

Appendix 1

Summary of Bourn Airfield New Village SPD representations

During the consultation, 312 representations were received, made by 71 respondents. Of the representations 36% were objections, 56% were comments and 8% were supports.

8 comments were also received to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Documents and the Equalities Impact Assessment (EQIA).

All of the SPD representations are available to be read in full on our online consultation system at <https://scambs.jdi-consult.net/localplan/>.

The table summarises representations received in the order of SPD. It includes relevant representation numbers in the first column. A summary of the nature of representation is included across the top of each part of the plan as support, object or comment and the total number of representations. The summary of issues raised is ordered by support, object and comment. Where a representation has been made by an organisation this is included in the summary in bold. Representations made by individuals are summarised without names.

1. Introduction				
Representations Received	Support: 1	Object: 3	Comment: 13	Total: 17
Main Issues in reps	Support			
67980	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DB Group (Holdings) Ltd essential the proposed new village takes full account of DB Group's existing operations and will not hamper future expansion plans. 			
68016	Requires particular consideration to adequate separation from noise sources, site and building layout / orientation,			
68041	provision of acoustic barriers as a result of detailed assessments (to be provided at developer's expense), particularly with regard to noise and air quality.			
68042	Object			
68105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key Issue 4 – traffic management solutions must be considered from the outset to prevent rat run. Traffic numbers should be published. 			
68134	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development must have direct access to the A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents. 			
68156	Comment			
68164	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aitchison Developments Ltd relationship with existing employment site is recognised as a key issue and requires new village to ensure the employment site is integrated, including any redevelopment. This is supported. Redevelopment provides opportunities to meet the needs of new village, district's requirement and local economy. Vitally important site can be developed independently. Appreciate need SPD to guide future development of new village but it should not impede existing employment site. 			
68231				
68236				
68240				
68258				
68261				
68313				
68314				
68315				
68353				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council SPD raises many key issues that they say need to be addressed but they are glossed over or ignored. Aspirational platitudes. Failure to analyse sufficiently problem with traffic generation. • Cambourne Town Council Key Issues refers to Cambourne as a village – should be as a town. • Cambridgeshire County Council Iron Age and Roman archaeological finds in the area. 20th C military aviation heritage. Suggest the historic environment could contribute to Key Issues 1, 3 and 4. E.g. open space and recreation could support heritage trails and interpretation for archaeological and military heritage. • Cambridgeshire County Council Reference to GCP Cambourne to Cambridge route is welcomed but at this stage needs to show commitment to a solution. • Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Section 1.3 (2) - agree with six stated key issues. Concern with how wording under (2) could be interpreted at determination of planning applications. Whilst SCDC aspires to create a cleaner, greener and zero carbon future for all its communities, the latter term should not be regarded as a mandatory requirement. SPD should be consistent with Local Plan Policy SS/7 (10) and not require even higher standards. Outline planning application contains package of measures to satisfy this policy which have been discussed and agreed in principle with officers. • Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Section 1.3 (5) - subtitle should be amended to 'Relationship with existing employment site'. Language should be softened to encourage engagement and collaboration between the developer and existing employers on site but not make this a requirement of successful delivery of the wider Bourn Airfield site. • Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Section 1.5 - CP acknowledge SCDC will not determine outline planning application until SPD adopted. Worked collaboratively during Local Plan process, outline planning application process, and in preparation of draft SPD. CP's extensive evidence base updated and shared with SCDC. Agree in principle on most matters. Comments where differences of approach or views, and wherever possible CP proposes to revise its plans where considered justified. Some areas CP consider their proposals have greater overall merit in design terms. Identified in document appended. SPD should provide flexibility to allow a range of design options to be explored, considered and determined through planning application process. Sought to demonstrate comprehensive approach – control 93% of site and liaised with Council, landowners / promoters of employment sites, owners of land to south, to demonstrate overall allocation and policy objectives, as well as third party interests will not be prejudiced by proposals. Delete the sentence: "Applications that fail to demonstrate a comprehensive approach to development,
--	---

	<p>as set out in this document, will be refused planning permission". SPDs are material considerations and cannot set planning policy in this way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency have no specific comment to make on the document. • Fenland District Council does not have any comments. • National Grid have no comment • National Trust Key issue 2 – no objection to proposed development but concerned about shortfall in existing open space within easy access of development locations west of Cambridge. • National Trust Key issue 4 - concern for proposed segregated bus link, part of measures to address congestion along A428/A1303 corridor. Part of proposed busway route crosses Green Belt land to north of Coton over which The National Trust holds restrictive covenants. Objected on grounds of landscape and visual impact.
--	---

2. Site Context				
Representations Received	Support: 3	Object: 32	Comment: 36	Total: 71
<p>Main Issues in reps</p> <p>67744 67930 67979 67981 67983 67988 67989 67949 68005 68011 68017 68029 68030 68031 68039 68040 68044 68052 68058 68059 68067 68069 68070 68072 68074 68075 68077 68078 68082</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Town Council strong support for statement "the new settlement should provide complementary facilities to serve its residents rather than competing and should help to support the wider existing offer". • DB Group (Holdings) LTD Essential New Village takes full account of DB Group's existing operations and will not hamper future expansion plans. Require particular consideration being given to adequate distance separation from noise sources, site and building layout / orientation, provision of acoustic barriers as deemed necessary (to be provided at the developer's expense) as a result of detailed assessments in accordance with PPG. • Natural England Section 2.5 welcome amendments to address previous advice, including acknowledgement of presence of a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) within 5 km of site boundary and requirement to consider impacts to designated sites beyond the site boundary. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hardwick Parish Council Lack of medical centre and possible reliance on Cambourne to provide facilities; would mean car owners would have to drive, and residents without transport would have to walk to north side of site to get public transport to Cambourne. Idea to get people out of cars, but this would just increase traffic movements throughout day. Some residents objected to traffic calming because of possible queues, more pollution, and difficulty getting in and out of drives and onto junctions. Part of developers plan to mitigate problems if they arise. This particularly concerns rat runs through surrounding villages. Will be monitored and traffic 			

<p>68084 68085 68107 68109 68110 68123 68132 68135 68136 68317 68138 68139 68140 68141 68142 68157 68158 68166 68191 68216 68218 68222 68224 68229 68243 68248 68249 68250 68254 68262 68263 68275 68278 68279 68280 68287 68290 68293 68294 68297 68345 68346</p>	<p>calming considered. If no junction onto A428, there should be traffic management / restriction on A1303 from Bourn Broadway to Madingley Mulch roundabout. Developers need to make sure traffic is monitored, and a base line established before development so comparisons can be accurately made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knapwell Parish Meeting Section 2 – Why is equivalence (with Bourn for Knapwell) not being drawn with regard to being 'responsive to local context'. Knapwell village centre similar distance to Western Bourn Airfield entrance as Bourn village. Knapwell has Conservation Area, High Street displays many similar characteristics. Despite chicanes, frequent accidents and near misses, result of dangerous and inconsiderate driving. Serious accident in May 2019, High Street likely KSI blackspot. On primary north/south route between A14/Boxworth Services and A428/Bourn Airfield Western exit. Gross oversight and inaccuracy that no maps show dangerous staggered junction at Bourn Broadway/St Neots Road/Knapwell High Street. Site of regular accidents; suggests negative externalities have not been appropriately considered. Accidents are routine at Elsworth Road/Boxworth Road/ Connington Road junctions. Reference in SPD special S106 requirements in same vein as Bourn. <p>2.4 Access, Movement & Connectivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caxton Parish Council should be direct access onto A428, and, given that it is not clear from their consultation document how much industrial use is proposed, it should be sufficient to provide employment for the proposed housing. • Knapwell Parish Meeting would like to see mandated direct access onto A428. Safety concerns are unfounded based on equivalent examples already in region. Current modal and traffic models grossly underestimate likely reality, in context of only alternative being a bus to Grange Road. Many commuters not travelling into Cambridge, which presents a strategic necessity for a more drastic infrastructure solution. Direct A428 access remains a viable option, most practical and sustainable solution to mitigate dangers and externalities of 3500 households, and their travel, on local village communities. • Waresley-cum-Tetworth Parish Council Untenable to allow development without a fast and reliable public transport system between Cambourne and Cambridge - development will be opposed until such a transport system is in place. Residents travel in opposite direction to get to London via St Neots train station, leading to rush hour queues in the westerly direction of A428. Development should not be permitted until completion of A428 upgrade. Development of Bourn Airfield will result in a ribbon of development on A428. • Scale of proposed development will result in rat-run traffic
--	---

