northstowe.</p> <p>NS49 seeks the specification of a 100m minimum width. Gallagher considers this distance to be too detailed for the AAP. Whilst the water park is likely to be around this scale, a specific figure of 100 metres is not supported by a proper technical justification. In addition such an approach by specifying a minimum invites a geometric form and would limit the opportunities for variations in the width and treatment of the park.</p> <p>References to a minimum distance should be avoided.</p>	CHECK IF WE MEAN AVERAGE OR MINIMUM (CONFLICT WITH NS54).	
3932 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Support NS49.</p> <p>'In the order of' 100 m is less specific than the width mentioned for green separation areas. If 'in order of' means the average then this is ok, if not then an average figure should be specified.</p>	CHECK - OPTION NS54 SAYS MINIMUM OF 100M. WE NEED TO BE CONSISTENT. MICHAEL PLEASE ADVISE.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4169 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature would support the proposal for a linear water park adjacent to the disused railway line as it would be likely to increase the biodiversity of the area. Along most of its length, the disused railway provides a linear habitat linking (hedges, watercourses abutting the disused railway) other sites within an agricultural landscape. English Nature had some concerns as to how the proposed Guided Bus route would impact on the ecological value of the disused railway. An ecological strategy is therefore being developed, in partnership with a number of other conservation organisations, which will guide the implementation of agreed mitigation measures. It should be ensured that the proposal to create a water park in this same area is compatible with the these mitigation measures.	Support noted. Comments about the need for treatment here to be consistent with mitigation measures for the Guided Bus are also noted and will be a matter for the detailed planning application and masterplanning stage.	
4957 5457	Support	Support.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS49 Landscape: St Ives Railway - Preferred Approach

Take the preferred approach to the treatment of the St Ives railway (100 metres to incorporate surface water attenuation lakes).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS50 Landscape: West of Station Road - Preferred Approach</i>				
1158	Object	How can you give more protection (50m) to this Northstowe edge than to the existing properties on the other side of Option B, which receive 40m?	The 50m proposed on this outer edge of Northstowe if Site B were chosen is consistent with the width proposed for landscape treatment on other outer edges of the town. For the east side of Station Road, Longstanton south of the railway, 40m is proposed in recognition that landscaping will read together with the existing road, which will add greater distance for the 5 properties on the west side of the road.	
1540	Object	Though I agree screening from the railway line is required I fail to see why 50 mts can be given to the railway and 40mts to houses already in situ	The 50m proposed on this outer edge of Northstowe if Site B were chosen is consistent with the width proposed for landscape treatment on other outer edges of the town. It would apply to land adjoining the Guided Bus route and the western side of the town. For the east side of Station Road, Longstanton south of the railway, 40m is proposed in recognition that landscaping will read together with the existing road, which will add greater distance for the 5 properties on the west side of the road.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6288 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>In the event of the District Council supporting Option B it will be appropriate for a sensitive landscape treatment to be provided on the edge of that development. The precise form that this should take should be informed by a detailed master planning exercise and landscape assessment. The stipulation of a specific figure of 50m is premature and likely to represent too much detail for the AAP. The scale of any strategic planting will depend upon the mix and distribution of uses within the area defined as Option B.</p> <p>Gallagher believes a more appropriate approach is simply to require the provision of an appropriate landscape treatment to protect the open countryside.</p>	<p>The Council has considered what landscape treatment will be required on all boundaries of the town and where it adjoins existing properties. The option proposes what the Council considers to be an appropriate requirement in terms of land area to provide suitable landscaping.</p>	
1457	Support	I support this in principle but don't see how it would fit in with the Country Park (NS84)	Support noted. If Site B were chosen, the Country Park would lie adjoining the town and the landscaped area would be able to be integrated into the country park.	
3934 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support NS50.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS50 Landscape: West of Station Road - Preferred Approach

Take the preferred approach to the landscape treatment of the properties to the west of Station Road south of the railway if Option B is chosen (50 metres landscape buffer).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS51 Landscape: Willingham and Rampton - Preferred Approach</i>				
889	Object	Do not want any development north of Railway all though tree planting to alleviate flooding acceptable	Objection noted. This issue is addressed at option NS3 in relation to Site C under a separation representation. Tree planting will not alleviate flooding in this situation.	
5351 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to NS51 as it seeks a minimum distance of 1km between Willingham and Rampton and the new settlement. It is accepted that a 50 m landscaping belt is provided along the NE boundary but in order to achieve the 10000 dwelling scale at a reasonable density of 40 dph and to achieve reasonable green separation to Longstanton and Oakington then the separation to Willingham and Rampton will have to be less than 1km. 800m would be more reasonable.	Site Option C, to which this option relates, proposes that same 'green separation' as Options A and B because the Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington rather than midway between Longstanton/Oakington/Willingham and Rampton. Also that it will make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The Structure Plan envisages that it will be so close to these two villages that it is necessary to specifically require 'green separation' in order to clarify that they will not be part of the new town. This issue is addressed at Option NS3 under a separate representation.	
6289 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>This proposal does not accurately reflect the approach taken in the Structure Plan. The Structure Plan seeks to locate the new town at Longstanton and Oakington.</p> <p>No provision is made for green separation to protect the village character of Rampton or Willingham for the reason that the Structure Plan did not conceive of a situation where there might be such an impact.</p> <p>Gallagher has argued strongly that option C cannot be supported. The need to create green separation policies to protect Rampton and Willingham, well beyond the guidance offered by the Structure Plan, reiterates the lack of conformity of Option C with key structure plan objectives.</p>	<p>The 1km distance referred to in the option is not proposed as "green separation" under the terms of the Structure Plan. It is recognised that the Structure Plan requires that the new town be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, and anticipates that it will be so close that it is necessary to include a requirement that they are kept apart by 'green separation'. The 1km distance is proposed as a guide to ensure that the town is at Longstanton/Oakington rather than midway between Longstanton/Oakington/Willingham and Rampton. The issue of site C is addressed at option NS3 under a separate representation.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3018	Support	A distance of 1km to Willingham and Rampton would allow for building over the railway line and increasing the separation space between Oakington and the New Town. A distance this big gives a significant gap to the residents of Willingham and Rampton, much more than Oakington and Longstanton are getting. The landscaping belt further protects them, and provides an opportunity to draw a line for the new Green Belt location.	Support noted. However, Site Option C to which this option relates, proposes the same 'green separation' as Options A and B because the Structure Plan proposes that the new town will be located AT Longstanton/Oakington and make best use of the previously developed land at Oakington Airfield. The Structure Plan envisages that it will be so close to these two villages that it is necessary to specifically require 'green separation' in order to clarify that they will not be part of the new town. This issue is addressed at option NS3 under a separate representation.	
3936 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3090 - Rampton Parish Council 3013 902	Support	Support NS51.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS51 Landscape: Willingham and Rampton - Preferred Approach

Take the preferred approach to the distance of Northstowe from Willingham and Rampton if Option C is chosen (a minimum distance of 1km and a 50 metre landscape buffer on the new town perimeter in this area).

NS52 Landscape: Site Option C, Treatment of Land Between Northstowe and the villages of Willingham and Rampton - Preferred Approach

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS52 Landscape: Site Option C, Treatment of Land Between Northstowe and the villages of Willingham and Rampton - Preferred Approach</i>				
1080 1912 890 903	Object	Option C should not be built and therefore this landscaping is not an issue.	Objection noted. The issue of Site Option C is addressed at NS3 under separate representations.	
6290 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher has argued strongly that that option C cannot be supported. The need to create green separation policies to protect Rampton and Willingham well beyond the guidance offered by the Structure Plan reiterates the lack of conformity of Option C with key structure plan objectives. With the eastern extent of the new town defined by the Cambridge-St Ives railway line the potential impact of the new town on the villages of Rampton and Willingham is kept to an absolute minimum.</p> <p>Separate but related representations have outlined in detail the position of Gallagher in respect of Site Option C. Gallagher therefore object to the requirements of NS52 as unnecessary and inappropriate based on Structure Plan requirements.</p> <p>References in paragraph 12.20 to undertaking landscape works within the proposed area of separation are unlikely to be capable of being delivered because of land ownership controls.</p>	Site option C is addressed at NS3 under a separate representation. Land ownership controls would be unlikely to be a significant issue in delivering the landscape belt if Option C were chosen with respect to	
3937 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support NS52.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS52 Landscape: Site Option C, Treatment of Land Between Northstowe and the villages of Willingham and Rampton - Preferred Approach

Take the preferred approach to the treatment of the landscape between Northstowe and Willingham and Rampton if Option C is chosen (to retain the land in agricultural production).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

NS53 Landscape: Water - Preferred Approach

3943 - Cambridgeshire County Council
4958
5458

Support

Support this approach

Support noted.

Decision on NS53 Landscape: Water - Preferred Approach

Take the preferred approach to using water as a defining characteristic throughout this fen edge town.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

NS54 Landscape: Water Park - Preferred Approach

1159

Object

As with NS49, I do not understand how this is to work if Site Option C is adopted.

The general approach to the water park would apply to all sites. However, if site C is chosen, NS87 states that the water park would be on either side of the railway line.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3417 - Longstanton Action Group 2209 - Longstanton Parish Council 2440 1311 1640 1459 958	Object	This would be at the expense of separation of existing homes. The water park can be built with less green space, the extra land being used to provide/expand separation that is being denied to date. The Park must not be used to discourage adoption of Option C.	<p>This option responds to the preferred approach to drainage at Northstowe for a linear water park along the outer boundary of the town. The location of the drainage features is dictated by the fall of the land to the north towards the railway land. The 100m width is the best assessment at this time of the land necessary to provide adequate surface water drainage facilities and sufficient associated landscaping to provide an appropriate landscape treatment on this side of the town in long distance views and also provide access routes along the water park so that it can become an attractive amenity for the town and the wider area as part of a circular route around the outer edge of the town linking proposed country parks. It is therefore not providing additional landscaping on the outer edge of the town at the expense of Longstanton and Oakington, because the drainage features cannot be transposed to the south side of the town.</p> <p>There is an inconsistency between option NS49 which talks of a water park "in the order of 100m" and option NS54 which says it should be "a minimum of 100m". It is not appropriate to be explicit at this stage in the planning process. The 100m width is the best assessment at this time of the land necessary to provide adequate surface water drainage facilities and sufficient associated landscaping to provide an appropriate landscape treatment on this side of the town in long distance views and also provide access routes along the water park. Option NS54 should be amended to be consistent with NS49.</p> <p>The general approach to the water park is proposed for all site options. However, if site C were chosen, NS87 states that the water park would be on either side of the railway line.</p>	<p>Amend Option NS54 to be consistent with NS49, so that in the second sentence, "a minimum" be deleted and the sentence be amended to read:</p> <p>"...This should be IN THE ORDER of 100 metres..."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6291 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher supports the provision of a water park but objects to the inclusion of a 100 metre minimum width as being overly prescriptive and not supported by a proper justification.</p> <p>The water park should be an edge feature providing drainage and recreation opportunities but linking the town to the countryside beyond. It is not appropriate to include the water park in the heart of a town crossing the railway line. This would be a totally different concept resulting in the substantial separation of development areas.</p>	<p>There is an inconsistency between option NS49 which talks of a water park "in the order of 100m" and option NS54 which says it should be "a minimum of 100m". It is not appropriate to be explicit at this stage in the planing process. The 100m width is the best assessment at this time of the land necessary to provide adequate surface water drainage facilities and sufficient associated landscaping to provide an appropriate landscape treatment on this side of the town in long distance views and also provide access routes along the water park. Option NS54 should be amended to be consistent with NS49.</p> <p>However, if site C were chosen, NS87 states that the water park would be on either side of the railway line.</p>	<p>Amend Option NS54 to be consistent with NS49, so that in the second sentence, "a minimum" be deleted and the sentence be amended to read:</p> <p>"...This should be IN THE ORDER of 100 metres..."</p>
3067	Support	<p>Have you taken into account the effect of the land being built over by houses and roads and footpaths, thus causing all the rain to run off into these balancing ponds? Heavy rain already causes flooding in Oakington.</p>	<p>The water park is a key part of the drainage strategy for Northstowe which is required to take account of flooding issues at Oakington. Drainage is addressed under separate options. This option proposes that the opportunity is taken to use this essential drainage feature to provide a visual and recreation amenity.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2641	Support	An important leisure facility as well as drainage need. The width should be minimised to that required to hold the lakes rather than set to an explicit width regardless of use	Support noted. There is an inconsistency between option NS49 which talks of a water park "in the order of 100m" and option NS54 which says it should be "a minimum of 100m". It is not appropriate to be explicit at this stage in the planning process. The 100m width is the best assessment at this time of the land necessary to provide adequate surface water drainage facilities and sufficient associated landscaping to provide an appropriate landscape treatment on this side of the town in long distance views and also provide access routes along the water park. Option NS54 is proposed to be amended to be consistent with NS49 in response to objections.	
4170 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature would support the proposal for a linear water park adjacent to the disused railway line as it would be likely to increase the biodiversity of the area. Along most of its length, the disused railway provides a linear habitat linking (hedges, watercourses abutting the disused railway) other sites within an agricultural landscape. English Nature had some concerns as to how the proposed Guided Bus route would impact on the ecological value of the disused railway. An ecological strategy is therefore being developed, in partnership with a number of other conservation organisations, which will guide the implementation of agreed mitigation measures. It should be ensured that the proposal to create a water park in this same area is compatible with the these mitigation measures.	Support and comment noted. The design of the water park and its compatibility with landscape and other mitigation measures on the Guided Bus route will taken into account at the planning application and masterplanning process.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4441 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 12.17 A linear water park should provide for biodiversity, as well as drainage and recreation. Amendment to paragraph 12.17 The□providing for biodiversity, drainage and recreation (see Map 7).	The issue of biodiversity at the water park is dealt with in a separate Biodiversity chapter in NS59. A cross reference would be helpful to clarify this given the close relationship between the 2 issues.	Include cross reference in paragraph 12.17 to biodiversity at the water park being addressed in NS59.
3944 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3091 - Rampton Parish Council 5460	Support	This option is supported.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS54 Landscape: Water Park - Preferred Approach

Amend Option NS54 to be consistent with NS49 so that in the second sentence "a minimum" is deleted and the sentence be amended to read: "...This should be IN THE ORDER OF 100 metres..."

Include cross reference in paragraph 12.17 to biodiversity at the water park being addresses in NS59.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS55 Landscape: Green Corridors - Preferred Approach</i>				
1006	Object	Green corridors make the town spread too far. Remove them and have a more compact town further away from the surrounding villages.	The green corridors proposed are based on the drainage infrastructure necessary to serve the town, some of which will be based on existing landscape features. It is considered desirable that they perform a wider function including recreational opportunities and wildlife corridors. They will not result in the town making poor use of land.	
6292 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher supports the provision of a green corridor network based on the required drainage infrastructure and existing landscape features. The primary role of the green corridors will however relate to surface water drainage and attenuation. Whilst water will be a feature of the corridors not all of the provision made for drainage will be permanently 'wet', but will reflect seasonal changes as do existing water courses.	Whilst drainage is an important function of the green corridors through the town, it is proposed that the opportunity should be taken to integrate them with green corridors which are also an important part of the strategic design of the town for landscape and biodiversity, and also provide opportunities for recreation. Integrating these uses also helps to make best use of land. Whilst it is recognised that the drainage channels may not all be wet all the time, there may be some areas where this is desirable for landscaping and biodiversity reasons. This is a matter for the planning application and masterplanning process.	
3946 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6418 - The Countryside Agency 5461	Support	Support the Preferred Approach.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS55 Landscape: Green Corridors - Preferred Approach

Amend Option NS54 to be consistent with NS49 so that in the second sentence "a minimum" be deleted and the sentence be amended to read: "...This should be IN THE ORDER of 100 metres..."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS56 Landscape: Access Roads - Preferred Approach</i>				
5629	Object	The significant amount of construction spoil generated by the development should be in conjunction with significant tree/hedge planting to create banks to the sides of the new access road from Halton's Road (B1050) and Dry Drayton Road to reduce noise pollution to existing properties.	The issue of construction spoil is addressed at option NS111 which states that there will be some opportunities for mounding to act as noise barriers to protect communities from traffic noise. How best to achieve this will be a matter for the planning application and masterplanning process.	
3947 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support NS56. Para 12.25 Would welcome full use of drought tolerant species on higher areas.	Support noted. However, this is more appropriately a matter for the detailed planning stage.	
5464	Support	support	Support noted.	

Decision on NS56 Landscape: Access Roads - Preferred Approach

Take the preferred approach to landscaping access roads (substantial planted in blocks beyond the highway boundary and in association with balancing ponds as well as planting trees and hedgerows along the highway boundary).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS57 Landscape: Management Plan - Preferred Approach</i>				
3421 - Longstanton Action Group 2210 - Longstanton Parish Council 2120 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 1560 1312 2282 1642 1460 2461 4962 959 1161	Object	Object to the extremely imprecise way that this has been presented. The concept sounds good, but has such a lack of detail that it could mean anything to anyone. Presumably 'local communities' include Longstanton and Oakington, but this is not defined. Also, it is not clear what 'support' means. Clear management and ownership plans, from the outset, should be transparent and accountable to the entire community. Many important questions need to be resolved.	It is not possible or appropriate for the Area Action Plan as a high level planning policy document prepared at an early stage in the process of developing the new town to be prescriptive about how maintenance and management of public open space will be dealt with, including issues of community involvement and funding. What is important is to highlight it as an important issue to be addressed and provide an appropriate policy hook to ensure that this issue must worked up more fully as part of a planning application, on which there will be public consultation. It is also important to make the link between the management of open spaces which have a variety of uses and which need an integrated approach to management, such as landscape, biodiversity, rights of way and drainage.	
6293 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher recognises the need for long term management arrangements to be adopted. Whether a single agreed plan will be the most appropriate way forward will need to be considered by all parties, particularly in the light of an implementation programme that will extend over many years. The principal requirement is that the management arrangements that are developed offer an integrated approach to landscape, biodiversity and recreation. It is appropriate that this is shaped by the local community through an ongoing consultation process. However the wording of NS57 in relation to the involvement of the community in the development of the landscape is unclear and appears to offer too much detail for the AAP policy.	It is important that a strategic level management strategy setting out an overall approach to the management of public open space is agreed at the start of the development to ensure an integrated approach to management is able to be implemented from the start of the development. There will be a need for more detailed management plans as different phases of the development come forward which will provide the opportunity to adapt to changing circumstances over time.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3949 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3092 - Rampton Parish Council 2749 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	Support NS57.	Support noted.	
6419 - The Countryside Agency	Support	We welcome the proposed preparation of a landscape management strategy. Please see also our comments on NS79 and NS80.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS57 Landscape: Management Plan - Preferred Approach

Take the preferred approach to the management of the landscape (the landownership structure should be as simple as possible and subject to a single agreed management plan covering landscape, biodiversity etc)

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 13. Biodiversity				
<i>NS58 Biodiversity: Objectives - Preferred Approach</i>				
1927	Object	This is pure political correctness, even though I am a professional ecologist. None of the species or habitats named can be expected to benefit from this development, and there is no conceivable way in which a new town can be made to increase local biodiversity, unless you want to include imported garden flowers, weeds and pests in your total. If construction is to start in 2007, you are already too late to start and complete credible baseline ecological surveys or gain understanding.	Not accepted. Although the development of a new town will alter the circumstances of the site, there is every opportunity to include measures to increase the overall biodiversity.	Confirm objectives.
6335 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Para 13.8 Clearly an appropriate landscape and biodiversity strategy will need to be prepared for the new town. The provisions set out in paragraph 13.8 are however too detailed for inclusion in the AAP and will need to be addressed in the strategy in the light of surveys undertaken.	Not accepted. The examples given are indicative of what needs to be done. Other measures are also appropriate.	Confirm objectives. Maintain examples set out in paragraph 13.8 as examples of how the objectives can be realised.
2121 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 2267	Support	Support but it is important that future management plans are supported by funding professionals to monitor /manage sites and interpret biodiversity to residents. Expecting community groups to create and care for habitats is unrealistic unless there is strong leadership and commitment, and pre-agreed professional advice and funding.	Support noted. It would be appropriate for major developments to contribute towards providing funding for a project officer.	Draft a policy to require a section 46 Agreement to secure an appropriate contribution towards providing a project officer to implement and manage the biodiversity strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4149 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 4148 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 3968 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2758 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 5465	Support	General support for these objectives and the policies and approach that would be developed. It is important to achieve net increase in biodiversity and to carry out full programmes of ecological survey and monitoring before, during and after construction in order to protect, manage and mitigate for protected species	Support noted.	

Decision on NS58 Biodiversity: Objectives - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Other actions proposed:

Maintain examples set out in paragraph 13.8 as examples of how the objectives can be realised.