	<p>blighting nearby villages. Knapwell already suffers more traffic at peak times than it can cope with, and there have been several serious recent accidents. Obvious solution is its own access directly to A428.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to have egress and exit to A428 will force commuters to use local B roads increasing congestion, pollution, noise to surrounding villages and negatively impacting on health and quality of life of residents. Planners aware of this increase in traffic locally as planning for future road calming measures. Do proper planning of future congestion problems, now, by building connections to A428. Comments from Highways regarding proximity of egress and exits to Cambourne and Hardwick is not a consideration in other developments, e.g. on A14 Dry Drayton / Bar Hill / Lolworth, A1 Buckden / Stirtloe. • A428 is main route into Cambridge. Need independent access onto A428 to alleviate excessive traffic along St Neots Road and through neighbouring villages. New connection for A428 to M11 at Girton essential, feeding traffic both South and North to main places of employment. Only one third of traffic heading east on Madingley Road travels into Cambridge for work. Has a traffic count been carried out at junction 13 (M11). Residents will use cars to shop, transport families, elderly and disabled - very low anticipated traffic movements are wrong. Expect excessive traffic movements on St Neots Road, Hardwick meaning more noise and increased carbon emissions. Contradictory statement on page 37 (no Access onto A428) and page 15 (maybe access available), which needs clarification. More traffic will be generated by new P&R, environmental issues noise, 24hrs illumination, light pollution, removal of belt of trees next to A428 to provide new busway. SPD stipulates busway should have a 50M-100M barrier to reduce noise and improve air quality. Hardwick is village with 2400 residents, St Neots Road is village road not a motorway. • Settlement needs direct access to A428 and should not have direct access to the Broadway. • Does not explore direct grade access to A428 from new village as no strategic case for this requirement has been made. Is this an invitation that such a case should be made? Direct connection to A428 is essential. Rural minor roads providing access to east and west are not built to take traffic from development of 3500 dwellings. Comparisons can be drawn with Cambourne, an identical development; could not function without direct connection to A428 and has escape route to south and A1198. No southern access from Bourn Airfield - all traffic onto St Neots Road. SPD states "marginal room" to do so. Countryside have stated they would pay if Highways England dropped their principles. Multiple locations where Highways England principle not been applied including J13 and J14 of M11. Expected to see statement in SPD
--	---

that ensures realistic traffic calculations with evidence put forward and risks examined. This should be embedded in Transport Statements and Travel Plans. Countryside calculations expect only 14 vehicles from development to St Neots Road, Hardwick, which we currently measure 3500 to 4000 vehicles a day. Alternative is implication that traffic estimates might be stated to "reverse into" decision to avoid direct connection to A428 which must be dismissed with evidence of course.

- SPD states A428 has direct connection to M11. It doesn't. Disappointing error. SPD states "A428 is connected to the M11 via the A1307". Error - A1303. Drivers working days and mental health is seriously affected by commute time delays of this road. Highways England should reconsider their stance on direct connection between A428 west and M11. Cambridge will be at the cross-roads of a major north south motorway and a major trunk road to west collective spend on upgrades over £3bn with only village connections between them.
- As resident of Hardwick village I feel let down by planning process as regards impact on our village. Roads into Hardwick will be hugely busy as a result of this development and allowance has not been made for this. Link road to A428 needs to be included to combat traffic increase. Noise pollution, air pollution, destruction of existing hedgerows that combat these things are planned. Whilst want to welcome newcomers to area result will be resentment due to huge change in our daily commute.
- Developers have not got a realistic estimate of vehicles leaving site. Of the thousand vehicles expected at BP roundabout and first Hardwick roundabout only an estimated 7 extra vehicles would be using St Neots Road. Ludicrous under estimate and far more vehicles will use this route into Cambridge causing considerable congestion on St Neots Road and all local roads. Essential for development to have access onto A428.
- Objects to cars being sent onto Broadway rather than dual carriageway given the environmental cost of slow moving traffic on minor roads is worse than that of a fast moving carriageway. Concerned about backlogs at junctions out of new towns and onto St Neots Road. Question how drivers can be prevented from turning right into new town? Need to be a roundabout.
- Concerned about noise and congestion caused by roundabout and suggest implementation of a noise barrier and/or a new route away from Caldecote homes. A bus service is desperately needed in Caldecote.
- Will be around 8,000 dwellings in area with no easily accessible Park and Ride. Scotland Farm 2 miles away. Site offered next to Camborne roundabout. SCDC's committee raised concerns re accesses but a general response was provided. Needs a site specific response to address very real issue / problem. Lack of detail for access design. Access onto A428 - cost shouldn't be an

issue when danger to life with proposed accesses; plenty of room on site frontage for east facing junction (west can use Cambourne), three Local Plan inspectors have said no traffic should use the Broadway.

- Inadequate access, direct A428 access needed.
- Traffic along St Neots Road where I live will be drastically increased. If the busway also goes ahead the line of mature trees will be removed. These trees are at least 60 years old. This is environmental vandalism, and will destroy our environment here. Trees absorb noise and pollution. Any replanting will have little or no effect for decades. Do not destroy our trees. A direct link from A428 - M11 is an obvious necessity as part of this scheme.
- Reference to HQPT 'route potentially passing through northern part of site' misleading. This is core to development. Infrastructure Delivery Plan states it must be completed prior to Occupation. SPD needs to be clear which it is, as fundamental element to connectivity. Costs of Busway and risk that traffic figures are not reduced are so fundamental to this development that when SPD is redrafted, it needs to include a statement that planning authority must verify the data on which this busway need is predicated. Transport/Travel Plan must state realistic Trip Rates and traffic numbers must be used and any variations evidenced. Countryside Travel Plan and associated predictions on TRICS and model shift from cars to buses, TRICS rates are far below current rates approved by SCDC and provide no evidence they can be met.
- **Knapwell Parish Meeting** Section 2.5 Nature Reserve, Wildlife Trust managed Overhall Grove is a designated SSSI, and recognised Ancient Woodland. Conservation Area. Village contains the RSPB's own national farm. Protected verges due to a range of extremely rare flora, including Sulphur Clover. These are not referenced in Sustainability and Habitats Appraisal, which requires further investigation. Request explicit reference in SPD to correct this oversight, with recognition that as such, specific measures are put in place to actively manage traffic volume in this sensitive Parish ecosystem.

2.8 Community Facilities and Services - Healthcare

- What provision for health services? Does not appear to be anything about this in the leaflet. When Bourn Airfield was proposed a GP surgery and provision for elderly were highlighted. GP surgery essential given pressure on current provision, already struggling, in the area.
- Context section is only place where provision of medical facilities is mentioned. Implication is that existing facilities in surrounding villages, with some upgrading of Monkfield practice, will suffice. Growing shortage of medical staff to supply existing practices in coming years, ongoing

financial problems with Addenbrookes, slow responses of ambulance services it seems naive to think that a new community of proposed size could be adequately served by tweaks to local practices. Needs its own Practice.