Draft a policy to require a section 46 Agreement to secure an appropriate contribution towards providing a project officer to implement and manage the biodiversity strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS59 Biodiversity: Water Park - Preferred Approach</i>				
7298	Support	The new town will inevitably create more flooding problems for the local area, given those already seen in recent years.	Support noted; it emphasises the need for the water park to deal with drainage.	None needed.
7299	Support	Any "park" facility needs sufficient resources dedicated to its management (both biological and in terms of security - vandal control etc).	Support noted; the issue of management is considered at NS57.	
1928	Support	If the wetland habitat at the water park is to provide drainage from the town, the agricultural land and from surrounding roads, it will inevitably be highly polluted and unsuitable for many of the species that might be seen as attractive targets to exist there.	Support noted. The issue of pollution would need to be addressed in detailed design of interceptors to ensure protection of wildlife.	none needed at this stage.
3021	Support	Every effort must be taken to provide good varied habitats for biodiversity, some of these areas should be inaccessible to the public.	Support noted; agree some areas will need to be inaccessible in order to protect wildlife - this is a matter for masterplanning.	
4156 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature fully support the preferred approach taken in this policy as it takes on board all the essential aspects of biodiversity that need to be taken into consideration when dealing with new developments. It welcomes that fact that key protected species have been recognised, though it is suggested that a mention should be made here of the Local Biodiversity Action Plan.	It is intended that the AAP will make reference to the Local Biodiversity Action Plan and that this will cover the Water Park.	
4157 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature supports this policy regarding landscape management and agrees that the landownership of public open space should be as simple as possible to facilitate management suitable for encouraging biodiversity.	Support noted; the issue of landownership and management is set out as the Council's Preferred approach at NS80 which will include open areas important for biodiversity as well as recreation.	Ensure that policy on management of open space includes reference to wildlife areas.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4161 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 4153 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 3969 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2760 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 5466	Support	Supports the preferred approach.	Support noted.	
6294 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher support the approach outlined subject to a recognition that the fundamental role of the Water Park will be to manage surface water drainage and flood risk.	Support noted; the Preferred Option NS77 suggests that the primary function is for drainage but that it also offers an aesthetic, visual and recreational opportunity as well. NS59 suggests it can also have a biodiversity function. It is not considered that there is a significant conflict between these objectives.	None needed.

Decision on NS59 Biodiversity: Water Park - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Other action proposed:

Ensure that policy on management of open space includes reference to wildlife areas.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS60 Biodiversity: Southern Parkland - Preferred Approach</i>				
2109	Object	Any green separation needs to be designed to inhibit public access generally to the edges of the existing communities to provide for privacy and to improve security.	Agree; there will be a need for some areas to be relatively inaccessible in order to protect wildlife interests as well as security for existing residents. This is a matter for masterplanning and more detailed planning stages.	None at this stage; note for future stages in the planning process.
4152 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 3970 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2801 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 5467	Support	Support this preferred approach as a new parkland area comprising grassland, woodland and other areas of semi-natural vegetation will greatly increase the biodiversity of the area.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS60 Biodiversity: Southern Parkland - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS61 Biodiversity: Green Corridors Beyond the Town - Preferred Approach</i>				
6297 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher recognises and supports the long term environmental benefits of extending the green corridors beyond Northstowe. Whilst connections may be provided to wildlife corridors off site it will not be possible for Gallagher to provide or deliver such off site corridors. Such an objective must recognise the land ownership, control and management issues this objective raises and should refer to connections rather than imply off site provision.	If such off site improvements are needed beyond the boundaries of the town and the land under the control of any applicant for planning permission, it will fall to that applicant to negotiate with any other landowner to ensure delivery of what is needed to create a successful development.	Confirm the Preferred Approach.
3971 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3026 2278	Support	Support but there needs to be a locally based professional team responsible for biodiversity conservation and interpretation. Contributions may be needed from the Developer.	Support noted; it would be appropriate to include a policy setting out that developer contributions will be sought through a Section 46 Agreement to contribute towards the funding for a project officer.	Include a policy setting out that developer contributions will be sought through a Section 46 Agreement to contribute towards the funding for a project officer.
3972 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 13.8 If appropriate, reference Biodiversity Checklist and Guides in this paragraph (which will hopefully become SPDs and are an existing resource). These are the appropriate mechanisms/guidance for maximising biodiversity.	Agree the AAP should include references to these documents.	Include reference Biodiversity Checklist and Guides to supporting text to policy in AAP.
4150 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 2803 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 5468	Support	Supports the preferred approach.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS61 Biodiversity: Green Corridors Beyond the Town - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Other actions proposed:

Include reference Biodiversity Checklist and Guides to supporting text to policy in AAP.

Include a policy setting out that developer contributions will be sought through a Section 46 Agreement to contribute towards the funding for a project officer.

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD******Chapter 14. Archaeology and Heritage******NS62 Archaeology and Heritage: Objectives - Preferred Approach***

3448 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships supports the principles of this objective but request that bullet point three is deleted and that a more flexible and adaptive response is undertaken through the masterplan process.	NS62 requires to a strategy to be developed, the aim of which will be to mitigate against any effects of the new settlement on unlisted structures of historic interest within the RAF airfield. It considered that this is not an overly-prescriptive requirement. There would be scope in the strategy for a flexible and adaptive approach to be taken which could look in greater detail at the best approach to mitigation in relation to individual features of historic interest. This strategy would then be implemented through the masterplan.
6298 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The final bullet point will need to be clarified further through negotiations on the planning application.</p> <p>As presently drafted the provision of an educational resource is imprecise. A number of responses might be envisaged. Extensive archaeological investigations have been or will be carried out, and some of this information might be made available. Care will need to be taken to ensure that the requirements are appropriate and reasonable.</p>	Agree that the specific details of the educational resource to be provided should be determined at the planning application stage. However, consider that it is a valid and reasonable objective of the Area Action Plan to provide an educational resource.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2122 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Support	LPPC support NS62: in the Parish Plan Survey, some residents have pointed out that it is important to treasure the Villages military-history resources, particularly as educational resources.	Noted. Agree that the features with military heritage value should be as far as possible preserved and developed as an educational resource. In NS63 it is proposed that structures such as the pillboxes would be retained as features/points of interest in the landscape. NS63 also proposes that buildings with a heritage value should be retained. Paragraph 14.7 states that "A strategy will need to be developed for the survey and recording of structures of historic interest on the former RAF airfield." It is considered that this survey will in itself be an educational resource which will be complemented by the retention of many features of military heritage interest on site.	Continue with preferred approach (as set out in NS63) towards preserving buildings of military heritage value and retain para 14.7 which sets out the need for a strategy to be developed for the survey and recording of structures on the former RAF airfield.
3973 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2211 - Longstanton Parish Council 1314 1644 1461 960 1162	Support	Representations support the Preferred Option, particularly its commitment to minimising adverse impacts on listed Buildings and Conservation Areas.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3822 - English Heritage	Support	<p>We welcome the recognition in the text given to the important historic features of the area. While some adverse impacts might occur, and mitigation is important, opportunities for enhancement should be pursued too. This section should refer to the importance of the new settlement being based on a thorough understanding of the evolution of the existing townscape and landscape, and the need for such information to shape the new development. Historic Landscape Characterisation and Conservation Area Appraisals can help with this.</p> <p>We suggest the policy includes bullet points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -referring to the need for development to be based on a thorough understanding of the present landscape and townscape. -providing for enhancement of the historic environment, including the repair of existing historic fabric, as appropriate. 	<p>Consider that it would be misleading to include references to the enhancement of archaeology and built heritage, as it is difficult to envisage how the construction of a new town can realistically be expected to enhance archaeology and built heritage. Archaeology can be preserved in situ and documented, but this cannot be said to constitute enhancement. The same applies to built heritage, as it is considered that the most appropriate setting for structures with a heritage value is the historic setting in which they were originally constructed. The development of Northstowe will mean that the original setting will be replaced. For example, whilst the structures of historic interest on the airfield can be preserved and re-used, it would be misleading to suggest that replacing their original airfield setting with that of a new town can be construed as an enhancement of their value as heritage features. Preservation, maintenance and mitigation are more realistic goals under the circumstances. Option NS63 provides policies for the re-use and retention of heritage features.</p> <p>In the Landscape section of the AAP (Chapter 8), extensive consideration is given to the way in which Northstowe should be incorporated into the landscape. Consideration is also given to the Conservation Areas in Longstanton, Oakington and Westwick in the Landscape chapter of the AAP. Conservation Area Appraisals are to be prepared, as stated at para 12.18 of the Core Strategy, and would be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>The importance of Historic Landscapes is addressed by CS72 of the Core Strategy.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
		<p>Paragraph 12.4 of the Core Strategy would be amended to read as follows: "The Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape database, developed by the County Council, provides a valuable tool in defining the evolution of landscape and in identifying historic landscapes. Regard will be had to the database in determining whether proposals would have an adverse impact on historic landscapes."</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the issues of Historic Landscape Characterisation and Conservation Area Appraisals are addressed in sufficient detail in other sections of the Northstowe AAP and in the Core Strategy Document.</p> <p>The scope of the first bullet point proposed by the representation is therefore considered to be covered in the landscape chapter (Chapter 8) of the AAP.</p>	

Decision on NS62 Archaeology and Heritage: Objectives - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Other action proposed:

Continue with preferred approach (as set out in NS63) towards preserving buildings of military heritage value and retain para 14.7 which sets out the need for a strategy to be developed for the survey and recording of structures on the former RAF airfield.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS63 Archaeology and Heritage: Use of Existing Buildings - Preferred Approach</i>				
3449 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships supports the principles of this statement but request that bullet point 2 is deleted and that a more flexible and adaptive response is undertaken through the masterplan process.	Consider that retaining the pill-boxes and other structures as features or points of interest in the landscape is a reasonable objective. As NS 62 proposes, a strategy which mitigates against any effects of the new settlement on unlisted structures of historic interest within the RAF airfield would be developed.	
6504 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships supports the principle of this objective but request that bullet point 3 is deleted and a more flexible and adaptive response is undertaken through the masterplan process.	It is considered that this is a reasonable criteria to put in a policy in the AAP. It "seeks" short term uses for existing buildings which is a sustainable response to the aspiration to provide a suitable community early in the development by reusing existing buildings. This may be preferable to introducing new temporary accommodation or not being able to provide certain facilities at all. It is not a requirement on the development and will be subject to negotiation through the planning application and masterplanning process.	
6505 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships supports the principle of this objective but request that bullet point 2 is deleted and a more flexible and adaptive response is undertaken through the masterplan process.	Consider that retaining the pill-boxes and other structures as features or points of interest in the landscape is a reasonable objective. As NS62 proposes, a strategy which mitigates against any effects of the new settlement on unlisted structures of historic interest within the RAF airfield would be developed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6299 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Further work will be required, and is being undertaken, to assess any heritage value of military buildings and of features such as the pillboxes. Only after such an assessment has been completed will options for retention or re-use become clear.</p> <p>The policy framework described in NS 63 appears to extend beyond that set out in NS62 by suggesting that all buildings with value should be found new long term uses and all structures should be retained. Pending the completion of further work it is unclear how practical this approach might be and the implications that this might have in terms of the most sustainable layout of the new town.</p> <p>NS63 should be consistent with NS62 in seeking to set out a strategy for the mitigation of impacts on buildings and features of historic interest.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that it may be impracticable to retain or secure long-term uses for all of the buildings which have heritage value. The findings of further work, including the strategy for mitigation set out in NS62 will influence any decisions on the feasibility of preserving individual buildings and structures. However, it is considered that NS63 sets out reasonable objectives for the use of existing buildings on the site which are consistent with NS63 in terms of the need to develop an appropriate mitigation strategy, as the re-use of existing buildings of heritage interest is one way in which the effect of the new settlement upon such buildings may be mitigated.</p>	
3974 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>The County Council supports the preferred option for use of existing buildings in terms of archaeology and heritage.</p>	Support noted.	

Decision on NS63 Archaeology and Heritage: Use of Existing Buildings - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 15. Meeting Recreational Needs				
<i>NS64 Recreation: Objectives - Preferred Approach</i>				
1738	Object	<p>Riders live in this area.</p> <p>Riding is traditional in this country.</p> <p>Please don't reduce our opportunities to hack safely.</p> <p>Please give consideration to improving these opportunities through dedicated bridleways.</p>	<p>The objective 'to provide an appropriate countryside experience' covers issues of countryside access. The issue is then dealt with explicitly in option NS85, advocating links to the countryside through an enhanced network of footpaths and bridleways.</p>	
3975 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6824 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Would like to see phrase "appropriate countryside experience" replaced by something more specific. The justification for a countryside experience is also unclear.</p>	<p>The aims of an 'appropriate countryside experience' are detailed elsewhere in the preferred options report, include country parks, green corridors, footpath and bridleways etc. Such measures are crucial as the town will have a considerable population living at densities which are overall higher than in the existing market towns. Agree the objective could be made clearer.</p>	<p>'Replace final bullet point with: 'To provide opportunities to access and enjoy the surrounding countryside.'</p>
6300 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher supports the provision of a town park at the heart of the town, closely related to the town centre. However the presentation of the town park in bullet three suggests that it is the focal point of the town's recreation strategy, which it will not be. It is an element of a more comprehensive approach to the provision of recreation opportunities. If it is to be retained it would be helpful to clarify that the town park is to provide recreation opportunities appropriate to the town centre.</p>	<p>As detailed in paragraph 15.18 of the preferred options report, the town park will operate as an outdoor venue for entertainment, and a focus for activity. The objective of 'a town park to serve as a focus for the towns activities' is therefore not unjustified.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3071	Support	recreation can also be had from wandering through or around wilderness: if the buffer zones were kept at 800 metres, there would be plenty of wild space, with all the flora and fauna which inhabit such spaces.	Support noted. Green separation is dealt with elsewhere in the Area Action Plan.	
4147 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	Generally supportive of the approach taken to recreation in this chapter and the benefits that it would also have on nature conservation interests. In addition we would recommend the adoption of the 'Accessible Green Space' standards, and would encourage the adoption of green open space, i.e. areas that would have benefit to wildlife and people.	Support noted. Green space is addressed in the Area Action Plan, including through provision of green corridors and country parks. The amount of provision is being explored by the County Council, as part of its study of strategic open space.	
5713 - Sport England	Support	Sport England supports the proposed recreation objectives, particularly those relating to providing adequate sports facilities, public open space for play and opportunities for commercial leisure, as they would be consistent with Sport England's policy (Policy Objective 11 in Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy Statement, November 1999) on securing the provision of new places for sport through new developments.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS64 Recreation: Objectives - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Replace final bullet point with: 'TO PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES TO ACCESS AND ENJOY THE SURROUNDING COUNTRYSIDE.'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS65 Public Open Space - Preferred Approach</i>				
5718 - Sport England	Support	Notwithstanding Sport England's objection to the methodology used for undertaking the Council's recreation study, the principle of setting out a standard for outdoor sports provision at Northstowe is supported, as this provides a basis for ensuring that adequate outdoor sports facility provision is made in the development.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS65 Public Open Space - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS66 Location of Sports Pitches - Preferred Approach</i>				
6301 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher agrees that there may be value in providing a (but not a single) cluster of sports pitches supported by appropriate ancillary facilities.</p> <p>Whether it will necessarily be appropriate for that group of pitches to be located adjacent to the secondary school is unclear at this stage. This should be resolved through the wider master planning exercise taking account of wider considerations such as the location of the town centre the relationship with the water park and with the areas of green separation.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to determine in isolation that a group of pitches should be located adjacent to the school. Without proper assessment it is considered too early to reach such a conclusion. It is considered therefore that NS66 is too prescriptive for inclusion in the AAP in setting out a requirement at the outset that the playing fields should be located next to the school.</p>	<p>The due to the benefits of collocating formal sports provision and the secondary school, this should continue to be required by the Northstowe Area Action Plan.</p>	
4442 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Although the County Council supports this approach in principle, it wishes to clarify the status of sports pitches/playing fields. In considering the contribution of playing fields to public open space it should be recognized that community use of school playing fields (and any other facilities) does not mean open public access. Security issues are a high priority for schools and parents alike. Community use means managed access to organized groups and sports clubs using a schools booking system. Public open space should be regarded as another form of land use that needs to be accommodated within the development.</p>	<p>Support noted. Paragraph 15.11 of the preferred options report makes clear that service level agreements for dual use do not cover grassed pitches. School playing fields are not included in the formal sport element of public open space, and must be provided separately to meet the needs of schools. The options seek to make the most of an opportunity to collocate school playing fields and formal sport provision, so that the public open space can offer some joint usage.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5716 - Sport England	Support	Sport England supports the principle of the proposal to locate Northstowe's sports pitches in a cluster adjacent to the secondary school, with a large clubhouse, in order to provide greater flexibility of use by school and community. It is assumed that the community sports pitches will be provided in addition to, rather than instead of, the secondary school's sports pitches. If this is not the case I would wish to object to the proposal.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS66 Location of Sports Pitches - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

NS67 Distance to Formal Sport - Preferred Approach

5720 - Sport England	Support	Sport England supports the principle of the proposal to locate all homes within 1000 metres of Northstowe's sports facilities, as this would accord with the principles of sustainable development and equality of access to sports facilities. This approach is consistent with Sport England's policies (Policy Objectives 3 and 10 in Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy Statement, November 1999) on equality of access and planning for new places for sport.	Support noted.	
----------------------	---------	--	----------------	--

Decision on NS67 Distance to Formal Sport - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS68 Formal Sports Provision - Preferred Approach</i>				
6302 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher supports the development of an appropriate strategy for formal sports having regard to the need to consult with Sport England and relevant bodies. Detailed discussions with the applicants will also be required.</p> <p>However the need to include the requirement to develop an appropriate strategy for Formal Sports provision within a separate policy position is unclear. The provision of a definitive list of sports facilities to be provided in the new town is also likely to be too detailed for the AAP although a possible range of issues to which further consideration may be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Support for development of an appropriate strategy for formal sports provision is noted. The importance of such a strategy necessitates its requirement through a policy in the Area Action Plan.</p> <p>A list of facilities flowing from this assessment being included in the Area Action plan will provide a guide to the minimum requirements for the new community. This can guide preparation of the master plan, where the exact nature of facilities can be determined.</p>	
5695 - Sport England	Object	<p>Objection is made to this paragraph, as it should be stated that the facilities listed are indicative of the needs of the development and will need to be refined following further assessment. Sport England have developed a more advanced needs assessment method which should be used to determine the nature and scale of provision. In addition, Sport England's facility planning tool is now known as the Sport Facility Calculator (no date), not the 2003 Sport England Facility Demand estimator.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that further work is required to develop a Strategy for Formal Sports. In discussion with Sport England the Council will endeavour to use appropriate tools to assist the assessment.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5723 - Sport England	Object	Sport England supports the principle of preparing a strategy for formal sports facility provision at Northstowe, which will include detailed discussions with Sport England and sports governing bodies. However, the preferred approach is objected to because for clarity, it should be confirmed what status the strategy will have in determining development requirements, i.e. will the development be required to provide the facilities identified in the strategy. To address this objection, it is requested that a sentence be added to the preferred approach, which confirms how the strategy will be used in determining development requirements.	The Strategy for Formal Sport will guide negotiation on the section 46 agreement.	Clarify the status of the Strategy for Formal Sport in the AAP.
4964	Support	Supported. Longstanton Sports and Social Club have been told the lease for their grounds will not be renewed - this will need to be taken into account.	Support noted. The provision available in surrounding villages will be taken account of in the study.	