- Development should have its own medical centre. One short paragraph stating that Monkfield Medical Practice in Cambourne would need to be expanded. For 9,000 new patients!!! Children and young parents need medical attention as well as older residents and proper provision must be provided for them on new site. Cannot provide thousands of new houses around Cambridgeshire without providing proper infrastructure and medical provision is absolutely essential.
- Healthcare - dedicated centre for development is needed as facilities in Cambourne will be at full capacity with proposed increase of the number of dwellings at the West of Cambourne. New school is very close to A428. Would this not be a potential problem with particulate pollution from dual carriageway (Oxford to Cambridge highway).
- Development must have direct access to A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

Comment

- **Aitchison Developments Ltd** Whilst existing employment site is identified within overall site context, SPD is silent on fact the site benefits from an extant permission (S/1020/13/FL), for demolition and replacement buildings to provide B1, B2 and B8 uses. Granted 17,723 sqm (190,768sqft) floorspace, comprising 16,850 sqm of B2 general industrial floorspace and 873sqm of ancillary B1 Offices. Should be acknowledged within the Site Context section.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Section 2.1 - Cambourne is not a settlement, it is a town, and is first Town in South Cambridgeshire.
- **DB Group (Holdings) LTD** Section 2.2 - DB Group confirms their intention to continue operating from their existing site. Proposed development of New Village must therefore ensure full account is taken of existing operations and future development will not hamper their expansion plans.
- **Greater Cambridge Partnership** Section 2.2 - in liaison with Highways England to acquire land parcels at both east and west accesses to enable provision of improved junctions to address expected traffic flows.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Section 2.3 - Figure 7 - Number 3 should be Cambourne Town Village Centre and Supermarket.
- **DB Group (Holdings) LTD** Section 2.3 - description of established employment area should be expanded upon to include a full description of DB Group's operations. Given their industrial nature, essential to ensure future

development that comes forward surrounding the site is appropriate.

- **Historic England** Section 2.3 should be amended to include reference to Bourn Conservation Area which lies to south of site and three Registered Parks and Gardens nearby.

2.4 Access, Movement & Connectivity

- **Barton & District Bridleways Group** Active Travel (Cycling and Walking) - includes horse riding therefore should also be included in heading to ensure equestrianism is included throughout this section. Equestrians should not be excluded from long distance routes proposed by GCP. Bridleways should be clearly marked as being for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Development provides opportunity to create a Restricted Byway network, creating access for carriage drivers. Lack of access for carriage drivers not only in Cambridgeshire but throughout UK.
- **Cambridge Past Present Future** Concerns about timing of substantial and individual proposals for infrastructure in area, including Local Transport Strategy, GCP proposals, and how a satisfactory plan can be agreed with all of these proposals in flux.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** SPD states that no access is required directly onto A428. County Council queried this with developer and developer made subsequent enquires with Highways England. Our understanding is that Highways England do not require this and have stated that a new access would not be desirable in policy or engineering terms.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** commitment to explore opportunities to create stronger linkages with Cambourne via PROW network is welcomed, but needs to be greater detail on which routes are suitable, which routes will need to be upgraded and any proposals to reclassify designation of a PROW e.g. BOAT, Bridleway, Cycleway, Footpath etc. in order to ensure current provision is not adversely affected.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Access, Movement and Connectivity - Cycle connection improvements need to link to Cambourne, Caldecote and Bourn village properly not just to the Broadway and Highfields Road as there is not suitable cycle infrastructure connecting these villages currently. Figure 8 - Three existing vehicular accesses to site are shown on western edge. Should be made very clear only most northerly access will access whole site. Other two just for existing employment sites. Figure 8 - needs to show cycle links to Bourn and Caldecote as well as Cambourne.
- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** One of main reasons for sustained objections to Bourn Airfield was projected impact of traffic on local roads. Q1 Who is responsible for making case for direct access to A428? Q2 Why was the case not made?

Q3 If an attempt was made to make the case, what data was used and what was the outcome? Highways England absolve responsibility to fund a new junction. There is room, though marginal, therefore possibility exists and must not be ruled out. Numerous examples of junctions built with sort of distances here. Investigate option of direct access to A428 further with strategic partners with data made available by Coalition of Parish Councils and StopBAD on traffic calculations. Modelling done by County Highways must be properly investigated and debated.

- **Greater Cambridge Partnership** Section 2.4 - although final C2C route through site has not been agreed yet, GCP and South Cambs are collaboratively working with Countryside to support preparation of SPD. GCP also in liaison with Highways England to acquire land parcels at both Eastern and Western ends of development which would enable provision of improved junctions intended to address expected levels of traffic flow. Traffic impact of site is included in C2C modelling assessments but should also be addressed in Transport Assessment for development.
- **Highways England** (1) For A1307, read A1303. (2) Developing plans to dual A428 between Black Cat and Caxton Gibbet. Will submit plans for planning consent to Planning Inspectorate on behalf of Secretary of State for Transport. Before submit, local community and stakeholders formally consulted on scheme and likely significant environmental impacts - consultation summer 2019. (3) Support SPD position for no direct access onto A428. Case for providing direct access onto Strategic Road Network is based on policy, need and deliverability. Policy set out in DfT Circular 02/2013 Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development. States proposals for new junctions or direct means of access may be identified and developed at plan-making stage where it can be established it is essential for delivery of strategic planned growth. Requires consideration of standard of road - for motorways and routes of near motorway standard development access is limited to use of existing junctions with all-purpose roads. Modifications to existing junctions will be agreed where these do not have an adverse impact on traffic flows and safety. In line with standards contained in Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, for safety and operational reasons, direct connections to slip roads and/or connector roads will not be permitted. For other roads there is a graduated approach. A428 is part of the Cambridge to Oxford expressway. High status, and therefore in line with policy, presumption against a new junction. Position needs to be balanced with strategic need, and whilst Bourn Airfield can be considered a strategic site, its wider strategic importance is more limited. Consequently, case for a new junction is not made. In parallel to development

of SPD, developers submitted an outline planning application. Highways England as reviewed transport modelling submitted and is broadly content with its findings which indicate that from a capacity perspective, subject to some modification, local road network has sufficient capacity to accommodate forecast impact from development. Given the local road connects with A428 both east and west of site, evidence shows on capacity grounds there is no need for direct access with A428. In line with current design standards, it is marginal that there is sufficient room for new junction between existing A428 junctions. Even if feasible, where junctions are spaced too closely it creates unnecessary weaving with traffic changing lanes raising greater safety risks and increased congestion, which reduces overall capacity. Conclusion - case for new junction is not made, and so Highways England supports the position set out in SPD. (4) welcome emphasis on providing a well connected community and policies to encourage modal shift and take up of public transport. Opportunities for strategic walking and cycling connections and connections with proposed Cambourne to Cambridge High Quality public corridor will help to contribute to ensuring the Strategic Road Network has sufficient capacity to provide for longer distance movements and connectivity from this and other communities along corridor.