Decision on NS68 Formal Sports Provision - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Other action proposed:

Clarify the status of the Strategy for Formal Sport in the AAP.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS69 Dual Use Sports Provision - Preferred Approach</i>				
3073	Object	Floodlit pitches!!! this is the countryside...	The flood lighting of pitches is dealt with by policies on lighting in the Core Strategy, the preferred option of which is to require schemes to have no adverse impact on the surrounding countryside.	
993	Support	With regard to indoor sports halls, maximising the use of any facility is laudable, but the development of community is NOT well served by poorly planned 'built to cost' sports halls lacking spectator facilities (banked seating, not just a viewing gallery) and related social areas.	The exact design of sports facilities can not be addressed by the area action plan. The Strategy for Formal Sports will provide further information on the nature of facilities needed in Northstowe, which can be used to guide design.	
3093 - Rampton Parish Council 4705 - Sport England 6303 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS69 Dual Use Sports Provision - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

NS70 Local Areas for Play - Preferred Approach

6305 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Although Gallagher raises no objection to the accessibility criteria for LAPs, there is no reason why the principles for local play should not be articulated in more detailed design guidance to be prepared for the new community obviating the need for a specific AAP policy in respect of LAPs.	The distribution of play spaces is crucial if they are to properly address the needs of the community. As such distance thresholds should be established in the Area Action Plan.	
----------------------------------	--------	--	---	--

Decision on NS70 Local Areas for Play - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

NS71 Local Equipped Areas for Play - Preferred Approach

6306 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Although Gallagher raises no objection to the accessibility criteria for LEAPs, there is no reason why the principles for local play should not be articulated in more detailed design guidance to be prepared for the new community obviating the need for a specific AAP policy in respect of LEAPs.	The distribution of play spaces is crucial if they are to properly address the needs of the community. As such distance thresholds should be established in the Area Action Plan.	
----------------------------------	--------	--	---	--

Decision on NS71 Local Equipped Areas for Play - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

NS72 Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play & Spaces for Imaginative Play - Preferred Approach

6307 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Although Gallagher raises no objection to the accessibility criteria for NEAPs and SIPs, there is no reason why the principles for local play should not be articulated in more detailed design guidance to be prepared for the new community obviating the need for a specific AAP policy.	The distribution of play spaces is crucial if they are to properly address the needs of the community. As such distance thresholds should be established in the Area Action Plan.	
----------------------------------	--------	---	---	--

Decision on NS72 Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play & Spaces for Imaginative Play - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS73 Town Park - Preferred Approach</i>				
1007	Object	It is a TOWN centre. All it does is to spread the town outwards. Expand the green separation between Northstowe and Oakington/Longstanton.	Most town centres have accessible open spaces, providing a usable space for town centre residents and visitors. A park is an appropriate town centre use.	
3450 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships supports the principle of establishing a town centre park but requests that the size of the park (3ha) is not stated in the policy commitment and that this is addressed through the masterplanning process.	It is appropriate for a policy in the Area Action Plan to set the minimum size of the park, in order that it is of sufficient size to meet the purposes for which it is needed.	
3979 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Query how the size of the Town Park (3ha) been determined?	It is appropriate for a policy in the Area Action Plan to set the minimum size of the park, in order that it is of sufficient size to meet the purposes for which it is needed. This was determined through study of other successful urban parks.	
4965	Object	Para 15.18 How can a town park be peaceful and vibrant at the same time? I object to the inclusion of the word "vibrant". The park should be a haven of peace in a busy area.	The minimum size of the park as stated in the preferred options report would be sufficiently large to include tranquil areas, and allow areas of different character to be created within it. Certain areas at certain times will also be vibrant, attracting significant numbers of users.	
6506 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships supports the principle of establishing a Town Centre park but request that the size of the park (3ha) is not stated in the policy commitment and is addressed through the masterplan process.	It is appropriate for a policy in the Area Action Plan to set the minimum size of the park, in order that it is of sufficient size to meet the purposes for which it is needed. This was determined through study of other successful urban parks.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6308 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher supports the provision of a town park at the heart of the town, closely related to the town centre. However it is considered too detailed an issue for the AAP to prescribe the size of the park.</p> <p>The objectives described in paragraph 15.18 may be achieved through a variety of design approaches which may be a green space or may be a more urban and hard space. Each solution will generate different requirements in terms of the space required. The AAP should include sufficient flexibility for the master planning process to test and resolve the requirements of the town park to provide for the level of interaction and activity envisaged.</p>	Support for the principle of a town park noted. It is appropriate for a policy in the Area Action Plan to set the minimum size of the park, in order that it is of sufficient size to meet the purposes for which it is needed.	
1541	Support	The land to the west of B1050 (option B) could be used for this purpose and the facilities shared by the residents of Longstanton and Northstowe. The possibility of amenities such as a driving range or golf course could be incorporated	Support noted. The exact design and location of the town park should be determined through the master planning process.	
2151	Support	A Town Park should be provided. By locating it next to Rampton Drift, the requirements of NS 10, 22, 44 and 45 would be met.	Support noted. The exact design and location of the town park should be determined through the master planning process.	
3027	Support	If the New Town were built centred on the railway line, thus maximising the separation space to the surrounding villages, a Town Park could be built that incorporates the through route of the mis-guided bus.	Support noted. The exact design and location of the town park should be determined through the master planning process.	
3976 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3094 - Rampton Parish Council 4708 - Sport England	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS73 Town Park - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS74 Green Corridors - Preferred Option</i>				
1008	Object	Green Corridors are not needed.	Green corridors are required for their landscape and biodiversity value, providing access routes, and their recreation value to the new town.	
4144 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature supports the use of a green corridor to serve both wildlife and people. Sports pitches, although less beneficial for wildlife than more informal recreational areas, can be designed to encourage wildlife, through appropriate planting of native trees and hedges around the boundaries, the use of wider range of grassland species than those required for sports pitches, and planning design to link these hedges and grasslands to surrounding gardens and other adjacent wildlife-friendly habitat.	Support noted.	
1715 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire) 2608	Support	Include bridleways, along with footpaths and cycleways.	Agree in principle that bridleways should be included in the potential uses of green corridors. There may be limits as to where this is applied due to the widths required by bridleways.	Include bridleways as potential uses in green corridors.
3980 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 15.20 Care should be taken that providing more formal managed green space within a green corridor would not detract from its biodiversity function. Option requires careful edge management. Amendment to paragraph 15.20, add after last sentence; These roles. Careful management of the green corridor edge is required in order to preserve its biodiversity function.	Support noted. The importance of the biodiversity value is acknowledged in the preferred option.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5154 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Support	Green corridors should be reserved for communication and informal recreation, and for wildlife, without comprising the sense of wildness or the area available for diverse habitats by including formal facilities such as sports pitches and their associated man-made structures. Linking of green corridors to the wider path network is important, and should be explicitly recognised in the wording of the policy.	Support noted.	
6309 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	The creation of a series of green corridors is supported as part of the landscape strategy for Northstowe. In addition Gallagher supports the potential for the green corridors to incorporate opportunities for informal recreation and children's play.	Support noted. The preferred options report acknowledges the potential of green corridors to accommodate informal recreation and children's play space.	
4443 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6420 - The Countryside Agency 2806 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS74 Green Corridors - Preferred Option

Develop the preferred option into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Include bridleways as potential uses in green corridors.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS75 Green Corridors - Alternative Option</i>				
6310 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The creation of a series of green corridors is wholeheartedly supported as part of the landscape strategy for Northstowe.</p> <p>Gallagher does not regard NS75 as an alternative to NS74. Rather in addition to opportunities for informal recreation and children's play, the AAP should allow for green corridors to link and embrace more formal open space in or adjacent to the green corridor itself.</p> <p>Whether this requires a specific policy response is unclear. If so then NS75 should be combined with NS74.</p>	<p>The potential to link other open spaces and neighbourhood community facilities with green corridors is acknowledged in paragraph 15.22 of the preferred options report. The issue of whether pitches form part of the green corridor must still be addressed.</p>	
4444 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6421 - The Countryside Agency 4716 - Sport England	Object	<p>Unless the green corridor in question is very extensive, it seems unlikely that formal sports pitches could be absorbed satisfactorily into what should be an informal landscape. It should recognise that as well as changing accommodation, formal outdoor sports provision may also require floodlighting, fencing and car parking provision.</p>	<p>Objection to the alternative option noted.</p>	
6936 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	<p>English Nature supports the use of a green corridor to serve both wildlife and people. Sports pitches, although less beneficial for wildlife than more informal recreational areas, can be designed to encourage wildlife, through appropriate planting of native trees and hedges around the boundaries, the use of wider range of grassland species than those required for sports pitches, and planning design to link these hedges and grasslands to surrounding gardens and other adjacent wildlife-friendly habitat.</p>	<p>Potential for designing sports pitches to encourage wildlife is noted.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2858	Support	I support the alternative option NS75 because I feel the reason for the green corridors, if they are linked to the drainage system (ditches?) should first to fit well within an integrated drainage network (connecting to Longstanton, Oakington, Cottenham, Swavesey, Over) and to contribute to managing surface water run-offs. Any 'green corridors' which can be designed to alleviate pressure on Longstanton's ditches and brook must be prioritised: get the watercourse engineers there before anyone else to have the final say on where these should be.	Support for alternative option noted. The link between provision of sports pitches on green corridors, and drainage systems is unclear.	

Decision on NS75 Green Corridors - Alternative Option

This alternative option is rejected.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS76 Crossing Green Corridors - Preferred Approach</i>				
3095 - Rampton Parish Council 2807 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	General support for the preferred approach.	Support noted.	
3981 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Welcome the inclusion of wildlife tunnels in this Action Plan. However Consideration should also be given to ditches for wildlife movement. Amendment to NS76 Road landscape. Provision should be made for safe and appropriate wildlife movement including providing tunnels under roads, and ditches alongside the roads.	Agree that ditches alongside roads may be appropriate in some locations.	And option '...such as tunnels under roads, AND DITCHES ALONGSIDE ROADS WHERE APPROPRIATE.'
5156 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 1716 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire) 2612	Support	Safe crossings for public rights or way and bridleways are also required.	In the preferred option these issues are covered in 'designed to limit safety implications' but it is agreed that a policy could refer to crossings for people as well as wildlife.	Refer to safe and appropriate crossings for people, as well as wildlife.
6422 - The Countryside Agency	Support	We support the Preferred Approach. Road and bus crossings of the green corridors should be kept to a minimum, and where unavoidable, should be carefully designed. Consideration should be given to the use of □green bridges□ to provide continuity of space and habitat across the road.	Support noted. Exact measures taken to limit the impact should be left to the design stage.	

Decision on NS76 Crossing Green Corridors - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

'...such as tunnels under roads, AND DITCHES ALONGSIDE ROADS WHERE APPROPRIATE.'

Refer to safe and appropriate crossings for people, as well as wildlife.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS77 Water Features - Preferred Option</i>				
4718 - Sport England	Object	Sport England objects to the preferred option, as a linear water formation, whilst offering informal recreation opportunities, would not offer the same watersports opportunities as a single large lake. The provision of such a lake instead would accord with Sport England's policy (Policy Objective 30 in Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy Statement, November 1999) on watersports. Sport England would therefore request that this option is requested in favour of the Council's rejected option for a single large lake, on the grounds that a lake would offer greater formal sports opportunities.	Support for the alternative option is noted.	
4756 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Should include a reference, similar to NS78 to avoid any possible doubt, that motorised water sports will not be acceptable, on the grounds of safety and noise intrusion.	Agree.	If this option is selected, ensure policy state that motorised water sports will not be acceptable.
3983 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Although we agree with the preferred option, water features should include lower-maintenance, less-formal wildlife areas (reed beds etc). Preference is also on biodiversity grounds. Amendment to paragraph 15.25 The sports. It is important that these water features include lower-maintenance, less formal wildlife areas such as reed beds, which would also enhance their biodiversity value.	Agree that the opportunities for biodiversity must be utilised, and this detailed in preferred approach NS59.	Cross refer to biodiversity policies in water features policies in the Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3985 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Although we agree with the preferred option, water features should include lower-maintenance, less-formal wildlife areas (reed beds etc). Preference is also on biodiversity grounds.</p> <p>Amendment to NS77</p> <p>The facility. In order to facilitate and encourage biodiversity the water features will include less-formal wildlife areas such as reed beds.</p> <p>The water features must integrate with other water features constituting the SUDS system for Northstowe, rather than being seen as a 'stand alone' water feature. Connecting swales and smaller depressions acting as detention basins can also represent water features - albeit that they may only occasionally contain water. Such features can have aesthetic and biodiversity value.</p>	<p>Agree that water bodies would be connected, as part of a wider sustainable drainage system, and also that lakes should offer opportunities for biodiversity. This must be integrated with a wider landscape strategy, and reflected in policies in the area action plan.</p>	
6311 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	<p>The general approach to surface water drainage in NS77 is supported, with a water park providing opportunities for recreation as well as drainage.</p> <p>The form of the park will be generally linear in nature but should allow for formal, semi formal and informal elements within which there would be water bodies. Whilst significant elements of the feature will have fen edge characteristics it may not be appropriate for it all to be consistent with this vision. It is not considered that a linear water feature such as a canal would be appropriate, but the main water bodies may be linked in part by swales and streams.</p>	<p>Support noted. Even formal areas can take account of the fen edge character. It is acknowledged that water bodies may be linked, as part of a wider sustainable drainage system network.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4000 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 6423 - The Countryside Agency 3096 - Rampton Parish Council 2809 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 3077	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS77 Water Features - Preferred Option

Develop the preferred option into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

If this option is selected, ensure policy state that motorised water sports will not be acceptable.

Cross refer to biodiversity policies in water features policies in the Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS78 Water Features - Rejected Option</i>				
5711 - Sport England	Object	Sport England supports the rejected option, as a single large lake would provide opportunities for water sports. The provision of such a lake would accord with Sport England's policy (Policy Objective 30 in Sport England's Land Use Planning Policy Statement, November 1999) on watersports. This option is therefore preferred to the Council's Preferred Option of providing surface water drainage through a linear water formation, on the grounds that a lake would offer greater formal sports opportunities.	The potential benefits for formal sport do not outweigh the impact on the fen edge character and the greater potential to enhance the design of the new town.	
3988 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3097 - Rampton Parish Council 6312 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 1920	Support	General support for the rejection of this option.	Support for rejection of this option noted.	

Decision on NS78 Water Features - Rejected Option

This option remains rejected.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS79 Landscaping Recreational Areas - Preferred Approach</i>				
3989 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	More naturalistic planting should include scrub/ground cover areas. Amendment to NS79 A areas of naturalistic planting (e.g. scrub/ground cover) within larger strategy.	Where appropriate this would be included as part of any design.	
1718 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire) 2617	Support	Please amend 15.27 to read "Both formal and informal recreational areas, footpaths and cycleways and bridleways will need to be appropriately landscaped to reflect their locations."	Agree	Include reference to bridleways in landscaping recreational areas.
3999 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 6424 - The Countryside Agency	Support	General support for the preferred approach.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS79 Landscaping Recreational Areas - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Include reference to bridleways in landscaping recreational areas.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS80 Management of Open Space - Preferred Approach</i>				
1378	Object	The District Council should be Responsible for the management and maintenance of the Open Spaces.	The District Council has traditionally not taken on such responsibilities. The trust is one option currently being explored, to ensure the best management method is chosen.	
2212 - Longstanton Parish Council 3098 - Rampton Parish Council 2125 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 1316 1645 1463 961 1163 4317	Object	There appear to be no interim arrangements for Open Space management, prior to handover of the commercial development. It could be several years before these commercial developments are generating revenue.	The Management Plan will establish how open space and facilities will be managed from the outset, prior to the management body taking control. There are a number of methods by which this early maintenance could be achieved, and this decision will take place in negotiation with developers.	
	Object	An objection must be sustained to the overall approach of management until the developers and district council can explain in coherent manner the plans for ownership, use and maintenance of all of these parcels of land to ensure deliverability of the objectives.	This approach will be developed through the management plan, before construction work commences.	
4728 - Sport England	Object	Sport England supports the proposals for public open space to be in a single ownership and for it to be managed by a trust fund by the development. However, objection is made to the lack of reference to how sports facilities will need to be managed by the public sector and they will require significant contributions from developers to ensure that they can be adequately maintained in the long term. To address this objection it is requested that "public sports facilities" be added after "incidental space."	Support for the use of a trust is noted. Paragraph 15.28 of the preferred options report acknowledges that a wide variety of public open space and facilities will require future maintenance. The management plan will need to be comprehensive, where facilities are not funded by other means e.g. commercial facilities, or dealt with through dual use agreements.	
4968	Object	The plan must be in place before any construction commences. Mention of the funding of this plan has been omitted. Who will be responsible for this?	A management plan will be prepared prior to a section 46 agreement. This agreement will also detail the funding requirements of developers.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6314 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher agrees that the management of open space must be addressed prior to the commencement of development. It is premature to settle on the model presented. The AAP should set out general guidelines to inform detailed discussions and should not assume cross subsidisation from commercial development as the most appropriate means of funding at this stage.</p> <p>Suggested principles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <input type="checkbox"/> management plan in place prior to construction; - <input type="checkbox"/> as few ownerships as possible; - <input type="checkbox"/> provide for management as long as is required; - <input type="checkbox"/> explore the potential role of Trusts and a Town Council - <input type="checkbox"/> provide for consultation with the local community. 	<p>The model detailed in the preferred approach has proved successful in other new communities.</p> <p>A working group has been established to explore possibilities of a Northstowe Development Trust, and also the other possibility of a community trust to manage both open space and community facilities.</p> <p>As detailed in the preferred approach, a single ownership of facilities offers significant benefits, and should be required.</p>	Develop a criteria based policy in the Area Action Plan requiring the management plan to be approved prior to the S.46 agreement, and single ownership of facilities, but allowing greater flexibility on the exact method of management.
3990 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
2812 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	We support the single-ownership model for public open space, with management funded from commercial development; but although such funding seems appropriate for generally available facilities such as public paths, we are worried that it may prove inadequate for funding more specialised leisure facilities, for which the model of commercial leisure provision in Option NS81 may be more appropriate.	Support noted. The management plan will address these issues.	
5157 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Support	We support the single-ownership model for public open space, with management funded from commercial development; but although such funding seems appropriate for generally available facilities such as public paths, we are worried that it may prove inadequate for funding more specialised leisure facilities, for which the model of commercial leisure provision in Option NS81 may be more appropriate.	Support noted. The management plan will address these issues.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6425 - The Countryside Agency	Support	We support the Preferred Approach to open space maintenance and the proposed preparation of an appropriate management plan as set out here. There is also the issue of securing the appropriate long term management of the land included in Landscape Strategy (NS57) that remains in private ownership to consider. This might include land in the green corridors and green separation zones. It will be vitally important that robust and adequately resourced arrangements are made to deliver these proposals over the long term.	Support noted. The management plan can explore methods of securing appropriate long term management.	
7031	Support	Support bring open space into single ownership.	Support for this aspect of the preferred approach noted.	

Decision on NS80 Management of Open Space - Preferred Approach

Develop a criteria based policy in the Area Action Plan requiring the management plan to be approved prior to the S46 agreement, and single ownership of facilities, but allowing greater flexibility on the exact method of management.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS81 Commercial Leisure - Preferred Approach</i>				
3081	Object	commercial leisure presumably means cinemas and bowling alleys - this new town is going to be very noisy, and will change the character of the existing villages and countryside, which I regret.	Maintaining village character is a specific objective of the vision for Northstowe detailed in preferred approach NS1.	
4729 - Sport England	Object	Sport England supports the preferred approach, because preparing a strategy for commercial leisure provision would ensure that the commercial needs of the development are fully identified at the outset. This would accord with Sport England's policy relating to securing the provision of new places for sport through new development. However, the preferred approach is objected to because for clarity, it should be confirmed what status the strategy will have in determining development requirements, i.e. will the development be required to make provision for the facilities identified in the strategy. Preferred approach should be amended accordingly.	General support for the approach noted. This option should have cross referred to preferred approach NS27. This clarifies that the strategy for provision will guide the negotiation over the granting of planning permission, and planning obligations used to require their phased delivery.	
6315 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	NS81 is a duplication of issues covered in NS27 and should therefore be deleted. PPS6 and PPG17 already provide an appropriate framework for the local assessment of need and for the assessment of impact so as to ensure that the provision made in the new town complements that already provided. It is sufficient for the AAP to indicate a requirement that such facilities should be assessed in the light of PPG6 and PPG17 and Policy P4/1 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan. It would be inappropriate for the AAP to prescribe a range of commercially provided leisure facilities.	This option should have cross referred to preferred approach NS27. This clarifies that the strategy for provision will guide the negotiation over the granting of planning permission, and planning obligations used to require their phased delivery. The Area Action Plan would not include a specific list of all facilities, but may include a list of minimum requirements.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS81 Commercial Leisure - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS82 Phasing of the Delivery of Open Space - Preferred Approach</i>				
4313	Object	An objection must be sustained to the overall approach of phasing until the developers and district council can explain in coherent manner the plans for ownership, use and maintenance of all of these parcels of land to ensure deliverability of the objectives.	Ownership and maintenance are dealt with under preferred approach NS80. This requires a management plan to be in place before construction commences.	
4763 - Sport England	Object	Sport England supports this approach, as it would ensure that the recreation facilities are delivered early in the development in order to meet the new community's needs from the outset. This would accord with sustainable development objectives and would be consistent with helping create a safe and healthy community at the outset of the development. However, the approach is objected to because it should clarify that both sport and recreational facilities should be delivered, as the current wording could be misinterpreted to imply that parks and open spaces should be delivered early but not more formal sports facilities.	Support for the approach is noted. As well as this option, more formal leisure facilities may be covered by NS26 and NS27, which deal with publicly provided and commercially provided services and facilities. These options also seek provision at early stages of development.	
4969	Object	Para 15.31 States sport pitches should be established 2 years before they can be used but planned occupancy of housing is only 2 years away. Where are the new sports pitches being constructed right now especially as Longstanton Sports and Social Club will be losing it's tenure of land in 3 months.	It would be unreasonable to require new provision to be usable from occupation of the first house, but lead in time will allow very early phasing. The Council will explore opportunities to utilise existing facilities, including on the barracks site, to ensure facilities are available for early residents.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6316 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	As with the provision of all services and facilities, Gallaghers support the phasing of the delivery of open space. This will require advance planning to ensure timely delivery of open space but equally must have regard to the pace at which need actually arises and to avoid unnecessarily inflating the advance costs of development. The identification of existing sports facilities within the Barracks area may assist in meeting needs on an interim basis.	Agree that an appropriate response to phasing is required, but the emphasis must be on early delivery to ensure need can be met when it arises. The potential to use existing facilities on the barracks in the short term for early residents should be explored further.	Examine potential to use existing recreation facilities on the barracks in the short term for early residents, to ensure the recreation needs of early residents are met in accessible locations.
3991 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 15.31 Phasing of open space should also include phasing any new/improved access to the wider countryside.	Support noted. Agree that the phasing must include secured improvements to access of the countryside.	Include secured improvements to access of the countryside in phasing of delivery.
5159 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 3099 - Rampton Parish Council 2813 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 2651	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS82 Phasing of the Delivery of Open Space - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Include secured improvements to access of the countryside in phasing of delivery.