- **Shelford and District Bridleways Group** Horse riding should be included in heading 'Active Travel (Cycling and Waling). Connecting existing Cambourne bridleway network with Byway 124/7 Knapwell, Bridleway 27/12 Boxworth and beyond should be a project for Section 106/ CIL funding. Bridleways marked in Figure 8 Access, Movement & Connectivity should be clearly marked as being for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.
- New development planned with little opportunity for local employment for residents, so most will need to travel to north Cambridge technology site, Addenbrookes, or to M11 for employment towards London. Majority of these only accessible by car and little new provision to enable access to these. Already over used roads of surrounding villages will be put under excessive pressure affecting environment and ecology in a detrimental way. New interchange on A428 much needed to stop these adverse effects to local communities and to enable efficient traffic movement. Other major routes have interchanges very close together so marginal space for an interchange is not a valid objection.
- Requests - Ban buses that are not providing timetabled services through Knapwell due to increased, noise, vibration, pollution, 75 tonne weight restriction, and road which is unmaintained and unsuitable width. Enforcement of 7.5 tonne weight limit by HGVs. Traffic travelling southbound from West exit onto Broadway has been identified as damaging to rural and residential character

of Bourn, and the Broadway. Road north, including village of Knapwell is equally vulnerable to negative externalities. Periodic closures of A14 give worrying insight into potential impacts of increased traffic on safety of Knapwell residents. Equal priority and precedence be given to manage North bound traffic under a S106 requirement to: - Minimise rat running. – Ongoing monitoring of traffic impacts. - Traffic calming and other measures. Knapwell High Street be added to maps, in particular, staggered junction, currently site of frequent serious accidents. Explicit direction be made under an S106 mandate to mitigate and manage their concerns.

- Direct access to A428. Improvement to Girton interchange re access to M11 and Cambridge. Dedicated healthcare centre. Relocate schools to less polluted area. Increase the area for local employment.
- Developers given unrealistic estimate of number of cars using site. Minimum number of cars with one per household would be 3,500. Majority of households have two cars giving a total of 7,000 cars onto St Neots Road. Would cause considerable congestion on St Neots Road and all local roads. Essential for development to have its own access to A428 providing a link to A428 (the Cambridge to Oxford highway) and with A14, A1, M11 and Cambridge. Girton interchange needs to be expanded to include a link to M11. At present cars have to go down Madingley Hill which can lead to a delay of over one hour.
- Proposals to improve public transport along A428 largely ignore impact on and needs of local villages. Does it make sense to push ahead with building houses on such a large scale until infrastructure issues are resolved and infrastructure promised by developers is in place. No strategic case for direct access to A428 - in absence of such access, traffic will flow along St Neots Road towards Cambridge/M11. Insufficient thought given to egress from new village for traffic joining A1198. Growth of housing agglomeration between West Cambourne and Highfield Caldecote provides rationale for a station if northern route for Bedford Cambridge rail link goes ahead. Should be south of A428; any location north of A428 rekindles interest in 'Habourne' and encourages traffic from wider area to rat run through local villages.
- Bourn Airfield development needs a connection to A428 directly. Present plan, to operate via Caldecote roundabout is not sufficient and will result in queues at peak times.
- Astounding lack of joined up thinking. Railway line (CAMB-BED) is planned to go nowhere near. How can the planning office support this dis-integrated approach when the timing is so close?
- Direct access to A428 for the new village.
- **Historic England** Section 2.5 Setting issues for heritage

assets extend beyond purely visual impact. Wider setting issues such as noise, light etc, will need to be considered for these and other heritage assets in and near the site.

- **Historic England** Section 2.7 Welcome reference to Bourn church, Bourn windmill and other landmarks as well as to Great Common Farmhouse. Maintaining sight lines and key views of such landmark buildings off site can be an important way to enhance the legibility of site. Should be referenced in SPD at end of eighth paragraph on page 18. No reference is made to listed barn north of Grange. Reference should also be made to need to preserve and enhance listed buildings and their settings; through appropriate buffer of open space, landscaping etc.

2.8 Community Facilities and Services

- **Cambourne Town Council** Section 2.8 - Figure 19 misses Upper Cambourne Co-Op from under other retail.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Section 2.8 - pleased to see reference to "a range of facilities and services to complement, not compete with, existing local provision". An important recognition of need for new village not to compete with existing provision in Cambourne. Statement does not go far enough and should give reference to Bourn Airfield forming a distinct village within wider town of Cambourne.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Section 2.8 - Sports and Leisure Facilities - SPD mentions Cambourne Sports and Social Club. This is a business that ceased to trade and the building is called Cambourne Sports Pavilion.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Section 2.8 - concern that Monkfield Medical Practice cannot be extended to take Bourn Airfield development as it is already being extended to take extra dwellings in West Cambourne.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Section 2.8 - Education - check measurements. Cambourne Village College is stated as less than 4.8km from site - it is more like 2.5 km or 3km by footpath.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Section 2.8 - Health - statements regarding current provision of Health Facilities, whilst correct may be too specific for SPD. i.e. likely that an offsite facility for "health services" is required, and likely to be at Monkfield Practice, and should be mitigated by development, precise location of such a facility is not known at this stage and further guidance should be sought from Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Section 2.8 – Education - proposals for the provision of education facilities within the new village, i.e. 2 primary schools up to 7 forms of entry and a secondary school (6 forms of entry), meets the County Council's requirements and is therefore supported.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Section 2.8 - Sports

	<p>and Leisure Facilities - Support, in principle, for shared and dual use of sports facilities. Should be noted that delivery will largely be dependent on securing agreement with school operator. Whilst Council can seek to influence this it is ultimately out of its control. Until an operator is selected and there is certainty that shared use can be delivered it is advised that LPA maintains a fall-back position to ensure sport and playing field standards are met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Healthcare facilities full to capacity in area. Site would require its own to cater for 7,000 people minimum. Location of schools are too near A428 and would be in a high pollution area. Area for local businesses is too small in relation to number of houses. A lot of people would have to travel from site each day. Cambridgeshire County Council Section 2.9 - Fig 21 Key Constraints maps WRC and Safeguarding Area which extends 400 metres. Would be helpful for SPD to note that any proposed development in this Safeguarding Area would be subject to Policy CS31 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Local Plan (or comparable emerging policy). National Trust Site context extends beyond surrounding features identified in SPD. Includes Wimpole Hall Estate, lying approximately 7km to south; closest National Trust property to Bourn. Site context extends beyond local authority's boundaries. Wider decision making framework set out by government for Oxford to Cambridge Arc includes A428/A1303 corridor within which Bourn Airfield sits, providing relevant context for SPD.
--	--

3. Vision and Objectives				
Representations Received	Support: 3	Object: 1	Comment: 8	Total: 12
Main Issues in reps	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aitchison Developments Ltd Support strategic objectives, particularly the desire to create a vibrant, prosperous and inclusive new village. SPD seeks to secure opportunities for local employment and entrepreneurship. Redevelopment of existing employment site will deliver jobs at heart of new village, well placed to provide access to jobs within reach of homes, Aitchison seeking to deliver successful high-tech business park comprising B1c and B8 uses. Will become asset to local economy, attracting investment and local employers, such that it could itself be identified as a Strategic Employment Location in future. Cambridgeshire Police Sustainable housing and commercial development can be achieved to create safe and secure working, leisure and home environment. 			
67733				
68006				
68018				
68032				
68045				
68143				
68176				
68192				
68264				
68316				
68317				
68361				

Developers should, at an early stage, seek advice from Cambridgeshire Police Designing out Crime Officers

- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** Six key objectives are laudable and would result in great placemaking if those principles were followed. Key to successful delivery of this new village is that it must be well planned as stated in objective 6.

Object

- The development must have direct access to the A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

Comment

Vision

- **Bourn Parish Council** SCDC aspires to be cleaner, greener and zero carbon. Therefore necessary for all elements of new village to integrate with natural environment, be innovatively designed and planned to meet and where possible exceed sustainability policy targets, and to secure net gains in biodiversity. Any adverse environmental impacts will not be supported unless they can be appropriately justified and mitigated. How will Council will reconcile aspirations with 3,500 houses where 70%+ will drive to work.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Vision - While CP supports need to reduce carbon emissions, concerned this may introduce a target for development which is not supported by adopted local policy. Text should re-worded to make reference to a 'low carbon lifestyle' to be consistent with adopted Local Plan. Stating development is moving towards net zero sets an expectation which is beyond Local Plan requirements and principles of development set out in SPD.