Other action proposed:

Examine potential to use existing recreation facilities on the barracks in the short term for early residents, to ensure the recreation needs of early residents are met in accessible locations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS83 Golf Provision - Preferred Approach</i>				
1181 866	Object	Existing facility should be retained until a replacement is available. If current course cannot be saved a new one should be available as soon as possible.	Given that the site of the existing golf course is a strategic and central location to all the site options, it may be problematic to keep the facility operating while the development begins. A new golf course would not be required before development commences. If established it is likely the need for a replacement course will be based on the needs created by the new town, implying that phasing would require it after a certain number of dwellings are completed. In the shorter term it is likely that existing need can be met by surrounding areas, including a new course that is under development at Milton.	
1099 - Cambridge Golf Club 1878 - Cambridgeshire ACRE 2183 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 2447 2577 1227 1214 1137	Object	The existing golf course should be retained.	The present golf course occupies such a strategic and central location within all of the site options that it will be developed.	
4971	Object	The same preparation time applies to a golf course as applies to sports pitches. Where is the new golf course being constructed right now.	A more detailed study of need for the golf course will be undertaken. A new golf course would not be required before development commences. If established it is likely the need for a replacement course will be based on the needs created by the new town, implying that phasing would require it after a certain number of dwellings are completed. In the shorter term it is likely that existing need can be met by surrounding areas, including a new course that is under development at Milton.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4843 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	If a replacement golf course is required as a result of market demand, then its provision should be encouraged but not as part of a 'planning gain' package associated with the new settlement. There are a number of golf courses in the area and the viability of creating an additional one must be left to the commercial judgement of an independent operator.	<p>PPG17 make clear on the loss of a recreation facility that where need exists it should be replaced: Paragraph 13 'development may provide the opportunity to exchange the use of one site for another to substitute for any loss of open space, or sports or recreational facility.'</p> <p>PPG17 Paragraph 33 also states that 'Local authorities will be justified in seeking planning obligations where the quantity or quality of provision is inadequate or under threat, or where new development increases local needs'</p>	
6317 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The golf course occupies a key location within the new town site and the strategic importance of the new town is such that it would be wholly inappropriate to retain the course as it stands.</p> <p>Paragraph 15.32 makes it clear that a more detailed assessment is required to assess whether replacement provision should be made. This is consistent with PPG17. NS83 prejudges the outcome of that exercise by requiring the provision of a suitable alternative.</p> <p>Preliminary assessment of the existing and future supply of golf facilities in the catchment area suggests that there are clear signs that there is adequate supply existing and proposed of golf facilities, and that alternative provision may not be required.</p> <p>It is inappropriate to include a policy in the AAP in the form currently set out in NS83. In any event the complications of delivering the provision sought make the policy unrealistic.</p>	<p>Agree that the course cannot be retained in its existing location.</p> <p>The needs of those requiring a golf course, particularly an affordable golf course, in both existing and new communities may not be met if the course is not replaced. This view is backed up by Sport England. This justifies the preferred approach, and the need for further exploratory work.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
865	Support	I particularly agree with the support given to "affordability" and the implied proximity of the new golf course to Longstanton.	Support noted.	
1110 1073	Support	Support for a new golf course. The ideal position would be between Longstanton and Northstowe, providing green separation.	As the preferred options report indicates, other types of green separation are preferred between Northstowe and Longstanton.	
2540	Support	But the new Golf course should be started well before the existing one is lost to us. Sympathetic landscaping of the Cottenham Lode and surrounds could provide the site of the new Golf course the water park and even a solution to local flooding issues. The creation of new wet lands here would be an added bonus for wild life.	Support noted. The potential locations for a new golf course have yet to be determined.	
2213 - Longstanton Parish Council 3100 - Rampton Parish Council 4685 - Sport England 2169 2157 1561 1319 1261 1646 1761 1465 962 2010 2008	Support	Support for provision of a new golf course, accessible to Longstanton, and available as soon as possible.	Support for the preferred approach noted.	

Decision on NS83 Golf Provision - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, taking account of further assessment of local golf provision and need.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS84 Countryside Recreation - Preferred Approach</i>				
1009	Object	Green separation should not be diluted by making it a country park	<p>Preferred Option NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach states "The green separation should not have a high degree of public access where appropriate and not contain any urban uses such as playing fields, allotments or cemeteries."</p> <p>The Country Park proposed for the green separation at Oakington would not contain any urban uses such as those mentioned in NS40, and the designation of the land as a country park would not affect the proposed landscaping of the separation. The treatment of the green separation at Oakington would, as proposed in NS44, comprise "additional tree planting in groups and copses to reinforce the pastoral parkland nature of this local landscape character", and the proposed designation of the land as a country park would not alter this treatment.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1967 - Cottenham Parish Council	Object	A public recreation area is not a Separation Zone. Alternative locations for Countryside Recreation should be found, away from existing settled communities.	Preferred Option NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington - Preferred Approach states "The green separation should not have a high degree of public access where appropriate and not contain any urban uses such as playing fields, allotments or cemeteries." The Country Park proposed for the green separation at Oakington would not contain any urban uses such as those mentioned in NS40, and the designation of the land as a country park would not affect the proposed landscaping of the separation. The treatment of the green separation at Oakington would, as proposed in NS44, comprise "additional tree planting in groups and copses to reinforce the pastoral parkland nature of this local landscape character", and the proposed designation of the land as a country park would not alter this treatment.	
6435	Object	The inclusion of Bridleways is an important addition that must be included in the plans. These should provide links to other villages as well as providing circular routes of varying length.	Noted. The need for bridleways to be included in a proposed strategy to link all part of Northstowe to the wider countryside is established in NS85. Paragraph 15.39 states that "improved access from Northstowe into the wider countryside through footpaths and cycleways, connecting wherever possible to other areas of Strategic Open Space". This paragraph is to be amended so that it includes reference to bridleways as well as to footpaths and cycleways.	Amend paragraph 15.39 as follows: "There will also be a need to develop a strategy whereby there would be improved access from Northstowe into the wider countryside through public footpaths, bridleways and cycle ways connecting wherever possible to areas of Strategic Open Space and to the public rights of way network."
4020 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Consider the term "vast areas" too emotive. Amendment to paragraph 15.38 Making use of green routes without needing large areas of dedicated open space.	Agree that the term "vast areas" is possibly too emotive and should be replaced with "large areas".	In paragraph 15.38, replace reference to "vast areas of dedicated open space" with "large areas of dedicated open space".

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3993 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 15.38 Unclear whether "countryside open spaces" refers to Country Parks. If this does not mean Country Parks, then surrounding intensive agriculture surely limits countryside open spaces?	The paragraph should refer to "Country Parks" and not to "countryside open spaces".	Delete reference to "countryside open spaces" in the final sentence of paragraph 15.38 and replace with "country parks."
3995 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Note again the vague phrase "countryside experience" Amendment to paragraph 15.38 To "maximising the value of countryside access without" space.	Agree that the phrase "countryside experience" could be made clearer.	Amend para 15.38 so that the phrase "the countryside experience" is replaced by "opportunities to access and enjoy the surrounding countryside".
3757 - Gallagher Estates	Object	No provision should be made for a country park outside the site of the new town. No need has been, or can be, demonstrated and it is unreasonable for planning policy to require a developer to make provision of facilities beyond what is reasonably required to serve Northstowe or address under provision elsewhere in the sub-region. Provision for wider strategic open space requirements should be addressed through the core policies and not tied to the new town. Any such ties, implied or real, have substantial delivery implications in terms of the commerciality of the development and of the ability to fund the direct infrastructure requirements of the town.	Strategic Open Space is another type of open space for which is reasonable to seek developer contributions under s46 of the Town and Country Planning Act. The County Council, in partnership with the District Councils has undertaken a Strategic Open Space study which, when completed, will help identify what standard should be identified towards Strategic Open Space and also the appropriate contribution towards additional Strategic Open Space that should come forward from developments. As a new town which will attain a size of 6,000 dwellings before 2016, it is clear that Northstowe will require the provision of strategic open space. As NS84 states, "if the areas identified for use as country parks are demonstrated to be in excess of what is required to meet the needs of Northstowe itself, a proportion of the west of Station Road country park would need to be funded by means other than developer contributions to Northstowe." There will therefore be no obligation imposed on developers to provide facilities at a level above that reasonably required by Northstowe.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4310	Object	An objection must be sustained to the overall approach of strategic landscaping until the developers and district council can explain in coherent manner the plans for ownership, use and maintenance of all of these parcels of land to ensure deliverability of the objectives.	This issue is addressed at NS80 and paragraph 15.28 of the Preferred Options Report. It is acknowledged in NS80 that the long-term management arrangements for strategic open space are planned and implemented at an early stage. NS80 states that "All public open space and incidental open space should be in a single ownership to avoid fragmentation and a robust management plan would be in place before construction work commences. Management and maintenance would be vested in a publicly accountable trust to ensure appropriate management in perpetuity. The Trust would be funded by commercial development in the town secured by agreement from the developers."	Continue with approach set out in NS80 to establish a management plan for all public open space and incidental open space prior to construction work commencing on site.
4446 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Use of land west of Station Road/Longstanton Road would not be appropriate if Site Option B is developed. Consideration should be given to the use of land east of the Guided Busway, subject to the provision of suitable access.	Disagree. The land west of Station Road/Longstanton Road would be built on as part of Northstowe if Site Option B were to be adopted. If Site Options A or C to be adopted, the land would be used for a country park. Under Site Option B, it is proposed that land further west, adjoining the western boundary of the urban area, would be used for a country park. It is considered that land east of the Guided Busway would not be appropriate for use as a Country Park, as the Park's accessibility to residents of Northstowe would be limited by the need to cross the Guided Busway. A country park east of the Guided Busway would also not be easily accessible to the residents of Longstanton and Oakington.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4998 4999	Object	<p>Far too much is expected of 200m green separation.</p> <p>Separation needs to be more than 200m with no public access to ensure it is effective in its aims.</p> <p>The problem is the overestimate in the number of houses the airfield site can take.</p>	<p>In preparing the Preferred Options Report, the Council considered in detail the purpose of green separation and how to achieve it. The Structure Plan states that it is to maintain village character. In the context of a town that will be close to the existing villages of Longstanton and Oakington, it is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation - the landscape treatment of the separation is crucial to its success. Preferred Option NS40 Landscape: Extent of Green Separation from Longstanton and Oakington states: The green separation should not have a high degree of public access where appropriate and not contain any urban uses such as playing fields, allotments or cemeteries". The Country Park proposed for the green separation at Oakington would not contain any urban uses such as those mentioned in NS40, and the designation of the land as a country park would not affect the proposed landscaping of the separation. The treatment of the green separation at Oakington would, as proposed in NS44, comprise "additional tree planting in groups and copses to reinforce the pastoral parkland nature of this local landscape character", and the proposed designation of this land as a country park would not alter this treatment.</p> <p>There is no reason to suggest why the airfield should not be capable of accommodating the target set out in the Structure Plan for locations with good public transport accessibility of 40 dwellings per hectare.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6319 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher objects to the provision made in NS84 for the provision of country parks in the Northstowe AAP. NS84 confuses the need for informal open space provided as part of the development and the provision the District Council wishes at Northstowe for strategic open space generated across the Sub-region. The primary objective is that provision should be made for informal leisure and recreation within the new town.</p> <p>For the reasons stated although the new town will make significant provision for open space and informal recreation, Gallagher does not consider that there is a policy imperative for the new town to make provision for one or more country parks. Nor would it be reasonable for the town to do so. It is particularly inappropriate that provision should be sought outside the new town as part of the new town.</p> <p>In drafting the AAP policies, policy should not be constructed to refer to country parks but to the need for the new town to make full and appropriate provision for informal recreation including a variety of recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>Strategic Open Space is another type of open space for which is reasonable to seek developer contributions under s46 of the Town and Country Planning Act. The County Council, in partnership with the District Councils has undertaken a Strategic Open Space study which, when completed, will help identify what standard should be identified towards Strategic Open Space and also the appropriate contribution towards additional Strategic Open Space that should come forward from developments. As a new town which will attain a size of 6,000 dwellings before 2016, it is clear that Northstowe will require the provision of strategic open space which can be provided in the form of country parks.</p> <p>The fact that the country parks will not provided within the boundaries of Northstowe itself does not preclude the local authority from seeking developer contributions provided that the items that are sought reasonably relate to the development. The country parks which are to be provided are necessary for Northstowe to provide the level of Strategic Open Space that its residents will require.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
963	Support	I believe this country park must be created regardless of whether or not Option B is implemented. This type of landscape will be essential for walking by the new residents as well as current communities.	In para 15.38 it is proposed that a country park to the west of Station Road would be established regardless of which site option for Northstowe were to be adopted. Under site Options A and C Station Road would form the western boundary of the Northstowe site, and it is proposed that the country park be established to the west of Station Road. Under site option B, where Northstowe would extend across to the western side of Station Road, the Country Park could be situated to the west of the part of Northstowe that would lie on the western side of Station Road. Thus under all three options a country park to the west of Station Road would be provided. The precise size of the Country Park will be decided with reference to the Strategic Open Space standard that is being developed by the County Council. However, under Options A and C, it is considered unlikely that the land that would be used for a country park under Option B could be combined with the land that would be used for a country park for A and C to create a larger country park, as to create a park of this size would require funding significantly in excess of that which could be reasonably expected to be provided through developer contributions.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1320	Support	Should be implemented regardless of Option A,B C adoption. A and C make it accessible to Longstanton villagers.	In para 15.38 it is proposed that a country park to the west of Station Road would be established regardless of which site option for Northstowe were to be adopted. Under site Options A and C Station Road would form the western boundary of the Northstowe site, and it is proposed that the country park be established to the west of Station Road. Under site option B, where Northstowe would extend across to the western side of Station Road, the Country Park could be situated to the west of the part of Northstowe that would lie on the western side of Station Road. Thus under all three options a country park to the west of Station Road would be provided. The precise size of the Country Park will be decided with reference to the Strategic Open Space standard that is being developed by the County Council. However, under Options A and C, it is considered unlikely that the land that would be used for a country park under Option B could be combined with the land that would be used for a country park for A and C to create a larger country park, as to create a park of this size would require funding significantly in excess of that which could be reasonably expected to be provided through developer contributions.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1197	Support	I support this objective, though I am concerned about the "inadequately supported" let-out. Longstanton and Northstowe need a Country Park in this location.	<p>Under the provisions of Circular 1/97 Planning Obligations, Local Authorities can presently seek developer contributions only for items which meet the following tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. necessary; ii. relevant to planning; iii. directly related to the proposed development; iv. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; v. reasonable in all other respects. <p>The extent of Strategic Open Space that will be needed to serve Northstowe will be determined with reference to the County Council's Strategic Open Space study. If it is found that the west of Station Road country park provides strategic open space beyond that which would be necessary to serve Northstowe, then it the District Council cannot legally seek to secure all of the Country Park through developer contributions.</p>	
1262	Support	A country park would be a benefit to both communities but not as the only green separation	<p>Noted. The treatment of the green separation at Oakington would, as proposed in NS44, comprise "additional tree planting in groups and copses to reinforce the pastoral parkland nature of this local landscape character", and the proposed designation of the land as a country park would not alter this treatment. As paragraph 15.37 states, the designation of the green separation land as a Country park could include managing an area adjacent to Oakington village for wildlife with less public access.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1542 1466	Support	The Country Park west of Station Road should be implemented regardless of whether Site Option A, B or C is adopted.	In para 15.38 it is proposed that a country park to the west of Station Road would be established regardless of which site option for Northstowe were to be adopted. Under site Options A and C Station Road would form the western boundary of the Northstowe site, and it is proposed that the country park be established to the west of Station Road. Under site option B, where Northstowe would extend across to the western side of Station Road, the Country Park could be situated to the west of the part of Northstowe that would lie on the western side of Station Road. Thus under all three options a country park to the west of Station Road would be provided. The precise size of the Country Park will be decided with reference to the Strategic Open Space standard that is being developed by the County Council. However, under Options A and C, it is considered unlikely that the land that would be used for a country park under Option B could be combined with the land that would be used for a country park for A and C to create a larger country park, as to create a park of this size would require funding significantly in excess of that which could be reasonably expected to be provided through developer contributions.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1649	Support	These proposals should be a component of EACH of the three site options.	In para 15.38 it is proposed that a country park to the west of Station Road would be established regardless of which site option for Northstowe were to be adopted. Under site Options A and C Station Road would form the western boundary of the Northstowe site, and it is proposed that the country park be established to the west of Station Road. Under site option B, where Northstowe would extend across to the western side of Station Road, the Country Park could be situated to the west of the part of Northstowe that would lie on the western side of Station Road. Thus under all three options a country park to the west of Station Road would be provided. The precise size of the Country Park will be decided with reference to the Strategic Open Space standard that is being developed by the County Council. However, under Options A and C, it is considered unlikely that the land that would be used for a country park under Option B could be combined with the land that would be used for a country park for A and C to create a larger country park, as to create a park of this size would require funding significantly in excess of that which could be reasonably expected to be provided through developer contributions.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2214 - Longstanton Parish Council	Support	We strongly support this Option. The Country Park west of Station road must be implemented regardless of whether Site Option A, B or C is adopted. Under Options A or C it would be an excellent facility and accessible to the village of Longstanton.	In para 15.38 it is proposed that a country park to the west of Station Road would be established regardless of which site option for Northstowe were to be adopted. Under site Options A and C Station Road would form the western boundary of the Northstowe site, and it is proposed that the country park be established to the west of Station Road. Under site option B, where Northstowe would extend across to the western side of Station Road, the Country Park could be situated to the west of the part of Northstowe that would lie on the western side of Station Road. Thus under all three options a country park to the west of Station Road would be provided. The precise size of the Country Park will be decided with reference to the Strategic Open Space standard that is being developed by the County Council. However, under Options A and C, it is considered unlikely that the land that would be used for a country park under Option B could be combined with the land that would be used for a country park for A and C to create a larger country park, as to create a park of this size would require funding significantly in excess of that which could be reasonably expected to be provided through developer contributions.	
4021 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Would suggest encouragement for a perimeter bridleway at Northstowe, following good practice established at Cambourne. This would serve to unify on-site and off-site public access provision.</p> <p>Amendment to paragraph 15.38, add new final sentence;</p> <p>A perimeter bridleway linking green provision around the new settlement should be provided in a similar fashion to Cambourne.</p>	The desirability of a perimeter bridleway around Northstowe is acknowledged. However, it is possible that it may not be feasible to achieve this due to the space requirements of needing to accommodate bridleways (which should have a width of 4 metres) alongside footpaths and cycleways. Nevertheless, the feasibility of achieving a perimeter bridleway should be addressed in the Access to the Countryside strategy, the need for which is set out in NS85.	Access to the Countryside Strategy (see NS85) should examine the possibilities for providing a perimeter bridleway at Northstowe.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3032	Support	Country Park can NOT be in separation space as goes against Structure Plan. Must be in addition to the separation space of paddocks and open fields.	The Structure Plan does not state that a country park function would be incompatible with the land allocated for green separation. Policy P9/3 of the Structure Plan states "There will be green separation between the new development and existing communities to maintain the village character of Longstanton and Oakington". This is the only reference to Green Separation at Northstowe contained in the Structure Plan. It is acknowledged that the treatment of the green separation is as crucial to preserving the character of Oakington. With reference to the green separation between Northstowe and Oakington, the area proposed for inclusion as the focus of a Country Park, the Council's Preferred Approach is set out at NS44 as follows: "The treatment of green separation at Oakington would comprise additional tree planting in groups and copses to reinforce the pastoral parkland nature of this local landscape character. These tree groups would be located so as to shield views through the green separation but at the same time retain a more open character." It is considered that this proposed approach to landscaping in the Green Separation between Northstowe and Oakington would be compatible with a country park function.	
3992 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	In the first sentence of paragraph 15.38 it states 'county' park. Should this not read 'country' park? Amendment to paragraph 15.38 To another country park could space.	Noted. The reference to "county park" in the first sentence of paragraph 15.38 should indeed refer to a "country park".	Amend first sentence of paragraph 15.38 so that it reads: "To the west of station road another country park could be established."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3987 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 4692 - Sport England 2815 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 2006 2005	Support	Support the idea of 2 country parks in the areas proposed.	Support noted.	
4445 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 15.33-15.38 We agree in principle with the provision of Country Park(s) for Northstowe to a generous standard. The size of these parks would have to be determined using the Strategic Open Space standard (once developed). The Parks must be easily accessible by the public and have links to the wider network of rights of way.	Support noted. The size of the parks would be determined with reference to the Strategic Open Space study. Consider that the need for the country parks to be accessible to the public and have links to the wider networks of rights of way is addressed in NS85.	
5065 5064	Support	Support the proposal for two country parks. Para 15.38 the northern country park should be situated as near to Longstanton as possible, to go some way towards replacing the golf course, as an area for country walks. Suggest it should be south of the railway line and adjacent to the Home Farm site.	Support noted. As proposed the west of Station Road country park would be south of the railway line and, as stated in paragraph 15.38, "would be well-related to the northern part of the town and to Longstanton, particularly the new development at Home Farm on the west side of the village". The precise extent of the country park will be established with reference to the County Council's Strategic Open Space standard, so it is unclear at present as to whether the park will be of extent that would mean it would be situated adjacent to the Home Farm development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5161 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Support	We support NS84, and particularly the proposal to link two Country Parks, providing a circular route round the town. The creation of circular walking and riding routes of this kind is a regular aspiration among those who seek to improve the functionality of rights of way networks at a local level, and such routes are nearly always popular.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS84 Countryside Recreation - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, taking account the results of the County Council's Strategic Open Space Study.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS85 Access to the Countryside - Preferred Approach</i>				
4022 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Amendment to paragraph 15.39 There will also be a need to develop a strategy - wider countryside through public footpaths, bridleways and cycle ways from Northstowe connecting wherever possible to areas of Strategic Open Space and the public rights of way network.	Agree with proposed amendment. Paragraph 15.39 as it currently stands omits reference to cycleways and to the need for linkages with the public rights of way network.	Amend paragraph 15.39 as follows: "There will also be a need to develop a strategy whereby there would be improved access from Northstowe into the wider countryside through public footpaths, bridleways and cycle ways connecting wherever possible to areas of Strategic Open Space and to the public rights of way network."
1186 1184 4930 4924	Object	Support the inclusion of bridleways as part of the proposed plan. Concern that the bridleway alongside the guided busway will be concrete and therefore unsuitable for horses.	Support noted. As NS85 states, a strategy will be developed to link all parts of the town through to the wider countryside by footpaths and bridleways. The bridleway that will run alongside the Guided Busway is being planned by the Cambridgeshire County Council Guided Busway team and is not an issue that can be addressed by the LDF and by this Area Action Plan.	
1719 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	The creation of new bridleways is particularly important. The local equestrian community is stranded between the A14 at the south and the River Ouse at the north, with no safe crossings over the A10 to the east and the A1 to the west. Road Riding is almost impossible and more traffic will be generated by the development of Northstowe. Priority should be given to creation of dedicated bridleways which form the "Northstowe community Circuit" - as part of the National Bridleroute Network, with linear links to existing public rights of way.	Support noted. Acknowledge that the bridleway/byway network is not cohesive and that there is not extensive provision in the Northstowe area. These issues would be addressed through the Access to the Countryside strategy.	The Access to the Countryside strategy should address issues of the lack of cohesion of the bridleway network, particularly the fragmentation resulting from major roads. The strategy should also address the need to provide local loops as well as providing linear links to existing public rights of way. Strategy should give consideration to the "Northstowe Community Circuit" concept.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1827	Support	At long last, bridleways are mentioned. there are too few bridleways in the area and the network has been completely fragmented by the A14. There are going to be more riders among Northstowe residents, who also deserve good access to the countryside. Do not forget that we riders contribute billions to the national economy by buying mostly British produce, and help keep the countryside afloat by maintaining grazing, buying vast amounts of mostly locally produced hay etc.	Support noted. Acknowledge that the bridleway/byway network is not cohesive and that there is not extensive provision in the Northstowe area. These issues would be addressed through the Access to the Countryside strategy.	The Access to the Countryside strategy should address issues of the lack of cohesion of the bridleway network, particularly the fragmentation resulting from major roads. The strategy should also address the need to provide local loops as well as providing linear links to existing public rights of way.
2329 - swavesey & district bridleways association	Support	Only walkers are well-served by current footpaths (walkers only) routes in county. Horse riders and cyclists are poorly served as the bridleway/byway network is not cohesive, does not go place-to-place or provide local loops. NS85 addresses this need to some extent at least in the proposed-Northstowe area of the county.	Support noted. Acknowledge that the bridleway/byway network is not cohesive and that there is not extensive provision in the Northstowe area. These issues would be addressed through the Access to the Countryside strategy.	The Access to the Countryside strategy should address issues of the lack of cohesion of the bridleway network, particularly the fragmentation resulting from major roads. The strategy should also address the need to provide local loops as well as providing linear links to existing public rights of way.
4023 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Agree with this approach. However, option needs to be amended to refer to public footpaths and include cycle ways. Amendment to NS85 An enhanced network of public footpaths, bridleways and cycle ways. A strategy should be developed to link all parts of the town to the wider countryside and existing public rights of way network. This should be achieved through an enhanced network of footpaths, bridleways and cycle ways which are designed for use by a wide group of users including the less able bodied and those with prams. Funding for creation and maintenance should be provided by the developer. Maintenance of the PROW network will be for a designated limited time period under the terms of government guidelines on planning obligations.	Agree that option needs to be amended to refer to "public footpaths" and to include cycle ways. Agree that there should be reference to developer funding and through s46 of the Town and Country Planning Act 2004 and Circular 1/97 or its forthcoming replacement.	Amend Preferred Option, as proposed, to read: A strategy should be developed to link all parts of the town to the wider countryside and existing public rights of way network. This should be achieved through an enhanced network of footpaths, bridleways and cycleways which are designed for use by a wide group of users including the less able-bodied and those with prams. Funding for creation and maintenance should be provided by the developer. Maintenance of the PROW network will be for a designated limited time period under the terms of government guidelines on planning obligations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5162 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Support	We strongly support NS85, but would wish to see it reworded to identify the need for adequate funding.	Agree. Developer funding can be required for the creation and maintenance of rights of way. See proposed amendment.	Amend NS85, as proposed by representation 4023, as follows: "An enhanced network of public footpaths, bridleways and cycleways. A strategy should be developed to link all parts of the town to the wider countryside and existing public rights of way network. This should be achieved through an enhanced network of footpaths, bridleways and cycleways which are designed for use by a wide group of users including the less able-bodied and those with prams. Funding for creation and maintenance should be provided by the developer. Maintenance of the Public Rights of Way Network will be for a designated limited time period under the terms of government guidelines on planning obligations.
6426 - The Countryside Agency 4722 - Sport England 2598	Support	Support for Preferred Option NS85.	Support noted.	
6321 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	While Gallagher supports much of the content of NS85 in particular the provision of connections to off site footpaths and bridleways, it is the responsibility of the Highway Authority to provide off site routes and in this regard, without land controls, the developer will not be able to assist delivery.	It will be the responsibility of the developer to negotiate with landowners and the County Council to ensure that improved links can be achieved.	