Strategic Objectives

- **Cambourne Town Council** Strategic Objectives – (1) How is this movement sustained once the fixed term bus subsidies have expired? (2) How will you encourage and support independent retailers? (3) How will you support access to fresh and healthy food? How will you provide for the wellbeing of isolated or marginalised residents? Community Development Fund/Worker? (5) How will you provide renewable energy and low emission travel beyond existing standards? (6) If the 'lifetime of the village' is a real objective, will lifetime homes and single storey dwellings be provided to accommodate residents through their life cycle and to provide housing for additional needs?
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Strategic Objectives - While fully supportive of delivering development which exceeds Local Plan standards this must be within what is feasible, viable and sound. Delivery of net zero buildings goes well beyond Local Plan requirements and has significant feasibility and viability issues. Recommend

	<p>Objective 5 be amended: 'Incorporating low carbon buildings, renewable energy and low emissions travel, aiming to exceed existing Local Plan standards where technically feasible and viable'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shelford and District Bridleways Group Objective 3 should indicate access to the countryside for all users.Historic England Objective 4 should include greater reference to local character, identity and materials. • National Trust Objective 5 - question how creating a cleaner, greener and zero-carbon future for local communities will be evidenced and monitored. Urge elaboration of a specific, measurable approach to monitoring which can be applied to all aspects of development, including traffic generation, utilising appropriate 'carbon accounting' techniques. • Cambridgeshire County Council Support 6 Strategic Objectives, in particular inclusion of strategic objective on "Healthy, Active and Resilient" which encourages walking and cycling. Access to healthy food is welcomed. SPD should consider availability of fast food outlets in vicinity or options to limit A5 uses. Include recommendations and findings of Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) guidance on "Planning Healthy Weight Environments".
--	---

4. Spatial Framework				
Representations Received	Support: 3	Object: 6	Comment: 16	Total: 25
<p>Main Issues in reps</p> <p>67783 67914 67990 68019 68060 68111 68144 68145 68159 68177 68208 68209 68210 68211 68212 68213 68251 68255 68259 68276</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aitchison Developments Ltd Support identification of existing employment site as providing future employment and need for new village to maintain direct access to strategic highway network to/from it. Fix A states primary street must "...provide direct vehicle access to the existing employment site." This is supported. Vital to site's success. Error on Spatial Framework Plan - annotated access as a secondary street and not a primary street. • Natural England Welcome that Spatial Framework Plan proposes a network of multifunctional green and blue spaces, with Strategic Landscape Areas including possible country park to the south, to improve local links and delivery of biodiversity and hydrological benefits. Also supportive of requirements for cycle and footpath links to Cambourne, Highfields, Caldecote and Bourn. • Wildlife Trust Supports spatial framework for Bourn Airfield development. Strategic landscape areas to south identified as a country park will be essential to delivering biodiversity net gain and providing an accessible and strategic natural greenspace for the new residents. <p>Object</p>			

68281
68289
68296
68311
68312

- **Cambridge Cycle Campaign** (a) one of HQPT stops is far away from homes; route needs to be more central with stops closer to houses (b) primary road runs through most densely populated parts, guaranteeing maximum number of people will suffer from exposure to pollution and road danger caused by cars and village centre will be car dominated because primary road runs through it; swap road alignment with HQPT so village centre and houses are only served by secondary non-through routes; (c) cycling network is too peripheral and doesn't appear to be well-connected to the interior of site; dense grid of closely spaced routes should criss cross site to be pervasive, direct and convenient.
- **Knapwell Parish Meeting** Locating village 'centre' in North West corner provides an inherent Broadway-biased emphasis, which will bias traffic movement to this area of the development, and therefore the Broadway. Should as minimum be relocated to centre, or more preferably to East side to reflect stated intent to 'minimise rat-running through villages' south (Bourn) and North (Knapwell), and bias traffic movements to Highfields exit.
- Movement of bus stop from Childerley roundabout towards Cambourne will be huge blow to Highfields residents. Access to existing stop is dangerous, without any increased traffic accessing site. Existing stop close enough for Highfields residents. Will force many residents to use cars, contrary to aims.
- The development must have direct access to the A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

Comment

- **Cambourne Town Council** Landscape buffer to Broadway is minimal. Okay to northwest where Cambourne is also close to Broadway, but southwestern parcel close to road should be moved back. Page 52 states that 'consideration of the existing country lane character of Broadway, and the potential value of retaining this' is needed, however, current buffer doesn't look to achieve this.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Concerned regarding route of HQPT. Stops are a long way from lots of houses and village centre is pushed towards Cambourne and will not be central to the new community.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Spatial Framework Plan suggests north-south runway as a focus for green corridor. North-east to south-west runway is of greater significance to military use of site (main runway under prevailing weather conditions). Suggest consideration be given to this feature in terms of site's heritage.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Spatial Framework Plan - uses in Safeguarding Area surrounding Bourn Water Recycling Centre (WRC) includes strategic

landscape which is acceptable. Also seems to be an area not defined in key (pale green horizontal hatching). Helpful if this was identified so that a view can be taken as to whether this is compatible with WRC.

- **Cambridgeshire County Council (CCC)** Spatial Framework Plan - at earlier stages of SPD preparation CCC Education preferred Option B, which located secondary school and primary school south of spine road. Provided good balance between accessible links within site for pupils and external links for staff. A428 is further away and therefore noise and air quality impacts would be much less severe. Option A in draft SPD. Only acceptable if environmental concerns can be adequately addressed, noting SPD proposes significant landscaping which may be bundled to reduce impacts of A428.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** generally support overall content, weight and balance of Executive Summary, including six strategic objectives, and stated main purpose of document (reference to the Spatial Framework on page ii). Support that SPD should establish the broad structure and indicative positions of key components of Spatial Framework. 'Spatial Framework Diagram' is a more accurate description of its form of presentation, should be used throughout SPD instead of 'plan'. Waterbeach SPD describes Spatial Framework as a diagram. Bourn Airfield should use same terminology.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Comparison of SPD Spatial Framework and Countryside's application - areas of difference: (1) HQPT alignment (moved eastwards). Secondary school building will not end vista from Runway Park. (2) Broadway access located within land outside applicant's control. (3) HQPT stop located in proximity to primary network junction, which would be difficult to achieve. (4) Local Centre located away from HQPT stop and would not benefit from footfall. (5) Formal sports provision split within four sites which improves catchment but will result in management issues and reduced changing/parking facilities. (6) Primary road network different alignment which moves the road further away from the Bucket Hill Plantation and County Wildlife site to avoid any adverse impact. (7) Green corridor follows different alignment. More direct pedestrian/cycle routes along it would be beneficial. (8) Additional green link shown. (9) Consistent runway corridor width. (10). Significant additional Country Park Area shown. (11) Country Park area outside applicant's control. (12). Primary school does not create an important event and focal element along primary route. (13) HQPT alignment discounts options running through St Neots roundabout. (14) HQPT stop moved westwards in front of existing DB Group cement manufacturing facility which would create poor gateway experience. (15) Mixed uses such as hotel might benefit from being closer to St. Neots roundabout.

Primary road alignment slightly different. (16) Larger formal sports provision more appropriate along A120 corridor. As (5). (17) Pedestrian cycle link through Aitchison employment area lies outside applicant's control. (18) DOS7 green corridor was located along existing ditch and part of drainage strategy. SFP alignment arbitrary. (19) As (5). (20) Additional primary road link. (21). Primary road alignment along woodland edge would impact adversely on Wildlife site. (22) Larger primary school site is shown providing an additional form of entry. (23) Significant additional Country Park Area shown.

- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Country Park** - shows areas beyond Countryside's control / landownership of family who currently own and farm the land. Includes land at south of site, shown to be strategic landscape/country park. Given landownership constraints it is not possible for full area shown in SPD, and Local Plan, to be delivered by CP. CP propose amendments to extend Country Park to provide lateral connections within revisions to outline planning application. Will enhance connections to adjoining settlements and existing PRow network. Further detail set out in appended document.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd NW Corner** - concerned the Spatial Framework Diagram proposes solely residential use in NW corner adjacent to expressway and Village Centre. Diagram should be revised to include this area as mixed use, and text to include a list of potential uses that would be acceptable, e.g. A1, A2, A3, A4, B1 (a)(b), C1, C2, C3, Da, D2. Such uses will be complementary to Village Centre and provide variety, flexibility and opportunities for community cohesion / interaction.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd NE Corner** - Spatial Framework Diagram excludes any indicative development within MDS in north-east gateway into site. MDS defined on Local Plan Policies Map Inset I allocates development in this area. Local Plan process tested this proposal and was found sound. No reasons given in SPD to justify no development. SPD should be in conformity with adopted Local Plan. Important to create a sense of arrival into new village by a combination of built form within an appropriate landscape-led setting. Appropriate forms of development in this gateway will create critical mass to enhance viability for HQPT. Should be shown for mixed use to allow for hotel or retail/café to come forward to support HQPT halt. For design flexibility, diagram should be revised to accord with extent of MDS shown on Adopted Policies Map. Design document shows how this could be achieved whilst supporting aim for that space to remain open.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Western Access** - Spatial Framework Diagram indicates a road that curves beyond land under CP control and SPD boundary.

	<p>Explained by Fix A (1). SPD Diagram and words should be revised to provide greater flexibility for delivery - remove words “(subject to availability of third party land)” as they add confusion. CP planning application includes detailed proposals to conform with Policy SS/7, which can be delivered within land under its control or Highway Authority. Without certainty, reference to third party land should be deleted. Potential to consider an alternative design option should be a matter for consideration of planning application and s106 agreement, which could secure an alternative option if land becomes available. SPD should set out principles not detailed prescription. Notwithstanding, design appendix outlines how Countryside have sought to review access proposals in this location to seek to achieve aspirations of SPD but within land under its control.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Village centre - located slightly south of CP proposed centre. Understood this is in response to stakeholders’ feedback during drafting SPD, advocating a more centrally located village centre. Support principles of co-location of village centre with runway bus halt and secondary school as set out in SPD. Important for village centre to be delivered west of a central location in order to provide for: early delivery, thus removing the need for transitional and temporary uses, encourage community cohesion with a hub clustered around activity rather than arbitrarily in centre, and enhance commercial viability. Bus halt is a fix, following consultation under a separate process from both SPD and planning application, and location on the Spatial Framework Diagram appears to have moved. CP broadly content with slightly revised indicative location in Framework Diagram, subject to minor amendments proposed in appended design document. • Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Outdoor Sports - CP understand merits in distribution across site in respect of phasing of delivery, sustainability, accessibility to facilities across site and for variety of uses to be provided. Sound reasons not to distribute the outdoor sports - benefits of clustering in respect of future maintenance, deliver a better quality of pavilion facilities to serve them which enhances potential use for non-sports activities, more efficient land use for residential development. Propose an alternative design solution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion of Broadway Fields for efficiency and improved village edge; • Expansion of northern formal sports pitch provision to form central focus and utilise enhanced facilities; • Eastern edge of development set back from Highfields Caldecote, in a more linear form, to create an increased length with a greater set back between two settlements; • Informal kickabout areas in North East gateway to enhance integration of two communities whilst maintaining separation; • Country Park increased in size with expansion of existing Highfields Caldecote recreation
--	---

	<p>ground. Planning application was designed on basis of dual use, as had been previously agreed through extensive pre-application process. Pending agreement on dual use at secondary school, suggest this be shown hatched to denote that they are an 'either/or' provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DB Group (Holdings) Ltd Essential that Spatial Framework Plan takes full account of DB Group's existing operations and will not hamper future expansion plans. Requires particular consideration being given to adequate distance separation from noise sources, site and building layout / orientation, provision of acoustic barriers as deemed necessary in accordance with the PPG. • Greater Cambridge Partnership Supportive in principle of proposed route alignment shown, consistent with discussions to date with SCDC and Countryside. Note provision for a segregated route for C2C route that avoids the Bourn roundabout. Consistent with one of three options for C2C currently being progressed, and can be further developed. • Ensure maps (e.g. Figs 20 & 22) are consistent with Caldecote Village Design Guide SPD. In particular locations of connecting pathways and valued views.
--	--

5. Creating the Place Section 1: A Well-Connected Place				
Representations Received	Support: 1	Object: 38	Comment: 34	Total: 73
<p>Main Issues in reps</p> <p>67738 67784 67913 67917 67967 67968 67984 67985 67999 68004 68007 68008 68012 68013 68014 68026 68027 68043 68049 68051 68053 68054 68057</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wanted to say how important plans to include Equestrians are, and as riders how much we appreciate inclusion. Lot of horse riders in area, creating proposed bridleways will link up adjacent villages and create much wider network of off-road riding, which allows for much safer hacking. Provision of soft surfaces to ride on, along with places to mount will be hugely beneficial and valued additions to access itself. We look forward to hopefully riding these tracks one day!!!! <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • British Horse Society Section 1A - Horse riding should be included in surrounding bridleway network, not just implying these are for pedestrians and cyclists. Section 1B - These should be NMU routes. • Cambridge Cycle Campaign Section 1A Support: 'Site access points from the surrounding road network which are safe and convenient for pedestrians and cyclists'. Oppose: 'A Primary Street which forms the spine of the site for all users...serves the village centre'. Primary road running through middle of site will expose more people to air pollution and road danger. Instead, primary road should run along northern fringe of site, in order to protect people from pollution and road danger caused by excessive motor traffic. Oppose: 'Secondary streets which provide direct access to other areas of the site and are 			

<p>68061 68068 68071 68073 68076 68086 68091 68106 68115 68116 68129 68130 68133 68149 68151 68178 68179 68193 68194 68196 68197 68207 68215 68220 68225 68244 68245 68248 68265 68266 68267 68269 68277 68295 68318 68319 68320 68347 68348 68349 68350 68351 68352 68354 68355 68356 68358 68359 68362</p>	<p>designed to accommodate potential bus routes'. Streets designed as bus routes tend to encourage higher speeds and more dangerous manoeuvres by car drivers. Therefore, (a) the dedicated 'high-quality' public transport route should run more centrally through site, (b) secondary streets that may host bus routes should be carefully selected in advance, and (c) bus gates should be used wherever needed to prevent rat-running by car drivers. Add: 'walking and cycling routes, whether they be on-street or off-street, should be the locus of social activity around buildings, therefore building frontages should always face and open up towards any adjacent walking or cycle route.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Cycle Campaign Section 1B Add: the cycle parking in new buildings must follow the design specifications laid out in policy T1/3 and either a cycle parking guide SPD when it is published by South Cambridgeshire District Council, or until such time, the guide (and its successors) currently published by Cambridge City Council. • Bourn Parish Council Section 1C – SPD states details for GCP Cambourne to Cambridge scheme are not yet finalised. Also, no detail for the Mayor's metro aspirations. SPD should explain what HQPT will be, passenger numbers, destinations, connectivity with other routes, and how many cars will be taken off road. Very concerned insufficient consideration to public transport connectivity. Suggest GCP finalised before SPD approved. • Bourn Parish Council Section 1C – SPD states small scale parking facilities adjacent to HQPT stops. Concerned will encourage more car use. More detail / explanation needed. • Cambridge Cycle Campaign Section 1C - Oppose: 'small-scale passenger parking facilities could also be provided on the site adjacent to the HQPT stops'. Even small-scale parking harms the surrounding walking and shopping environment. Only blue badge parking and cycle parking would be acceptable here. For all others, the Park and Ride service is available off-site. • Knapwell Parish Meeting Section 1C - One of strategic objectives is stated as the avoidance of coalescence, ensuring Bourn Airfield is a 'distinct new village'. Providing direct transport links to Cambourne and Bourn Broadway from west side of a new development fundamentally undermines this strategic statement. Locating village 'centre' in North West corner fundamentally undermines this strategic statement. • Section 1C - Access to HQPT refers to travel to Cambridge city which really understates where residents will need to travel to. Falls short of delivering connection of public transport to rail, business parks, biomedical centres, retail parks and places that people would otherwise use their cars. Dependence on shift to public transport is to risk that St Neots Road can carry car traffic
--	--