Decision on NS85 Access to the Countryside - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD****Chapter 16. Land Drainage and Water Conservation****NS86 Land Drainage and Water Conservation: Objectives - Preferred Approach**

996	Object	Detailed planning for Northstowe is all well and good. But when the next 1 in 100 year storm comes after the town is developed, the likelihood is that Rampton will flood. This is due to improperly maintained ditches and drains. At a local level we have seen most of the ditches alongside the village roads either filled typically with only comparatively narrow pipes. In other words, the problem will be successfully planned for in the new town, but not in the surrounding villages.	The objective not to increase flood risk to surrounding communities includes Rampton. Appropriate strategies for management and maintenance of water courses will be developed.	
4453 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1053 - Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes 2215 - Longstanton Parish Council 2223 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 2449 1562 1322 2859 1651 1467 964 1198 6433	Object	Flood risk at Longstanton should be mitigated, as well as Oakington, as opposed to just not exacerbating it.	The objective not to increase flood risk to existing properties or communities will apply to Longstanton. The Structure Plan specifically requires mitigation of existing flood risks at Oakington. This is because Northstowe would have a direct impact on flooding in the village, as it will drain into Oakington Brook and Beck Brook. Although not specifically required in the Structure Plan, it is reasonable that where part of the Northstowe development would impact on Longstanton flooding, an additional requirement be established. This is particularly the case with site option B, and all options for road access to the site. Options are currently being explored for balancing lakes west of Longstanton in relation to the access roads, which would provide a degree of improvement to the village.	If the Northstowe development will have a direct impact on flooding at Longstanton, it will be required take the opportunity to mitigate existing flooding problems in the village.
5620	Object	As the land in the development site drains towards Rampton and Cottenham people are extremely worried about the threat of flooding. This would be extremely worrying in the case of Site C because the proposed retaining lakes would appear to be upstream of part of the development.	The objective to not increase flood risk to surrounding properties includes Rampton and Cottenham.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5335	Object	Willingham also has drainage problems, and is likely to be affected as well as Longstanton. Look into Willingham drainage problems when considering the development.	Willingham is included in the objective not to increase flood risk to surrounding communities.	
5656 5637 4967 4966	Object	Rampton is not mentioned in the objectives. Flood risk in this village must also be considered.	The objective not to increase flood risk to surrounding villages also applies to Rampton.	
4879 - Environment Agency	Object	Suggest inclusion of a policy which stipulates the requirement for an appropriate management structure to be put in place to address maintenance issues for the drainage systems and infrastructure. This could be similar to CE78 in the Cambridge East AAP.	This is reflected in the preferred option NS90, which requires water courses and water bodies to be maintained and managed by a specific trust which would be publicly accountable.	
4977	Object	Object to the wording of bullet 2 - it should read "to ensure that the surrounding properties and communities particularly in Oakington and Longstanton or downstream areas are not affected in any way whatsoever"	This issues is sufficiently covered by the second bullet point, detailing that flood risk to surrounding properties should not be increased.	
6518 - Histon & Impington Village Society 1543 4658 1348 2004	Object	General concern about the risk of flooding, particularly to surrounding villages.	The Council is working closely with the Environment Agency to ensure any flood risk issues are fully addressed, and that flood risk to surrounding areas is not increased.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3101 - Rampton Parish Council 3044 2117 3303 2386 1335 1512 1924 2099 1752 1682 1574 5660 5658	Object	1 in 100 year protection is not sufficient, particularly in Rampton, where a 1 in 200 year flood was recently experienced on the Cottenham Lode.	1 in 100 year is the minimum level of protection that has been agreed with the Environment Agency. It is likely that flood protection will actually be provided to a higher level.	
4024 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6493 - The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards 1969 - Cottenham Parish Council 2816 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 5265 - Swavesey IDB 3033	Support	General support for the preferred approach.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS86 Land Drainage and Water Conservation: Objectives - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Include additional objective: 'IF THE NORTHSTOWE DEVELOPMENT WILL HAVE A DIRECT IMPACT ON FLOODING AT LONGSTANTON, IT WILL MITIGATE EXISTING FLOODING PROBLEMS IN THE VILLAGE.'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS87 Surface Water Drainage - Preferred Option</i>				
3451 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships is strongly committed to the provision of SUDS in the development and as a policy commitment. However we believe its form and function should be determined as an integral part of the masterplanning process rather than as a prescriptive policy.	While the exact form of the drainage system can be determined through the master planning process, it was important to achieve public participation on general principles at this early stage.	
3102 - Rampton Parish Council	Object	The proposed drainage lakes alongside the old railway/rapid transit system are at a higher level than the proposed dwellings for Option C that are to the North and East of the old railway line. The land slopes to Rampton. Water does not run uphill. There is a higher risk of flooding therefore in Rampton. Who will foot the bill for flooding in Rampton as a result?	In order to meet the objectives for land drainage, any risk to Rampton would not be increased by development of Northstowe. Any drainage scheme will take account of impact on surrounding areas.	
5352 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to NS87 & Ns88 as they both appear to predetermine the site of the new settlement and only consider options B & C as bolt-ons, rather than determining the location, then establishing the most appropriate surface water drainage strategy. Also NS88 provides a misleading representation of a single large lake capable of use for recreational purposes.	The option provides a solution to surface water drainage for all three site options put forward in the Preferred Options Report.	
4982	Object	Too imprecise. At the moment rainwater finds its way to ditches and streams and onwards, or simply soaks away into the ground. With the full development and the vast area of roofs, roads and footpaths there will be many millions of gallons being concentrated into the stormwater drains. Whilst I support the water park, if water runs into it upstream, it has to run out of the downstream end. What balancing lakes/ponds are there to be incorporated outside the water park?	A number of options for drainage are currently being explored, in partnership with the Environment Agency. This includes other balancing ponds in locations away from the proposed water park. In particular balancing ponds west of Longstanton are being explored, in conjunction with options for access roads.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1055 - Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes 2224 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 5273 - Swavesey IDB 2879	Object	Concern about the impact of this option on Longstanton Brook, as areas on land detailed in site options discharge into it. Increased surface water drainage will put pressure on Longstanton, that must be mitigated.	<p>The objective not to increase flood risk to existing properties or communities will apply to Longstanton.</p> <p>The Structure Plan specifically requires mitigation of existing flood risks at Oakington. This is because Northstowe would have a direct impact on flooding in the village, as it will drain into Oakington Brook and Beck Brook.</p> <p>Although not specifically required in the Structure Plan, it is reasonable that where part of the Northstowe development would impact on Longstanton flooding, an additional requirement be established. This is particularly the case with site option B, and all options for road access to the site. Options are currently being explored for balancing lakes west of Longstanton in relation to the access roads, which would provide a degree of improvement to the village. This issue will be addressed in the Land Drainage and Water Conservation Objectives.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6322 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher supports the drainage strategy presented for Site Options A and B, although some further work will be required to determine the best option for draining Option B including the need to drain to the north and west.</p> <p>To pursue Option C it is suggested that the drainage strategy would embrace land either side of the railway. In this eventuality there are substantial issues raised in terms of the design of the new town and the linking of development north of the railway line to that to the south. Provision for drainage is included within the proposals for a water park to meet recreation and landscape requirements as well. The water park should be retained as a high quality edge to the new town not a divisive feature within it.</p> <p>For clarification, it may be better to refer to a series of connected water bodies rather than lakes as a number of different measures to store water may be used (including channels rather than lakes).</p>	<p>Support for this option, and drainage strategy as it relates to site option A and B noted.</p> <p>Objection relates to drainage strategy if site option C is selected. Design will need to ensure water bodies do not become a devise feature if this site option is selected.</p> <p>Agree final point.</p>	Refer to series of connected water bodies, rather than specifically referring to lakes.
4025 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2818 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
3996 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature would support the preferred option of this policy as it would result in a series of channels rather than a single lake which would be a more natural environment for this area and have more wide-spread benefits for nature conservation.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4454 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The approach to surface water drainage is to be supported but further opportunities to incorporate a range of SUDS measures should also be included. An exemplar development where a range of SUDS measures is being employed is the FLOWS showcase residential project on GC16 in Cambourne. The Sustainability Appraisal appears to pick up the need for inclusion of a more wide-ranging set of SUDS features, but the reference is only implicit (Sustainability Appraisal p18 for NS88). Amend option by including additional SUDS measures.	Exemplar projects are to be included in a separate policy in the Area Action Plan. The Environment Agency's preferred approach to drainage is the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems. This is reflected in the Core Strategy, and should also be reflected in the Area Action Plan.	Require in the Area Action Plan the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems where practicable.
6494 - The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards	Support	Ns87 - generally support preferred option. Board are concerned how proposal for either side of railway (option c) would work - system must be designed to protect the district	Support noted. Drainage system design will be prepared in partnership with the Environment Agency, and be required to meet the objectives detailed in the previous option.	

Decision on NS87 Surface Water Drainage - Preferred Option

Develop the preferred option into policy in the Area Action Plan, as modified:

Refer to a series of connected water bodies, rather than specifically referring to lakes.

Require in the Area Action Plan the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems where practicable.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS88 Surface Water Drainage - Alternative Option</i>				
1054 - Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes	Object	A single lake is not at all in keeping with the current character, and would be detrimental to wildlife.	Noted.	
3452 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships is strongly committed to the provision of SUDS in the development and as a policy commitment. However we believe its form and function should be determined as an integral part of the masterplanning process rather than as a prescriptive policy.	Whilst exact form and function can be established through the master planning process, it was important to consult on general principles at this early stage.	
5353 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to NS87 & NS88 as they both appear to predetermine the site of the new settlement and only consider options B & C as bolt-ons, rather than determining the location, then establishing the most appropriate surface water drainage strategy. Also NS88 provides a misleading representation of a single large lake capable of use for recreational purposes.	Disagree. The options seek public participation on a general principle for the design of the drainage system. All three site options are referred to in the option.	
4455 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4026 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3103 - Rampton Parish Council 6323 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Objection to this alternative option.	Noted.	

Decision on NS88 Surface Water Drainage - Alternative Option

This alternative option is rejected.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 17. Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal				
<i>NS89 Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal - Preferred Approach</i>				
2158	Object	The foul drains and sewers within Rampton Drift are substandard. The Northstowe system should also encompass Rampton Drift, which should be properly integrated into a new system for the whole town.	It is possible that Rampton Drift be Incorporated into foul drainage systems of Northstowe. This would need to be explored at the detailed design stage.	
3395	Object	Anglian Water's advice remains tentative after long discussions. LDB objections over discharge of treated effluent do not appear to have been overcome. A development of this size needs a new treatment works with discharge direct to the tidal section of the River Ouse below Earith. re-Consultation and commitment from service provider is essential.	The Council is exploring appropriate methods of foul drainage and sewage disposal with the Environment Agency, and Anglian Water. If appropriate this will utilise the Uttons Drove STW, with appropriate improvements as required.	
3538 3536	Object	There are flooding problems with regard too many houses linked to an overworked sewerage system. There are concerns the new development will exacerbate this problem.	The objective is that the new town will not increase flood risk to surrounding properties or communities.	
4826	Object	What volume of foul drainage and sewage disposal are the Authorities budgeting for, and via which treatment works, when it has not been decided how large the town will grow to in future?	The requirements for surface water drainage will reflect the size of the town selected through the site options. Any the impact of any future growth would need to be considered separately.	
4881 - Environment Agency	Object	Over the next decade, a massive expansion in the population of Cambridge is planned, including the development described here. Anglian Water are currently carrying out an appraisal of the sewage provision for the whole catchment. This includes an assessment for the available options for Uttons drove STW. Any increase in flow form any of the existing STWs would require a reassessment of the consent conditions to ensure that there would be no deterioration of river quality. Anglian Water are aware of this fact.	Noted. The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency and Anglian Water to ensure an appropriate solution can be achieved.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5252 - Swavesey IDB	Object	<p>Discharge of foul water from this development, and the 700 proposed additional dwellings at Cambourne, would lead to increased discharge of treated effluent into a tributary of the Swavesey Drain, which crosses the boards area. The board is concerned that this will exacerbate the flooding currently experienced within their catchment.</p> <p>The board is aware that Anglian Water Services Ltd are currently in discussion with the Environment Agency concerning these matters, but is concerned at the length of time that discussions have taken to achieve this and will continue to oppose any development that proposes to discharge treated effluent into the Swavesey drain system via any new or existing sewage treatment works.</p>	The Council will continue to work with the Environment Agency and Anglian Water to ensure an appropriate solution can be achieved.	
6324 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>It will be for Anglian Water Services to determine the most appropriate discharge strategy for Foul Drainage and Sewage disposal.</p> <p>Although it may be appropriate for the AAP to indicate, in supporting text, the District Council's understanding of the AWS position, it would be inappropriate to require any particular foul drainage strategy. Accordingly Gallagher would suggest that it would be inappropriate to include a policy for foul drainage save to indicate that sewage disposal will be by means of a suitable sewage treatment works and outfall. The number of foul water pumping stations will be dependent upon more detailed analysis when the layout is further advanced.</p>	Agree that options for foul drainage and sewage disposal are still being explored with the Environment Agency and Anglian water. Exact measures should not be included in the Area Action Plan, as they will depend on design of the development.	Do not include exact list of foul drainage measures in AAP.
1056 - Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes 2216 - Longstanton Parish Council 1324 1278	Support	Support for this option, in particular provision of new pumping facilities and outfall routes.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS89 Foul Drainage and Sewage Disposal - Preferred Approach

Whilst Uttons Drove may still prove to be the appropriate solution for foul drainage and sewage disposal, do not include exact list of foul drainage measures in Area Action Plan, instead include a criteria-based policy detailing requirements that a system must achieve.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS90 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses - Preferred Option</i>				
1387	Object	District Council to guarantee management of water and to ensure both short and long term management functions are provided.	Appropriate measure will be taken to ensure the management body is fit for the purpose.	
3418	Object	Management will become a significant obligation and must be locally based using staff with local knowledge. Since discharge of surface water will be via awards LDB drains and EA main rivers further options need to be examined. (ie creation of a new drainage authority with rating powers and true public accountability.)	A criteria based policy will be prepared detailing the requirements that any management body must meet.	
4757 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council 2225 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 5354 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	The District Council should be publicly accountable for management and maintenance of watercourses.	It is inappropriate to determine the exact management body at this stage. A criteria based policy will be included in the Area Action Plan detailing the requirements of any management body. This will not rule out Local Authority involvement.	
1057 - Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes 2217 - Longstanton Parish Council 1325 1652 1469 4984 965 1199	Object	There is no strategy for management in the short term.	Prior to adoption by the selected management body, developers will be responsible for the maintenance of watercourses.	
6495 - The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards 2168	Object	Concerned about resourcing and expertise of management body.	The Council will ensure that the management body is fit for the purpose, and appropriate legal agreements are put in place. A criteria based policy will detail requirements.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4027 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1971 - Cottenham Parish Council 3105 - Rampton Parish Council 5245 - Swavesey IDB	Support	Support for this option.	Support for this option is noted.	
6326 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	<p>Gallagher recognises the need for a proper management and maintenance regime that is both technically competent and financially stable in the long term. It is not appropriate however for planning policy to specifically require the vesting of commercial property.</p> <p>It is too early in the development process to prescribe such an approach to the formation of a maintenance body at this time. It is likely and appropriate that this will be a matter determined at a later stage by legal agreement as part of the planning application process. The AAP should set out only the principles that will need to be addressed in devising an appropriate management and maintenance regime (see main text).</p>	<p>Whilst the exact nature of a future management body has yet to be established, the option makes clear the Council's preferred approach.</p> <p>It is agreed that a criteria based policy may be a more appropriate response, detailing the requirements that any management body must meet, such as guaranteeing management in perpetuity.</p>	Develop a criteria based policy on requirements for management and maintenance of water courses.

Decision on NS90 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses - Preferred Option

Develop a criteria based policy for management and maintenance of watercourses, detailing the requirements any management body must meet, including achieving management in perpetuity.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS91 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses - Rejected Option</i>				
1380 1379	Object	The District Council should manage water courses.	It is inappropriate to determine the exact management body at this stage. A criteria based policy will be included in the Area Action Plan detailing the requirements of any management body. This will not rule out Local Authority involvement.	
4762 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	The reasoning behind the rejection of the District Council taking on the responsibility is frightening, in that it admits that it does not have the necessary expertise to fulfil statutory duties that it already has in respect of numerous "Awarded Watercourses" in this area. Furthermore, it admits that the manner and means of raising the necessary ongoing funding to support this vital work in respect of Northstowe is flawed, and therefore cannot be relied upon in the longer term.	It is inappropriate to determine the exact management body at this stage. A criteria based policy will be included in the Area Action Plan detailing the requirements of any management body. This will not rule out Local Authority involvement.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6327 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher recognises the need for a proper management and maintenance regime that is both technically competent and financially stable in the long term.</p> <p>In responding to NS90, Gallagher accepts that the trust may well be an appropriate way forward but also that there may be other options. In this respect Gallagher does not rule out some involvement of the District Council.</p> <p>At this stage it is suggested that the AAP sets out a number of general guidelines.</p> <p>It is suggested that the general principles should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -□having a maintenance plan in place prior to construction; -□exploring the potential for a Trust to assume this role but also to consider other models (including hybrid models); -□ensuring appropriate funding; and -□providing for consultation with the local community. 	<p>Agree that it is inappropriate to determine the exact management body at this stage. A criteria based policy will be included in the Area Action Plan detailing the requirements of any management body. This will not rule out Local Authority involvement.</p>	
4028 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>The County Council supports the District Councils rejection of option A for the management and maintenance of watercourses in Northstowe (see NS90 comments).</p>	<p>Support for rejection of this option noted.</p>	

Decision on NS91 Management and Maintenance of Watercourses - Rejected Option

Develop a criteria based policy for management and maintenance of watercourses, detailing the requirements any management body must meet, including achieving management in perpetuity.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS92 Management and maintenance of Watercourses - Rejected Option</i>				
1383	Object	Anglian Water to manage and maintain water bodies and watercourses.	It is inappropriate to determine the exact management body at this stage. A criteria based policy will be included in the Area Action Plan detailing the requirements of any management body.	
4029 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6328 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Support for rejection of this option.	It is inappropriate to determine the exact management body at this stage. A criteria based policy will be included in the Area Action Plan detailing the requirements of any management body.	

Decision on NS92 Management and maintenance of Watercourses - Rejected Option

Develop a criteria based policy for management and maintenance of watercourses, detailing the requirements any management body must meet, including achieving management in perpetuity.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS93 Alleviating Flood Risk at Oakington - Alternative Option</i>				
1765	Object	I support a diversion of Beck Brook and a diversion of Longstanton Brook along the B1050 bypass before any construction work is undertaken. The structure plan states that risk in Longstanton must not be exacerbated. Up to date Environment Agency data shows flood risk in the village is higher than previously calculated. However, in any case mitigating risk in Longstanton is consistent with the structure plan requirement of not exacerbating it (there is no requirement that risk not be mitigated).	The diversion of Longstanton Brook is not required, nor can it be delivered due to land ownership. However, if the development of Northstowe has a direct impact, it would be required to make improvements to the flooding situation at Longstanton. This may be achieved in relation to new balancing ponds west of Longstanton, associated with new Northstowe access roads.	
2820 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Object	The Wildlife Trust objects to any option which would adversely affect the Water Vole population that has been recorded from the Beck Brook. Which ever option is chosen must ensure the survival of the Water Voles	Objection noted. The importance of protecting biodiversity is reflected in the preferred option for biodiversity objectives. Appropriate protection for water vole habitat will be required.	
4456 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2180	Object	Would create an unsightly feature, and could send water more quickly to villages down stream.	Objection to this option noted.	
4768 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Experiences of flooding in our village confirm that the raising of ground levels along parts of the side of the brook will have very little impact on our flooding problems, which are mainly due to the inadequate capacity of the numerous road bridges. This option could well reduce the risk of flooding for a limited number of residents, but it would do nothing for the vast majority of those at risk. For banks to be effective they would need to be continuous along both sides of the whole length of the brook through and beyond our village. The fact that there are numerous bridges crossing this brook would necessitate every one of these being raised to the same level as the bank.	Objection to this option noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4661 - Environment Agency	Object	Method by which flood risk at Oakington is to be mitigated is still to be determined. The agency would not wish to state a preference at this stage for alleviation options.	Agree that the exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that a criteria based policy would be more appropriate.	Develop criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements.
4986 966	Object	Longstanton's risk must be mitigated, not alleviated.	The objective not to increase flood risk to existing properties or communities will apply to Longstanton. The Structure Plan specifically requires mitigation of existing flood risks at Oakington. This is because Northstowe would have a direct impact on flooding in the village, as it will drain into Oakington Brook and Beck Brook. Although not specifically required in the Structure Plan, it is reasonable that where part of the Northstowe development would impact on Longstanton flooding, an additional requirement be established. This is particularly the case with site option B, and all options for road access to the site. Options are currently being explored for balancing lakes west of Longstanton in relation to the access roads, which would provide a degree of improvement to the village.	If the Northstowe development will have a direct impact on flooding at Longstanton, it will be required take the opportunity to mitigate existing flooding problems in the village.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6329 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Structure Plan policy requires mitigation of the flood risk at Oakington not alleviation.</p> <p>In options NS93 to 96, the AAP sets out four options for mitigating existing flood risk. Only NS95 is deliverable by Gallagher. Further work is required to evaluate further the options set out in the Preferred Options report.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that the policy to be included in the AAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -□ refers to the need to mitigate flood risk in Oakington; -□ does not include a specific solution as a policy requirement; -□ in the event that SCDC is intent on including a specific solution that this solution is the one described in NS 95 	<p>Agree that the exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that a criteria based policy would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Develop criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements.</p>
3085 3036 831	Support	<p>Support for this option, conjunction with other measures.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	

Decision on NS93 Alleviating Flood Risk at Oakington - Alternative Option

Develop a criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements in the Area Action Plan.

Other action proposed:

If the Northstowe development will have a direct impact on flooding at Longstanton, it will be required take the opportunity to mitigate existing flooding problems in the village.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS94 Alleviating Flood Risk at Oakington - Alternative Option</i>				
6776 - Longstanton Parish Council 3413 2173 6774 6772 1435 1248 1654 1471 4987 967 1138 6782 5137 5125 1384 1626 1607	Object	Flooding at Longstanton should also be mitigated. Longstanton Brook must be diverted along the B1050 bypass.	The diversion of Longstanton Brook is not required by the development, it may be difficult to deliver due to land ownership and it may not be the best option. However, if the development associated with Northstowe has a direct impact, it would be required to make improvements to the flooding situation at Longstanton. This may be achieved in relation to new balancing ponds west of Longstanton, associated with new Northstowe access roads.	
2172	Object	So long as a new channel does not imply flooding for those who may live along its banks further downstream. If there are concerns about water table levels in the new settlement surely it would be feasible to have some control of water flow into the channel during times of low precipitation	The exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that a criteria based policy would be more appropriate. Concerns about biodiversity (and the impact of changes to the water table) will need to be addressed by any flood alleviation measures.	
4662 - Environment Agency	Object	The method by which flood risk at Oakington is to be mitigated is still to be determined. The Agency would not wish to state a preference at this stage for alleviation options.	Agree that the exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that a criteria based policy would be more appropriate.	Develop criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6330 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Structure Plan policy requires mitigation of the flood risk at Oakington not alleviation.</p> <p>In options NS93 to 96, the AAP sets out four options for mitigating existing flood risk. Only NS95 is deliverable by Gallagher. Further work is required to evaluate further the options set out in the Preferred Options report.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that the policy to be included in the AAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -□ refers to the need to mitigate flood risk in Oakington; -□ does not include a specific solution as a policy requirement; -□ in the event that SCDC is intent on including a specific solution that this solution is the one described in NS 95 	<p>Agree that the exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that a criteria based policy would be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Develop criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements.</p>
1221	Support	<p>I support all the flood alleviation measures for Oakington.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	
4457 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>The County Council has no preference from options B,C or D, although recognises the concern in the Preferred Options Report that a new channel could have an adverse effect on local biodiversity by lowering the water table at Northstowe. If this were demonstrated to be the case this would not be the favoured option. The most important factor is the efficiencies of the solution.</p>	<p>Agree that the exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that the efficiencies of the solution is the most important consideration. A criteria based policy would be more appropriate.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2218 - Longstanton Parish Council 3404 3038 2992 2965 2170 1563 1327 2016 1983 2914 1586 6777 832 6437	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS94 Alleviating Flood Risk at Oakington - Alternative Option

Develop a criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements in the Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS95 Alleviating Flood Risk at Oakington - Alternative Option</i>				
2175	Object	Balancing ponds can flood too! Much of Oakington's flooding problem is exacerbated by inadequate balancing ponds at Bar Hill. The planners got that wrong. They could as easily be as wrong with plans to drain Northstowe. The Environment Agency said that the 1998 floods in Oakington were a once in a century feature - the same level of flooding occurred two years later! I have little respect for these self appointed experts.	Balancing ponds would be required to meet the Environment Agency's requirements, and be properly maintained in perpetuity.	
4663 - Environment Agency	Object	The method by which flood risk at Oakington is to be mitigated is still to be determined. The Agency would not wish to state a preference at this stage for alleviation options.	Agree that the exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that a criteria based policy would be more appropriate.	Develop criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements.
4988 968	Object	Longstanton's risk must be mitigated, not alleviated.	The objective not to increase flood risk to existing properties or communities will apply to Longstanton. The Structure Plan specifically requires mitigation of existing flood risks at Oakington. This is because Northstowe would have a direct impact on flooding in the village, as it will drain into Oakington Brook and Beck Brook. Although not specifically required in the Structure Plan, it is reasonable that where part of the Northstowe development would impact on Longstanton flooding, an additional requirement be established. This is particularly the case with site option B, and all options for road access to the site. Options are currently being explored for balancing lakes west of Longstanton in relation to the access roads, which would provide a degree of improvement to the village.	If the Northstowe development will have a direct impact on flooding at Longstanton, it will be required take the opportunity to mitigate existing flooding problems in the village.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4776 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	This option is seriously flawed in that there is not a single source for our flooding problems. It is true that the bulk of the water comes from Bar Hill, but significant amounts also come via the awarded watercourse running alongside Longstanton Road and the one that leads from the A14 in the general area of the crematorium. Additionally, the flooding problem at Westwick and Station Cottages, Oakington is compounded by the water from Girton, Histon and Madingley which adds to that which flows through Oakington village.	Other water courses have been examined, including through the continuing work of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The Objectives relating to Northstowe and flood risk will apply, and impact of Northstowe on these watercourses will be considered. With regard to the watercourse along Longstanton Road in particular, it is likely that water from a large part of the Airfield site will be drained to the north, reducing the intake of that particular watercourse.	
6331 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Structure Plan policy requires mitigation of the flood risk at Oakington not alleviation. In options NS93 to 96, the AAP sets out four options for mitigating existing flood risk. Only NS95 is deliverable by Gallagher. Further work is required to evaluate further the options set out in the Preferred Options report. It is therefore suggested that the policy to be included in the AAP: - <input type="checkbox"/> refers to the need to mitigate flood risk in Oakington; - <input type="checkbox"/> does not include a specific solution as a policy requirement; - <input type="checkbox"/> in the event that SCDC is intent on including a specific solution that this solution is the one described in NS 95.	Agree that the exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that a criteria based policy would be more appropriate.	Develop criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements.
2488	Support	This seems the best long term solution to what will be an increasing problem as development, as it inevitably will, grows apace.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3557 3040 3587	Support	Support, but other measures also need to be implemented to provide effective flood protection.	The flood alleviation may require a number of measures, and can not be determined in the area action plan. A criteria based policy would be more appropriate, settling out the requirements the measures must achieve.	
4458 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council has no preference from options B,C or D, although recognises the concern in the Preferred Options Report that a new channel could have an adverse effect on local biodiversity by lowering the water table at Northstowe. If this were demonstrated to be the case this would not be the favoured option. The most important factor is the efficiencies of the solution.	Agree that the exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that the efficiencies of the solution is the most important consideration. A criteria based policy would be more appropriate.	

Decision on NS95 Alleviating Flood Risk at Oakington - Alternative Option

Develop a criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements in the Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS96 Alleviating Flood Risk at Oakington - Alternative Option</i>				
2189	Object	As far as we are aware the balancing pond at Bar Hill, (similar to the one on the Dry Drayton / A14 slip road?) has been allowed to silt up and is now almost completely covered with reed beds. What guarantee is there that this will not be allowed to happen in the future whether it is dredged or not in the interim?	This is a maintenance issue. The criteria based policy proposed will include a requirement for management in perpetuity, thus ensuring flood risk attenuation measures work as designed in the future.	
4779 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	This option is flawed in the same way as NS95, because water that comes from Bar Hill is only part of the problem and significant amounts also come via the awarded watercourse running alongside Longstanton Road and the one that leads to the A14 in the general area of the crematorium. Additionally, the flooding problem at Westwick and Station Cottages, Oakington is compounded by the water from Girton, Histon and Madingley which adds to that which flows through Oakington village.	Other water courses have been examined, including through the continuing work of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The Objectives relating to Northstowe and flood risk will apply, and impact of Northstowe on these watercourses will be considered.	
4664 - Environment Agency	Object	The method by which flood risk at Oakington is to be mitigated is still to be determined. The Agency would not wish to state a preference at this stage for alleviation options.	Agree that the exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that a criteria based policy would be more appropriate.	Develop criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1058 - Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes 4989	Object	Longstanton's risk must be mitigated, not alleviated.	The objective not to increase flood risk to existing properties or communities will apply to Longstanton. The Structure Plan specifically requires mitigation of existing flood risks at Oakington. This is because Northstowe would have a direct impact on flooding in the village, as it will drain into Oakington Brook and Beck Brook. Although not specifically required in the Structure Plan, it is reasonable that where part of the Northstowe development would impact on Longstanton flooding, an additional requirement be established. This is particularly the case with site option B, and all options for road access to the site. Options are currently being explored for balancing lakes west of Longstanton in relation to the access roads, which would provide a degree of improvement to the village.	If the Northstowe development will have a direct impact on flooding at Longstanton, it will be required take the opportunity to mitigate existing flooding problems in the village.
6332 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Structure Plan policy requires mitigation of the flood risk at Oakington not alleviation.</p> <p>In options NS93 to 96, the AAP sets out four options for mitigating existing flood risk. Only NS95 is deliverable by Gallagher. Further work is required to evaluate further the options set out in the Preferred Options report.</p> <p>It is therefore suggested that the policy to be included in the AAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -□refers to the need to mitigate flood risk in Oakington; -□does not include a specific solution as a policy requirement; -□in the event that SCDC is intent on including a specific solution that this solution is the one described in NS 95. 	Agree that the exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that a criteria based policy would be more appropriate.	Develop criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4459 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council has no preference from options B,C or D, although recognises the concern in the Preferred Options Report that a new channel could have an adverse effect on local biodiversity by lowering the water table at Northstowe. If this were demonstrated to be the case this would not be the favoured option. The most important factor is the efficiencies of the solution. Option D should be considered in combination with Options B or C rather than as an alternative.	Agree that the exact nature of all flood alleviation measures can not be determined in the area action plan, and that the efficiencies of the solution is the most important consideration. A criteria based policy would be more appropriate.	

Decision on NS96 Alleviating Flood Risk at Oakington - Alternative Option

Develop a criteria based policy in relation to flood alleviation requirements in the Area Action Plan.