if shift does not materialise. TRICS rates would suggest traffic numbers pro rata with Cambourne, 30,000 vehicles in/out per day, around 2000 vehicles departing per morning peak. Traffic heading east is 77%, with no connection to A428, will more double traffic heading down St Neots Road, Hardwick. This without traffic from developments in St Neots and Cambourne West. To offer retrospective fixes if monitoring shows roads are inadequate means further long periods of misery while A428 connections are built. Experience of Cambourne shows task ahead. For proof that Public transport even within site is not solution, evidence full carpark that serves Morrisons, Medical centre, Library and other retail outlets.

- **Bourn Parish Council** Section 1D - Seriously concerned about traffic generated. Based on Cambourne, will generate 2,695 car journeys. Even with 10-30% shift to public transport, 2,142 cars. In addition, planning application for employment site, with up to 800 parking spaces. Where is comprehensive approach to assessing traffic movement for both planning applications?
- **Cambridge Cycle Campaign** Section 1D - Oppose: 'Parking should be designed in accordance with the guidelines set out in Policy T1/3 and the associated table at Fig 11: Parking Provision, with an aspiration for low car ownership.' Policy T1/3 encourages high car ownership rates and is in direct conflict with aspiration for low car ownership. Principle should be rewritten to allow for lower levels of car parking provision. 'Limiting the number of through-routes' is not strong enough, it should be written as 'There will be no through-routes for vehicles through residential areas' to prevent rat-running.' 'Informal pedestrian crossings' does not give priority to pedestrians. To give priority there must be more formal, Zebra pedestrian crossings. Add: 'Streets should incorporate planted verges adjacent to the carriageway, especially streets with driveways, in order to allow room for dropped kerbs and street furniture while ensuring that footways and/or cycleways can be built unobstructed and without adverse camber.'
- Section 1D - plan will necessitate increased traffic and additional busway down St Neots Rd. Line of mature trees will be chopped down. How can you justify that now, when we know how trees affect our health and environment? Trees have been absorbing noise and pollution for decades. Adding MORE traffic, but removing mature trees is irresponsible. Fences are no substitute.
- Section 1D - State "private vehicles are the least preferred transport" is to ignore fact that a good proportion of traffic will be heading east, towards M11 and access south. SPD should state what evidence is available to support how traffic can be accommodated by public transport? State that private cars are essential for only "some" people simply wrong. Ignores everyday life.

Aspiration of development with no cars ignores fact pretty much all residents will have 1 if not 2 cars and will use them. SPD should state that evidence is required on all figures presented in Travel Plan and Transport Assessment to ensure Developers can be taken to task. Monitoring is insufficient as it provides developer with an open invitation to be economical with Plan on which development is based. Connection to A428 is a MUST and traffic figures based upon Cambourne trip rates and traffic pattern support this. Direct connection up and over A428 will allow Busway to run on north of A428 avoiding destruction of village life in Hardwick.

- **Cambridge Cycle Campaign** Fix A Add: 'All the new or reconfigured junctions must be designed with safe and convenient walking and cycling routes.' Oppose: 'The development will create a primary street linking the main access points, which must...serve the village centre'. Terrible mistake to put primary street through village centre, it will create a car-dominated environment and discourage people from walking to and around shops. Village centre should be accessed by car through secondary streets and should never be possible to use village centre as driving through-route. Add: 'The primary street should be routed as far to the north and distant from houses as possible, keeping it close to the existing road infrastructure and keeping pollution, noise and road danger away from residents.'
- **Guilden Morden Parish Council** Fix A - future transport arrangements should include the new Bourn Airfield development.
- **Hardwick Evangelical Church** Fix A - recognise need for new housing. Would like new development to be as good as possible for those who come to live there, and already live in surrounding villages. Potential car journeys generated are forced onto local roads because no direct access to A428 is major concern. You're expecting traffic queues out of village. Please re-visit major omission for all our sakes.
- **Toft Parish Council** Fix A - very concerned about access and egress to site as undoubtedly it will impact traffic through Toft and surrounding villages.
- Fix A there should absolutely be no access to Broadway from new settlement given the great detriment the increase of traffic through village would cause.
- Fix A - Direct access to A428 essential: some residents will have to catch another bus within city; others will work outside Cambridge in surrounding villages and beyond. Rush hour traffic is major issue in Cambourne, Toft, Hardwick, Comberton and Bourn and new development will further exacerbate. Highways England drastically underestimated amount of traffic usage on these smaller roads including extra traffic from new development. Developers need to finance resolution of these very significant issues.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fix A - Will cause huge increase in traffic down St Neots Rd, Hardwick. Busy at rush times, affecting getting in and out of our properties. Increase in noise and air pollution coming straight past our doors. No chance of leaving windows open either. Will affect our health and ruin our environment. • Fix A - should be direct access onto A428. If traffic comes directly onto Childerley roundabout it will cause congestion on St Neots Road and Highfields Road through Caldecote. HQPT system must be kept completely separate from Childerley roundabout and St Neots Road. No traffic lights, no possibility of cars entering by mistake. • Fix A – Caldecote residents extremely concerned about inevitable massive increase in traffic numbers, vast majority of which will be funnelled onto Caldecote roundabout and narrow local roads. Congestion at peak times resulting in long tail backs in all directions, gridlock in villages such as Hardwick and Madingley Road to Cambridge. Commercial vehicles from Aitchinson development will create further pressure on roundabout which is too small for volume of vehicles. Drivers will become impatient and take risks. Vehicles entering and leaving petrol station will complicate further. Accidents already occurred. Likely to rat run through Caldecote (impact safety and amenity of residents) to access B1046 into Cambridge, M11 via Barton, Addenbrookes or A1198 for Royston and station, in order to avoid hold ups. Little employment, not self-sufficient for jobs. Efforts mitigating impact on Caldecote will be ineffective. Speed cushions and narrowing road with blind bends does not stop vehicles hurtling round bends in middle of road. Little faith in transport surveys conducted by client friendly commercial transport consultants. Suggestion development will be 'well connected ... locally' seems optimistic. Only viable solution is to have direct access onto A428 and rethink of transport provision, ensuring Caldecote receives some bus provision and people are able to access it safely. • Fix A - Development must have direct access to A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, development will have unacceptable negative impact on surrounding villages and its future residents. • Fix A - Number of cars use village as a rat run; been serious road traffic accident, reported thefts from road side and buildings are experiencing cracks due to thundering of lorries. • Fix A - Getting traffic to and away from new development is not being considered thoroughly enough, given current thinking means a huge load is weighted on The Broadway, making Bourn and surrounding villages rat runs that Knapwell and Dry Drayton have become. Exits should lead on to A428; the lives, environment and safety of existing villagers are more important than too many
--	---

junctions on A428.