Other action proposed:

If the Northstowe development will have a direct impact on flooding at Longstanton, it will be required take the opportunity to mitigate existing flooding problems in the village.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

NS97 Water Conservation - Preferred Approach

6333 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher recognises the need where possible to adopt sustainable conservation measures and that Northstowe perhaps presents scope for such opportunities.</p> <p>However, these opportunities need to be identified through an appropriate and flexible strategy that takes full account of technology, adoption and/or maintenance together with commercial and consumer considerations.</p> <p>That strategy is best arrived at through a proper period of evaluation and consultation rather than through imposition by detailed policy requirements. This is recognised in NS86 which places a requirement on the need to determine the scope for water recycling within the development. It is this approach which should be adopted rather than the prescriptive approach set out in NS97.</p>	<p>Given the importance of this issue, particularly highlighted by the sustainability appraisal, it is important that a clear policy is established in the development plan from the outset. The preferred option requires a strategy to be prepared by developers, allowing for flexibility on how the high reduction in the use of piped water can be achieved.</p>	
----------------------------------	--------	--	---	--

3986 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 4030 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1059 - Longstanton Residents for Dry Homes 3106 - Rampton Parish Council 2822 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 2852	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
---	---------	----------------------------------	----------------	--

Decision on NS97 Water Conservation - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS98 Telecommunications Objectives - Preferred Approach</i>				
972	Object	I would like a specific statement that fibre optic cabling will be used. For an entire new town, it will be a missed opportunity to use last century's technology.	The technology used to achieve broadband coverage does not need to be specified in the policy. There a number of technologies, that could achieve this objective.	
2118	Object	If possible, modern telecommunications could be extended to the surrounding villages, otherwise they may be left as poor relations in this respect.	While this is not directly relevant to the Northstowe Area Action Plan, the Council is developing a scheme to improve broadband coverage across the villages of South Cambridgeshire.	
4032 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the approach to telecommunications in Northstowe.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS98 Telecommunications Objectives - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

NS99 Telecommunications - Preferred Approach

4782 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	It is right and proper that telecommunications provisions should be "designed and installed as integral part of the development". Equally, it is also right and proper to be even more specific and to require that the actual hardware in the form of base stations and associated antennae is installed within the development, and not in the surrounding countryside.	Any masts required will be covered by the telecommunications policies, and other policies, in the Core Strategy of the LDF.	
1546	Support	I agree with this but feel fibre should be installed for the future not present day technologies.	NS99 provides flexibility for dealing with technology changes during the period of development.	
4033 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports the approach to telecommunications in Northstowe.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS99 Telecommunications - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 18. Energy				
<i>NS100 Energy Objectives - Preferred Approach</i>				
2161	Object	This lacks vision. Northstowe presents a unique opportunity to employ a centralised heating and hot water system from a central power station. Hot water for domestic use and heating would be provided by a metered supply to all buildings. One large central depot would alleviate the need for 8,000 individual heating boilers. Such a concept is widely used on the continent, and a good example of such a system is at Viborg in Denmark.	South Cambs and Cambridgeshire Horizons are establishing a Sustainable Energy Partnership (SEP) for Northstowe to take responsibility for delivering investment in an integrated sustainable energy system that includes low carbon generation, distribution infrastructure and energy efficiency measures. It is intended to develop a business plan for Northstowe SEP, which will feed into the Area Action Plan, and could potentially cover a range of energy efficiency and generation measures.	
4035 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	"Greater use should be made" - what is this relative to? Given the relatively low provision of renewable energy in the area, to meet national, regional and local targets Northstowe, as a blank canvas site, could aim to provide more than its maximum uses of renewable power. Need clarification on definition of greater use - possibly in supporting text.	NS101 applies the district-wide policies for energy to Northstowe. CS62 - Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development requires at least 10% of energy requirements to be provided by renewable sources in developments over 1,000sq m or 50 dwellings (since changed to 10 dwellings). This target does not preclude the achievement of more than 10% of energy from renewable sources.	
4990	Object	Support the general principles expressed, but I object to the wording of the 3rd bullet point. This should specifically exclude any proposals for wind farms to generate electricity.	General support noted. The 3rd bullet allows flexibility in the achievement of a greater use of renewable energy from a range of sources. Placing restrictions on one type of renewable energy over another would be contrary to Government guidance in PPS22, which states that local authorities should produce criteria-based policies to judge proposals on a case-by-case basis. CS62 will be a district-wide criteria-based policy in accordance with PPS22.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1010	Support	All houses should be built with solar panels for hot water/electricity	Support noted. NS101 applies the district-wide policies for energy to Northstowe. CS62 - Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development requires at least 10% of energy requirements to be provided by renewable sources in developments over 1,000sq m or 50 dwellings (since changed to 10 dwellings), but is flexible, allowing developers to demonstrate how this will be achieved. It is considered too prescriptive to require solar panels on all houses, as the 10% renewable energy target could be met by various means. Also, there may be instances where solar panels could be considered unsuitable, for example, from a design point of view.	
1771	Support	Housing must be built to maximize energy efficiency - e.g. with solar panels, using run off water for flushing toilets etc.	Support noted. NS101 applies the district-wide policies for energy to Northstowe. CS63 - Energy Efficiency requires developments to be energy efficient, reducing the amount of CO2 emitted by a further 10% over and above the Building Regulations, the national minimum standard. In addition, CS62 - Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development requires at least 10% of energy requirements to be provided by renewable sources in developments over 1,000sq m or 50 dwellings (since changed to 10 dwellings). These targets do not preclude the achievement of higher standards.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6441	Support	This comment relates to Section 19 Waste. As a major new development and free standing new settlement it is logical to consider a combined waste management and treatment facility having the ability to 'burn' waste (generated by - at the very least - Northstowe) and use heat recovery to supply Northstowe development - utilising one or a mix of the newer waste management treatment technologies.	South Cambs and Cambridgeshire Horizons are establishing a Sustainable Energy Partnership (SEP) for Northstowe to take responsibility for delivering investment in an integrated sustainable energy system that includes low carbon generation, distribution infrastructure and energy efficiency measures. It is intended to develop a business plan for Northstowe SEP, which will feed into the Area Action Plan, and could potentially cover a range of energy efficiency and generation measures.	
3454 - English Partnerships	Support	The Local Authority should consider BREEAM and NHER standards such as Eco-homes development in the District. Environmental standards also assist in establishing high quality design and effective site management and reduction in waste materials.	CS63 does not preclude the achievement of a higher environmental standard. It is not appropriate to require through planning permission a standard beyond Building Regulations.	
3978 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	We recommended that the LPA achieves a minimum standard of 'very Good' with an aspiration to achieve an 'Excellent' BREEAM where possible. English Nature support these preferred approaches as they will reduce the use of fossil fuels and contribute to the sustainable use of natural resources.	Support noted.	
3108 - Rampton Parish Council 2824 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	Support the preferred approach.	Support noted.	
4880 - Environment Agency	Support	Support inclusion of policy on energy conservation.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS100 Energy Objectives - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS101 Energy Provision - Preferred Approach</i>				
4037 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 18.5 Requirement for a stronger definition of what constitutes 'viability'. In addition, are there to be criteria for when renewable energy provision becomes 'overburdening'? If not it may depend greatly upon who is charged with making the assessment. This is not reflected in discussions regarding other requirements for development e.g. green corridors etc. This approach is considered unduly negative and appears to treat renewable energy differently from other requirements on developers.	NS101 applies the district-wide policies for energy to Northstowe. CS62 and CS63 provide flexibility in the achievement of their targets, and can be negotiated on a case-by-case basis, similar to other development requirements, such as affordable housing. It would be inappropriate to provide a stronger definition of viability as what is viable in one situation may differ in another.	
2892	Object	I object to paragraph 18.4 of NS101, quite frankly: is Northstowe/Longstanton to be the dumping ground for all the nagging problems the County Council and District Council have about finding emplacements for large wind mills, major recycling plants, much needed sewage works and the like? Horrendous thought of a small community on the edge of the fens sacrificed to the needs of the sub-region. Do we want to swap golf course, paddocks, open views, ex MOD beautiful mature parkland for recycling plants, wind mills, sewage works, park and ride, cheap housing blocks ...?	NS101 applies the district-wide policies for energy, as detailed in CS60-CS63. There is significant scope for achieving these targets when planning a new community from scratch. The "Delivering Renewable Energy in the Cambridge Sub-Region 2004" report identifies Northstowe as a location with great potential for incorporating renewable energy. Therefore, there is scope to meet the energy targets by utilising a range of technologies and, as these are being designed in at the outset, there is greater scope for mitigating any potential impact.	
3697 - House Builders Federation	Object	The achievement of SAP ratings is too simplistic a matter to be dealt with by a single numerical target and is more complicated than a simple pass / fail number. This matter should properly be administered by the Borough Council's Building Control Department taking account of all the relevant factors and technical considerations.	Agreed; consistent with the emerging policy ENV8 of RSS14, it is appropriate to require developments to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction etc, but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards beyond Building Regulations. A standard above Building Regulations requirements could be "traded" for part of the renewable energy requirement through negotiation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5068 5067	Object	The creation of a new town offers the opportunity for more rigorous targets to be used.	NS101 applies the district-wide policies for energy to Northstowe. CS63 - Energy Efficiency requires developments to be energy efficient, reducing the amount of CO2 emitted by a further 10% over and above the Building Regulations, the national minimum standard. In addition, CS62 - Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development requires at least 10% of energy requirements to be provided by renewable sources in developments over 1,000sq m or 50 dwellings (since changed to 10 dwellings). These targets do not preclude the achievement of higher standards. In addition, the inclusion of NS103 Energy Provision: Exemplar Projects will respond to Structure Plan requirements for development that "will be an example of excellence in the creation of a sustainable settlement".	
6238 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Object - see representation regarding energy in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>These are summarised:</p> <p>(Rep 6217) The RPG refers to electricity generation. Our view would be that any policy should refer to project electricity demand or its equivalent rather than energy.</p> <p>(Rep 6229) Electricity generated within a development does potentially need to be available for local sale rather than for sale to the national grid. The reason is that revenues per unit of electricity are very small from the national grid and make local generation unviable.</p>	<p>NS101 applies the district-wide policies for renewable energy, i.e. CS62. PPS22 suggests the inclusion of local policies that require a percentage of energy to be used to come from renewable energy developments. The threshold applied in CS62 takes into consideration the viability issue by only requiring larger developments to contribute to the target.</p> <p>It is proposed that electricity generated should be supplied to the national grid rather than made available for sale locally. This will not impose any maintenance costs on those supplied and enable competition in the market to keep prices reasonable.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1772	Support	No mention is made of using waste from the new town to provide energy; this could well be another way of maximising energy efficiency	South Cambs and Cambridgeshire Horizons are establishing a Sustainable Energy Partnership (SEP) for Northstowe to take responsibility for delivering investment in an integrated sustainable energy system that includes low carbon generation, distribution infrastructure and energy efficiency measures. It is intended to develop a business plan for Northstowe SEP, which will feed into the Area Action Plan, and could potentially cover a range of energy efficiency and generation measures.	
4036 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 18.5 Welcome a "forward-thinking approach", if this means not only meeting minimum targets, but truly maximizing renewable use (see comment at NS100).	Support noted.	
3170	Support	This requirement should be strengthened. Northstowe, as a greenfield site, is well placed to set and achieve higher renewable energy targets via use of available technologies - centred locally.	Support noted. NS101 applies the district-wide policies for energy to Northstowe. CS63 - Energy Efficiency requires developments to be energy efficient, reducing the amount of CO2 emitted by a further 10% over and above the Building Regulations, the national minimum standard. In addition, CS62 - Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development requires at least 10% of energy requirements to be provided by renewable sources in developments over 1,000sq m or 50 dwellings (since changed to 10 dwellings). These targets do not preclude the achievement of higher standards. In addition, the inclusion of NS103 Energy Provision: Exemplar Projects will respond to Structure Plan requirements for development that "will be an example of excellence in the creation of a sustainable settlement".	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4460 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports in principle the preferred approach to energy provision at Northstowe, and welcomes the "forward-thinking approach". However, it is important that the approach is followed through into implementation and that not only minimum targets are met, but that renewable use is truly maximized (see comment at NS100).	Support noted. NS101 applies the district-wide policies for energy to Northstowe. CS63 - Energy Efficiency requires developments to be energy efficient, reducing the amount of CO2 emitted by a further 10% over and above the Building Regulations, the national minimum standard. In addition, CS62 - Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development requires at least 10% of energy requirements to be provided by renewable sources in developments over 1,000sq m or 50 dwellings (since changed to 10 dwellings). These targets do not preclude the achievement of higher standards.	

Decision on NS101 Energy Provision - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS102 Energy Conservation - Preferred Approach</i>				
970	Object	Being unsure what the District Wide approach is, I object because I would like to ensure that the new development is a model in domestic energy efficiency (building materials, etc.), rather than keeping pace with requirements for existing buildings.	The district-wide approach is set out in CS60-CS63. With regards energy efficiency CS63 - Energy Efficiency requires developments to be energy efficient, reducing the amount of CO2 emitted by a further 10% over and above the Building Regulations, the national minimum standard. This target does not preclude the achievement of higher standards. In addition, the inclusion of NS103 Energy Provision: Exemplar Projects will respond to Structure Plan requirements for development that "will be an example of excellence in the creation of a sustainable settlement".	
3698 - House Builders Federation	Object	The achievement of SAP ratings is too simplistic a matter to be dealt with by a single numerical target and is more complicated than a simple pass / fail number. This matter should properly be administered by the Borough Council's Building Control Department taking account of all the relevant factors and technical considerations.	Agreed; consistent with the emerging policy ENV8 of RSS14, it is appropriate to require developments to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction etc, but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards beyond Building Regulations. A standard above Building Regulations requirements could be "traded" for part of the renewable energy requirement through negotiation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5072 5071	Object	The policies on energy provision and conservation do not go far enough towards addressing the problem of global warming. The creation of a new town offers the opportunity for more rigorous targets to be used.	NS101 applies the district-wide policies for energy to Northstowe. CS63 - Energy Efficiency requires developments to be energy efficient, reducing the amount of CO2 emitted by a further 10% over and above the Building Regulations, the national minimum standard. In addition, CS62 - Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development requires at least 10% of energy requirements to be provided by renewable sources in developments over 1,000sq m or 50 dwellings (since changed to 10 dwellings). These targets do not preclude the achievement of higher standards. In addition, the inclusion of NS103 Energy Provision: Exemplar Projects will respond to Structure Plan requirements for development that "will be an example of excellence in the creation of a sustainable settlement".	
6239 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Object - see representation regarding energy in the Core Strategy. This is summarised: (Rep 6218) Energy conservation beyond Building Regulations will be financially burdensome. If Government felt it appropriate and sustainable to require measures well in excess of Building Regulations these would be included within the basic Regulations. It is inappropriate to consider one particular aspect of energy issues in isolation. The specific target in CS63 is therefore inappropriate.	Agree. The approach should be amended to require developers to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction, but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above minimum standards. This is consistent with RSS14.	Amend approach to require developers to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction, but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above minimum standards.
4038 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	No comment option, however: Para 18.7 Welcome this paragraph as long as it means truly maximizing energy conservation.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4040 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	No comment option, however: Minimizing energy use, and producing energy from renewable sources, is central to sustainability in its true sense. Therefore we welcome the inclusion of exemplar projects within the site which can demonstrate close alliance with true sustainability goals (zero carbon emissions, reduced need to travel, etc)	Support noted.	

Decision on NS102 Energy Conservation - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS103 Energy Provision: Exemplar Projects - Preferred Approach</i>				
3699 - House Builders Federation	Object	The achievement of SAP ratings is too simplistic a matter to be dealt with by a single numerical target and is more complicated than a simple pass / fail number. This matter should properly be administered by the Borough Council's Building Control Department taking account of all the relevant factors and technical considerations.	Agreed; consistent with the emerging policy ENV8 of RSS14, it is appropriate to require developments to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction etc, but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards beyond Building Regulations. A standard above Building Regulations requirements could be "traded" for part of the renewable energy requirement through negotiation.	
6240 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Whilst it may be appropriate for Northstowe to include 'exemplar' developments within the development, the means to do this could take many forms and NS103 suggests a targeted approach on a part of the development. Other means to achieve the same aim would be to introduce schemes in relation to SUDs, or ecology or another 'topic' area.</p> <p>To reflect the variety of approaches that might be adopted it is suggested that NS103 should refer simply to the need to give consideration to exemplar schemes. For consistency with the approach set out in NS101 and NS102, care should be taken not to require exemplar projects without consideration as to whether this imposes a reasonable expectation on the development.</p>	Agree that exemplar projects could encompass "topics" other than energy. Therefore, the Exemplar Projects policy should be moved from the Energy Chapter and become a stand alone all-encompassing policy.	Revisit the Exemplar Projects policy to make it all-encompassing and not energy specific.
3982 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature support these preferred approaches as they will reduce the use of fossil fuels and contribute to the sustainable use of natural resources.	Support noted.	
3109 - Rampton Parish Council	Support	Rampton Parish Council supports this option	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3054	Support	Every effort must be made to reduce energy use by the population and the excessive public use of street lighting. Light pollution to the sky MUST be kept as low as it is possible to do so. We have good views of the sky and stars at night. Don't let this development ruin one of the best attractions of this area. The Royal Greenwich the observatories of Cambridge University also should be consulted. Make bylaws that forbid the huge floodlights on peoples houses.	Noted. It is not a remit of the LDF to create bylaws banning the use of floodlights on peoples houses. However, the issue of street lighting should be addressed in the Development Principles Chapter in the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	
4461 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council supports in principle the preferred approach to energy efficiency at Northstowe. This means there should be a commitment from public bodies and the developer to implement real solutions. Moreover, there should be serious investigation of combined heat and power (CHP) or energy from waste as an integral part of the development.	Support noted. South Cambs and Cambridgeshire Horizons are establishing a Sustainable Energy Partnership (SEP) for Northstowe to take responsibility for delivering investment in an integrated sustainable energy system that includes low carbon generation, distribution infrastructure and energy efficiency measures. It is intended to develop a business plan for Northstowe SEP, which will feed into the Area Action Plan, and could potentially cover a range of energy efficiency and generation measures.	

Decision on NS103 Energy Provision: Exemplar Projects - Preferred Approach

Revisit the Exemplar Projects policy to make it all-encompassing and not energy specific.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Chapter 20. Phasing and Implementation				
<i>NS104 Phasing and Implementation Objectives - Preferred Approach</i>				
2640 - East of England Development Agency	Object	EEDA requests that the issue of how the new town is to be delivered is addressed more fully, with particular regard being paid to the nature of any partnership arrangements that will be used, the role of an infrastructure package, and the timing of development.	The Area Action Plan will include greater detail on the delivery arrangements for the new town. In some cases however, negotiations and detailed assessments will still be under way, therefore the Area Action Plan will include criteria based policies to guide development.	
2123 982 1101	Object	A14 improvements must be made before Northstowe begins.	Agree that the upgrade of the A14 is vital for the full development of Northstowe, given the existing traffic conditions along the corridor. The district council will require guarantees that the A14 upgrade will be implemented. The Highways Agency have indicated a start date for the improvement works in 2008 and the district council will seek assurance that the first phase of works will be between Bar Hill and Girton, the most congested stretch. Some development may be able to proceed before the A14 upgrade is completed as it will take more than a year after the development commences before houses will be available for occupation and completion rates will take a year or two to get up to full speed. The Area Action Plan should indicate that any planning application for Northstowe should be able to demonstrate that travel conditions will not significantly worsen the existing conditions, even if this means the developers putting in infrastructure in advance of the Highways Agency. For example, this could be the provision of a parallel distributor road, improvements to junctions and the links to the parallel road.	Seek assurances that the A14 upgrade works will begin to be implemented in 2008 and that the first phase will be the stretch between Bar Hill and Girton.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4731 - Anglia Polytechnic University (Land North of Huntingdon Road, Girton)	Object	The Options Reports for the SCLDF are fundamentally flawed as they fail to demonstrate clearly that the housing requirements as set out in the adopted Cambridgeshire Structure Plan (2003) can be met. The ability of South Cambridgeshire to accommodate new housing, for the edge of Cambridge in particular, is questioned. Our site should be considered for release from the Green Belt.	Preferred approach NS116 would require developers to submit a method statement alongside an outline planning application stating measures they will take to meet the required build rate. This would be improved and enforced by the District Council. The site detailed, in north west Cambridge, will be dealt with through a separate area action plan.	
4789 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	This preferred option needs to highlight the importance of the timely implementation of the agreed flood relief measures for Oakington, especially as there is no way of being certain about the possible additional problems that the construction work will produce. Importantly it is a fact that there are natural springs within the site with a potential for delivering significant quantities of water, given that in living memory they once supplied the drinking water and other needs of Oakington village.	Agree that an appropriate objective can be included for measures relating to flooding, as detailed in early chapters of the Area Action Plan.	Include additional objective: To ensure timely provision of drainage and flood alleviation measures, to ensure Land drainage and Water Conservation objectives are achieved at all stages of the development.
4991	Object	I wish to see an overriding objective which states that none of the infrastructure works impinge on Longstanton or Oakington. The new haul roads must be used for the transport of all equipment and personnel into the site.	This principle is reflected in the first objective, to ensure the impact of the development of Northstowe is kept to a minimum, both in terms of physical impact and duration, and where possible adverse impacts are avoided through the management of the development process.	
6241 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	In bullet point four NS104 sets out a requirement in relation to build rates so as to deliver the Structure Plan requirement of 6,000 dwellings by 2016. To meet this aim Policy NS104 should also commit to a start on site by 2006.	The Council is endeavouring to plan for Northstowe in order to allow for a start on site in 2006. Developers may also contribute to achieving this goal by submitting applications in line with the Area Action Plan. The targets must remain in place in order to reflect requirements of the Structure Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4041 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3110 - Rampton Parish Council 2825 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	Support for the preferred approach.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS104 Phasing and Implementation Objectives - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

Include additional objective: To ensure timely provision of drainage and flood alleviation measures, to ensure Land drainage and Water Conservation objectives are achieved at all stages of the development.

Seek assurances that the A14 upgrade works will begin to be implemented in 2008 and that the first phase will be the stretch between Bar Hill and Girton.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS105 Site Accesses - Preferred Approach</i>				
3684 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 3437	Object	This section has totally ignored the major benefit that would accrue if the railway line was used for import of all major infrastructure and building material transport to site.	The Cambridge-St Ives railway line is to be utilised for a guided bus. Construction traffic generally utilises roads, and use of the railway is not a practical solution.	
4994	Object	The wording should include Longstanton and Oakington, as well as Northstowe. The 2nd bullet in para 20.5 must be rigidly enforced with no noise at the site boundary.	The text refers to existing residents, which by definition will include residents of Longstanton and Oakington.	
4790 - Oakington & Westwick Parish Council	Object	Longstanton Road, Oakington is subject to a Road Traffic Order that prohibits most classes of vehicle from using it, except for access. This means that all classes of vehicle could lawfully use it to gain access to all parts of the site. Illegal use of the road is already a major problem in our village. Urge that the road should be prohibited as a means of access to the site from day one and throughout the construction period and that there should be some form of physical barrier to ensure enforcement.	Planning conditions will be placed on any planning permission, governing the method of access of construction traffic to the site, include which roads can be used, at what times, and which roads must not be used.	
1773	Support	It is vital that local communities are protected as far as possible from the impact of the development; perhaps a local liaison forum might oversee the implementation process.	Support noted. As part of a Considerate Contractors Scheme, developers are required to provide contact telephone numbers in order to receive feedback from the public. A local liaison forum may be another useful method of achieving feedback.	
2663	Support	Note that existing residents includes Rampton Drift as well as Longstanton and Oakington	The term 'existing residents' is sufficiently broad, and will include existing residents of Rampton Drift.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2227 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee	Support	LPPC support NS105. In the Longstanton Parish Plan Survey 2004, residents expressed fears about the nuisance of construction work and construction deliveries, particularly during antisocial hours. SCDC, in tandem with developers, should publicise the mechanisms that ought to be introduced to convey Longstanton's residents complaints, and establish effective feedback procedures so that residents have prompt redress.	Support noted. The option makes clear that the public should have a mechanism to feedback concerns that arise from the development. This is a requirement of Considerate Contractors Schemes.	
3111 - Rampton Parish Council 3042	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
2547 3088 2920 5470	Support	Support, but access must not be from existing roads, including the B1050.	Support noted. It is likely that existing roads, potentially including the B1050, may be used in part, with additional haul roads constructed to access the site directly. Where existing roads are utilised upgrades of those sections will be required to deal with the additional traffic.	
6242 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher support the general approach in relation to haul routes. The extent to which it is possible to avoid all traffic passing through any village, and to avoid any adverse impacts is unclear. Whilst Gallagher believes that at Northstowe it is possible to achieve low levels of impact, it would be prudent for policy references to refer to the need to minimise such impacts to acceptable levels.	Support noted. Planning conditions will be placed on any planning permission, governing the method of access of construction traffic to the site, include which roads can be used, at what times, and which roads must not be used.	

Decision on NS105 Site Accesses - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS106 Storage Compounds, Plant and Machinery - Preferred Approach</i>				
4995	Object	The wording should include Longstanton and Oakington, as well as Northstowe. The 2nd bullet in para 20.5 must be rigidly enforced with no noise at the site boundary.	The term 'existing residents' is sufficiently broad to include residents of Longstanton and Oakington.	
2549 2664	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
5476	Support	Imperative that storage, accommodation, offices, plant yards etc. that will be set up to service the site for the next 20 years are not set up west of B1050. Dry Drayton junction with A14 is far less busy than Bar Hill junction. Access road from Dry Drayton junction should be built first, with contractors compounds near new access road.	Support noted. It is likely that existing roads, potentially including the B1050, may be used in part, with additional haul roads constructed to access the site directly. Where existing roads are utilised upgrades of those sections will be required to deal with the additional traffic.	
6243 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher support the general approach in relation to storage compounds etc. The extent to which it is possible to avoid any adverse impacts is unclear. Whilst Gallagher believes that at Northstowe it is possible to achieve low levels of impact, it would be prudent for policy references to refer to the need to minimise such impacts to acceptable levels.	Support noted. It is important to plan from the outset for no adverse impact of storage, plant and machinery on residents.	

Decision on NS106 Storage Compounds, Plant and Machinery - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS107 Construction Activities - Preferred Approach</i>				
6244 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher support the general approach in relation to minimising the impact of construction. Gallagher believes that at Northstowe it is possible to achieve low levels of impact, although it would be prudent for policy references to refer to the Considerate Contractors Scheme or any appropriate equivalent.	Noted.	
2551 1774	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
2228 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 5479	Support	Support, but the scheme must be monitored, and effective feedback procedures established.	Support noted. When the Considerate Contractors Scheme is established, developers are required to provide contact numbers in order to receive feedback from the public. They are also audited to ensure they are meeting requirements of the scheme. This audit reports can be made available to the Local Authority.	

Decision on NS107 Construction Activities - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS108 Strategic Landscaping - Preferred Approach</i>				
4309	Object	An objection must be sustained to the overall approach of strategic landscaping until the developers and district council can explain in coherent manner the plans for ownership, use and maintenance of all of these parcels of land to ensure deliverability of the objectives.	The strategic landscaping should be designed to address the wider landscape needs and not initially conform to land ownership restrictions. This issue is dealt with under option NS80, which seeks to require a management plan, and a mechanism for future maintenance, before construction work commences.	
6245 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher supports the need for an agreed landscape strategy that sets out the phasing and timing of planting. The early establishment of planting should be addressed as part of that strategy although this must be appropriate to the phasing of the development overall. It will not be possible to undertake all planting in the first phases of development. The provisions regarding landscape maintenance are too detailed at this stage for inclusion in the AAP policy.	In order to deliver the landscape strategy, early planting is required in order that it can become quickly established as the development takes place. The landscape strategy will include the early planting of key areas to establish both screening and major character areas. this may not always relate directly to a phase of development. Landscape maintenance is dealt with under option NS80 of the preferred option report. The requirement to maintain landscaping and replace dead dying and diseased stock for 10 years is essential in order to effectively deliver the landscape strategy.	
4042 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6414 - The Countryside Agency 2826 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 2552 3043 1139 2668 5481	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on NS108 Strategic Landscaping - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS109 Green Separation - Preferred Option</i>				
2226 - Longstanton Parish Plan Committee 4291	Object	Option fails to require that maintenance policy and funding also need to be set up from the outset.	This issue is dealt with under option NS80, which seeks to require a management plan, and a mechanism for future maintenance, before construction work commences.	
4043 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6246 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	May not be practical, and could result in delays to the development. It will create an extra burden on early phases of development. A phased programme of landscaping should be pursued.	The Structure plan requires green separation to maintain village character. If this is to be achieved while the development is taking place, it will need to be established prior to development commencing. Much of the landscaping of green separation will mean working with the existing landscape, and therefore be easier than starting from scratch.	
2220 - Longstanton Parish Council 1328 969 7300 1489 1222	Object	Object, as option should have included landscaping of a new golf course.	A new golf course would not be required before development commences. If established it is likely the need for a replacement course will be based on the needs created by the new town, implying that phasing would require it after a certain number of dwellings are completed. In the shorter term it is likely that existing need can be met by surrounding areas, including a new course that is under development at Milton.	
1564 1655 1476 2000 1999 2484	Support	Support, but should include landscaping of a replacement golf course.	Support noted. A new golf course would not be required before development commences. If established it is likely the need for a replacement course will be based on the needs created by the new town, implying that phasing would require it after a certain number of dwellings are completed. In the shorter term it is likely that existing need can be met by surrounding areas, including a new course that is under development at Milton.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3455 - English Partnerships 2827 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 2554 3045 3069 2124 1263 4997 1182 1141 2673 5482 1011	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS109 Green Separation - Preferred Option

Develop the preferred option into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS110 Green Separation - Rejected Option</i>				
4044 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6248 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 3456 - English Partnerships	Object	Object to rejection of this option. A phased approach to landscaping green separation should be adopted.	The Structure plan requires green separation to maintain village character. If this is to be achieved while the development is taking place, it will need to be established prior to development commencing. Much of the landscaping of green separation will mean working with the existing landscape, and therefore be easier than starting from scratch.	
3046 1478 2675 5483	Support	Support for rejection of this option.	Support for the rejection noted.	

Decision on NS110 Green Separation - Rejected Option

This option remains rejected.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS111 Construction Spoil - Preferred Option</i>				
4961	Object	Para 12.29 There will no doubt be opportunities to spread the construction spoil about the site, but what depth of fill is going to be generated? How will ground water levels be affected? How is the flood risk to be mitigated? This is a very important subject and I object to the imprecise way it appears to be approached.	The preferred options stage is used to generate general principles. Many of these issues will need to be addressed at the detailed design stage.	
5696 - Sport England	Object	With reference to paragraph 20.10: Sport England supports the proposals to utilise construction spoil on site. However, objection is made to the lack of reference to how the spoil can be used for helping to construct sport and recreation facilities. For example, earth mounds can be used for creating athletics training areas and BMX cycle tracks. To address this objection, it is requested that reference be made in the paragraph to the potential for using construction spoil to assist in providing sport and recreation facilities.	Whilst the intention to utilise construction waste to build recreation facilities is an appropriate aim, the actual proportion of waste that could be used in this way is minimal. Such issues can be addressed at the detailed design stage.	
2556 1775	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
6249 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 6507 - English Partnerships	Support	Support this approach, however it is inevitable that some types of spoil will need to be removed from the site.	Agree.	Refer to 'all SUITABLE construction spoil...'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4045 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Construction waste should be included in the Core Strategy. We would agree that any inclusion of construction waste at Northstowe must be sympathetic to the landscape.</p> <p>Para 20.9</p> <p>NS111, NS112 and NS113 are options and approaches to managing construction waste and recycling of building materials. It is the County Council's recommendation that the Core Strategy includes policies on those areas, applicable to development across the District and that the AAPs contain policies specific to each individual area covered in the AAP.</p>	Support noted. These issues are to be addressed in the Development Principles chapter of the Core Strategy.	
5485	Support	<p>But your absolute rejection of NS112 could be diluted, allowing proposals to make some of the views from the B1050 less flat.</p>	Support noted, however, constructing hills for the sake of landscaping around the B1050 would create features alien to the local landscape.	

Decision on NS111 Construction Spoil - Preferred Option

Develop the preferred option into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified.

Refer to 'all SUITABLE construction spoil...'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS112 Construction Spoil - Rejected Option</i>				
4046 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Construction waste to be included in Core Strategy. Para 20.9 NS111,NS112 and NS113 are options and approaches to managing construction waste and recycling of building materials. It is the County Council's recommendation that the Core Strategy includes policies on those areas, applicable to development across the District and that the AAPs contain policies specific to each individual area covered in the AAP.	Construction waste will be addressed in the Development Principles chapter of the Core Strategy.	
6508 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships supports the re-use of construction spoil in the construction process. However inevitably some spoil will need to be taken off site. Therefore we request that whilst the Local Authority maintains a presumption against the transportation of spoil off site, a limited flexible response is recognised as an inevitable part of the construction process.	This issue is addressed in the response to a similar representation on preferred option NS111.	

Decision on NS112 Construction Spoil - Rejected Option

This option continues to be rejected.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS113 Recycling of Building Materials - Preferred Approach</i>				
1436	Object	Ns113 The crusher should be at least 800m from houses.	The crusher needs to be located on site in order to remove the need to transport the materials, which would be unsustainable. NS113 seeks to address the potential impact of a crusher on existing residents. Given the location of the materials to be recycled; the runway, perimeter road, and any remaining hard standing areas, it will be necessary for the crusher to be located on the Barracks, situated towards the outer edge. In addition, through granting planning permission, the Council can require additional noise attenuation measures and screening, and will limit the operating hours.	Delete references to a minimum distance of 200m and replace with the following text: "...which would be located towards the outer edge of the Oakington Barracks."
1243 1737 1350 2925 1183	Object	The use of a hard core crusher or similar machinery should be at least 500 metres from any existing properties.	The crusher needs to be located on site in order to remove the need to transport the materials, which would be unsustainable. NS113 seeks to address the potential impact of a crusher on existing residents. Given the location of the materials to be recycled; the runway, perimeter road, and any remaining hard standing areas, it will be necessary for the crusher to be located on the Barracks, situated towards the outer edge. In addition, through granting planning permission, the Council can require additional noise attenuation measures and screening, and will limit the operating hours.	Delete references to a minimum distance of 200m and replace with the following text: "...which would be located towards the outer edge of the Oakington Barracks."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2166	Object	A rock crushing plant is not only extremely noisy, it also causes a large downwind dust pollution hazard. Such a plant should be located as far as possible - preferably 1,000 metres from any built up area.	The crusher needs to be located on site in order to remove the need to transport the materials, which would be unsustainable. NS113 seeks to address the potential impact of a crusher on existing residents. Given the location of the materials to be recycled; the runway, perimeter road, and any remaining hard standing areas, it will be necessary for the crusher to be located on the Barracks, situated towards the outer edge. In addition, through granting planning permission, the Council can require additional noise attenuation measures and screening, and will limit the operating hours.	Delete references to a minimum distance of 200m and replace with the following text: "...which would be located towards the outer edge of the Oakington Barracks."
2174	Object	Hardcore crushers should be located as far as possible from Longstanton homes as they are very noisy. 800-1000 meters would not be too far. It makes no sense to locate them as close as 200 meters at any time during construction	The crusher needs to be located on site in order to remove the need to transport the materials, which would be unsustainable. NS113 seeks to address the potential impact of a crusher on existing residents. Given the location of the materials to be recycled; the runway, perimeter road, and any remaining hard standing areas, it will be necessary for the crusher to be located on the Barracks, situated towards the outer edge. In addition, through granting planning permission, the Council can require additional noise attenuation measures and screening, and will limit the operating hours.	Delete references to a minimum distance of 200m and replace with the following text: "...which would be located towards the outer edge of the Oakington Barracks."
2360	Object	While heartily supporting the re-cycling ethic I would think it impossible to site such a noisy and dirty operation ANY WHERE on the Northstowe area and remain within environmental law. Before reaching a decision I suggest that the relevant planners witness one of these monsters in action. Perhaps the beast could be operated in one of the redundant hangers?	The crusher needs to be located on site in order to remove the need to transport the materials, which would be unsustainable. NS113 seeks to address the potential impact of a crusher on existing residents. Given the location of the materials to be recycled; the runway, perimeter road, and any remaining hard standing areas, it will be necessary for the crusher to be located on the Barracks, situated towards the outer edge. In addition, through granting planning permission, the Council can require additional noise attenuation measures and screening, and will limit the operating hours.	Delete references to a minimum distance of 200m and replace with the following text: "...which would be located towards the outer edge of the Oakington Barracks."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3112 - Rampton Parish Council 3074 1052	Object	Distance needs to be greater and there should be control of the hours of operation.	The crusher needs to be located on site in order to remove the need to transport the materials, which would be unsustainable. NS113 seeks to address the potential impact of a crusher on existing residents. Given the location of the materials to be recycled; the runway, perimeter road, and any remaining hard standing areas, it will be necessary for the crusher to be located on the Barracks, situated towards the outer edge. In addition, through granting planning permission, the Council can require additional noise attenuation measures and screening, and will limit the operating hours.	Delete references to a minimum distance of 200m and replace with the following text: "...which would be located towards the outer edge of the Oakington Barracks."
5112 - Toad Acres Park Home Residents Association 5000 1389 1633	Object	A noisy machine to crush hardcore should be as far away from any housing as possible, so as to produce no local impact.	The crusher needs to be located on site in order to remove the need to transport the materials, which would be unsustainable. NS113 seeks to address the potential impact of a crusher on existing residents. Given the location of the materials to be recycled; the runway, perimeter road, and any remaining hard standing areas, it will be necessary for the crusher to be located on the Barracks, situated towards the outer edge. In addition, through granting planning permission, the Council can require additional noise attenuation measures and screening, and will limit the operating hours.	Delete references to a minimum distance of 200m and replace with the following text: "...which would be located towards the outer edge of the Oakington Barracks."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3176 - Longstanton Action Group 2221 - Longstanton Parish Council 5116 - Toad Acres Residents Association 3371 4287 2983 2463 2179 1565 1330 1656 1769 2025 1050 1455 1142 2685 1223 5004 5006 1606	Object	200m is far too close to domestic properties for locating a building materials recycling plant.	The crusher needs to be located on site in order to remove the need to transport the materials, which would be unsustainable. NS113 seeks to address the potential impact of a crusher on existing residents. Given the location of the materials to be recycled; the runway, perimeter road, and any remaining hard standing areas, it will be necessary for the crusher to be located on the Barracks, situated towards the outer edge. In addition, through granting planning permission, the Council can require additional noise attenuation measures and screening, and will limit the operating hours.	Delete references to a minimum distance of 200m and replace with the following text: "...which would be located towards the outer edge of the Oakington Barracks."
5107	Object	Object to a stone crusher being used on site unless more than 400m from my property.	The crusher needs to be located on site in order to remove the need to transport the materials, which would be unsustainable. NS113 seeks to address the potential impact of a crusher on existing residents. Given the location of the materials to be recycled; the runway, perimeter road, and any remaining hard standing areas, it will be necessary for the crusher to be located on the Barracks, situated towards the outer edge. In addition, through granting planning permission, the Council can require additional noise attenuation measures and screening, and will limit the operating hours.	Delete references to a minimum distance of 200m and replace with the following text: "...which would be located towards the outer edge of the Oakington Barracks."
1479	Support	I strongly support the retention of as many of the existing trees as possible. There are very few north of Cambridge.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1776	Support	This is the most sustainable option.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS113 Recycling of Building Materials - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan, as modified:

Delete references to a minimum distance of 200m and replace with the following text:
 "...which would be located towards the outer edge of the Oakington Barracks."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS114 Use of Raw Materials - Preferred Approach</i>				
2923	Object	I object to the statement that a 'significant amount of woodland' from the MOD parkland will be chopped down and recycled for building work: why deciding in advance that woodland must go? Who says and why? Good town planning all over the world incorporates mature trees in new settlements, why not at Northstowe? Beside it is perverse casuistry to call this woodland redundant because it was originally landscape for military training?	NS114 did not propose that a "significant amount of woodland" would be chopped down. Para 20.14 recognises that the MOD had undertaken "significant amounts of woodland planting" and that it will not all be retained. However, it will be a matter for consideration in the detailed design of Northstowe, to establish what is appropriate for retention and the extent and type of new planting should be incorporated within the town. The existing woodland is not of native species and there is scope to introduce native species, which will in term help to integrate the new development into its surroundings.	
5001 5003	Object	The existing belt of trees on the old airfield near the northern edge of Oakington has taken nearly 20 years to reach its present condition. This should be kept in mind before any decision to cut down existing trees. Note that they do at present provide us with a degree of screening from activities on the airfield.	Noted. It will be a matter for consideration in the detailed design of Northstowe, to establish what is appropriate for retention and the extent and type of new planting should be incorporated within the town. The existing woodland is not of native species and there is scope to introduce native species, which will in term help to integrate the new development into its surroundings.	
4048 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	We would support use of untreated wood available on-site for use in construction of Northstowe, subject to prior determination of available stock for use in construction under the landscape strategy (Referenced in 20.7) and not withstanding our comments on NS39 which seeks compensation for removal of trees.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS114 Use of Raw Materials - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS115 Accommodation for Construction Workers - Preferred Approach</i>				
2222 - Longstanton Parish Council 3113 - Rampton Parish Council 2171 1331 3202 5002 3223 5108 3977	Object	Detrimental impact on local villages through overloading resources, social disturbance, and there would be a need for policing, and access should not be through villages.	Recognise the potential problems and implications for continuing with this approach, most of which would be beyond the remit of the Area Action Plan or control of the local planning authority. It is proposed to discontinue this approach and it will be a matter for the construction industry to sort out.	Discontinue this approach.

Decision on NS115 Accommodation for Construction Workers - Preferred Approach

Discontinue this approach.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NS116 Achieving the Build Rate - Preferred Approach</i>				
3701 - House Builders Federation 4666 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc 5355 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	It is beyond the control of developers to set a build rate below which they are unable to drop in the event that the housing market is unable to sustain the build rate of 650 dwellings per year. PPS12 requires plans to be reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances.	The Structure Plan targets would have taken account of variations in market demand when developing the housing numbers requirement. Achieving the required building rate is a material planning consideration, therefore it is correct that the Council requires information on how it will be met at the planning application stage. The method statement will require monitoring. Where development falls short of the target, developers will be required to demonstrate why they cannot meet the target, and how the shortfall will be made up in later years.	
6250 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher is committed to bringing forward the development of Northstowe quickly and has a commercial interest in doing so. The implementation programme will be influenced by factors outside the control of the promoters of Northstowe. In the absence of a better understanding of the scope of the proposed method statement, Gallagher is concerned that such a statement will already be covered in appropriate legal agreements. The suggested provision for a method statement is unnecessary.	Achieving the required building rate is a material planning consideration, therefore it is correct that the Council requires information on how it will be met at the planning application stage.	
4466 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6509 - English Partnerships 5488	Support	General support for this approach.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
Decision on NS116 Achieving the Build Rate - Preferred Approach				
Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.				
<i>NS117 Timing / Order of Service Provision - Preferred Approach</i>				
1974 - Cottenham Parish Council	Object	Oppose, not because it is wrong in principle, but because the approach has failed elsewhere when so called 'trigger points' have been reached without action on the part of the developers or the Planning Authority. The Local Parish Councils need to be supported in the agreeing of s106 Agreements and told they need independent legal advice.	The Local Authority has learnt many lessons from Cambourne with regard to phasing. This includes operating start trigger points as well as finish trigger points, and mechanisms to deal with non completion of requirements. These lessons will be put to good use when planning Northstowe.	
3424	Object	This statement needs to be revised to link provision of programmed infrastructure to build rates and completions. These would need to carefully defined by section 46 agreement. The completion of A14 improvement and operation of other transport systems will be key to this policy	The preferred approach reflects the need to provide infrastructure in phases when the need arises. The importance of transport to this process is acknowledged, and will be included in this process.	
5340	Object	Facilities (schools, doctors surgery etc.) need to be built at the start of the development.	The need for early delivery of key services and facilities is acknowledged in other options in the preferred options report, including NS26 and NS27	
5492	Support	For those of us who access Bar Hill, Cambridge and the south by car, your conditions should include that all bypass work, upgrading of the B1050, be done at the very beginning of the programme.	As detailed in the option, infrastructure will be phased according to when the need arises for it from the development. This will include new or upgraded roads.	
4468 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6251 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

Decision on NS117 Timing / Order of Service Provision - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.