- Fix A Object strongly to access on Broadway given rat-race to Royston and how speed limit is ignored. Road across to Broadway will be an accident hazard.
- Fix A - live on the Broadway and traffic already speeds down, through village. BAD states that people will be unable to turn left onto the Broadway. However, residents will be able to go round a roundabout and turn right down the Broadway. Traffic calming is therefore a necessity.
- Fix A - Object on grounds that it does not provide sufficient ingress/ egress for residents and does not sufficiently mitigate impact on St Neots Road and surrounding villages. Direct access to A428 is needed.
- Fix A "good transport connections will be important in making the new village successful". Agree. Why then is village not connected directly to A428? Why will you make residents travel through lower capacity roads to get out of village? Object for these reasons. Current road layout will inevitably lead to more traffic on minor roads including those through local villages rather than getting best use out of major road A428. Needs changing now before layout is set in stone.
- **Cambridge Cycle Campaign** Fix B Contradiction between 'A shared pedestrian and cycle route' and 'Segregated pedestrian and cycle routes'. Unclear which is meant where. Delete the word 'shared' and instead replace it with 'segregated'. Add: 'Cycle routes along urban streets must be adjacent to a separate, dedicated footway. Away from streets, cycle routes should be built with a separate, dedicated footway unless it can be convincingly demonstrated that pedestrian usage will be sufficiently low to allow sharing. For design and construction, use standards found in manuals such as Designing for Cycle Traffic by John Parkin.' Add: 'Strategic walking and cycling routes must have continuity and priority over motor traffic at side-road crossings and driveways.' Add: 'Routes must be fully accessible to people with disabilities who are using mobility aids such as mobility scooters, adapted cycles and wheelchairs.'
- **Hardwick Evangelical Church** Fix B - if serious about walking, cycling and public transport, make these things easiest and most accessible - put busway and cycle way through middle (currently route of "primary street") and move "village centre" and community building to middle of rather than northeastern corner. Current plan encourages driving locally.
- **Shelford and District Bridleways Group** Fix B - No NMU routes are being considered for woodland. Walking and pedestrian access is implied in wording - any links to the bridleway network need to be NMU. Enhancement needs to be defined - tarmac surfaces on bridleways are not enhancements. Figure 28 does not include routes discussed at meeting with BHS.
- **Cambridge Cycle Campaign** Fix C Oppose: 'combined

walking and cycling path with a minimum 3m width'. Segregated combined walking and cycling path must be at least 4.5m wide. 3m much too narrow for segregation, would allow only 1.5m for footway and 1.5m for single direction cycleway, without enough space for a bi-directional cycleway. Add: 'There must be a safe buffer between the busway and the cycleway of at least 2m grass verge.' 'There must be safe and convenient crossing points designed with cycling-friendly curvature such that people walking and cycling approach the crossing in a direction perpendicular to the movement of buses, with clear and very long visibility splays in both directions, and ideally with a 3m-deep refuge island between the bus lanes.' 'No chicanes or guardrails are to be used, because these block visibility, exclude some people with disabilities from using the path, pose an obstacle that will cause injuries, create a dangerous distraction from moving buses, and cause conflict between users of the path.

- Fix C - creation of massive loads of stress for new residents who will have to commute as no local work. Bus into centre of Cambridge will not answer needs of people working at Science Park, Addenbrookes or outside of Cambridge.
- Fix C - laudable that high quality public transport route is provided, although doubts many will undertake trek from southern reaches to use it and will probably drive. Bus stop will be moved further from Caldecote roundabout, and Caldecote residents - already walk one / two miles. Adequate and safely accessible bus service must be provided to serve communities whose freedom of movement will be severely curtailed by effects of congestion.
- Fix C - plans include moving bus stop serving Highfields towards Cambourne. Unacceptable and blatant disregard of existing village requirements! Site not directly connected to A428 and proposed access routes are woefully inadequate. Traffic entering and leaving site will use Highfields and Hardwick as rat runs should there be any issue with between Childerley roundabout and A428 and this simple fact appears to have been brushed aside!
- **Bourn Parish Council** Access to Broadway contentious. Compromise position to ensure northbound only. Anxious to see layout of northbound only junction. Third party land needs to be secured before planning permission is granted. More detail needed on St Neots Road / Broadway junction design – roundabout would nullify effectiveness. HQPT, cycle and walking junction needs to be kept free of vehicles in perpetuity.
- **Hardwick Parish Council** disappointing to note SPD endorses much of outline application with particular regard to transport infrastructure, and seems disregarded recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Village meeting attended by 60 residents,

main topic of debate was transport infrastructure, and particularly provision of an all ways junction onto A428. Traffic figures considerably under estimate traffic movements, when compared to surveys carried out for other developments. No left turn at Broadway, and two lanes for a short distance at Caldecote roundabout for traffic from east, is a poor solution. Proper access needs to happen before building commences, mitigation of problem after this is too late. If Broadway is kept as country road by preventing traffic from settlement turning left, why is St Neots Road is not classified same. Can't be too late to lobby Highways England for junction onto A428. Developers admitted that providing a junction would mean less facilities on settlement, should this be at surrounding villages expense and quality of life or their bottom line?

- **Bourn Parish Council** Concerned at use of Childerley roundabout and the Broadway as main access points. Clear that local roads will be severely affected. Already rat runs, will be exacerbated. Robust assessment of new junction onto A428 needed. DfT circular refers to delivery of strategic planned growth – surely 3,000 houses fits criteria. Countless examples of closely spaced junctions. Argument doesn't hold weight. Questions over who should have made the case, what steps did SCDC take to assess case? No opportunity for debate or consultation.
- Access for traffic directly onto A428 would allow easy access to/from village without having to drive along old A428. Lack of direct access will create excessive traffic through surrounding villages. Village centre offset to north west meaning residents in south will have a long way to get to amenities and will use their cars. Better to relocate to a more central location so all villagers could easily walk to shops etc. Vehicular access onto Broadway will cause congestion and traffic through Bourn village, even with restricted left turn. Busway only travels along top of village. Better to route it through centre making it easier to access by all residents and not have to drive to reach.
- Residents will not just work in central Cambridge. Provision of a single access point to A428 via the St Neots road is totally inadequate for community of this size. Needs direct link to A428. Bus proposal will serve a single point in City requiring further bus rides to get to and from where people actually work. Will lead to rat-running through Bourn Valley villages and traffic calming entire local road network to address is too ridiculous for words.

Comment

- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Section 1A - inclusion of dementia friendly design principles is welcomed.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Section 1A - inclusion of "...street network that integrates movement and place" is welcomed. Greater clarification is needed on commitments to deliver segregated cycle routes and

segregated pedestrian routes. SPD is unclear if separate routes will be delivered or if shared surfaces will dominate. Term "alongside streets" needs to be defined/clarified to understand the level of segregated routes which will be expected to be provided. Figure 28 appears to show a gap in provision to South West corner of site, this may be due to lack of residential housing in this area or provision of green space, either way reasoning should be made clear.

- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Section 1A Point 1 should read, "This should prevent access onto the Broadway for southbound traffic and also northbound traffic from the Broadway south to prevent rat running through the existing village of Bourn as per policy SS/7".
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Section 1A - fully aware of key importance of junction onto the Broadway as an entrance to new village but also in light of its interaction with existing community at Bourn. Key area of focus during pre-application discussions and application process itself with key stakeholders and local community. CP have revisited proposals (shown in design appendix) to respond to aspirations but within land currently available and shown within Local Plan allocation. Through application process CP prepared to consider contingency arrangement only on basis it was fully accepted by SCDC there were no constraints in delivery, pursuant to responses received from CCC. Currently no certainty that land will be transferred. Spatial framework should be based on land included within Local Plan allocation. Existing junction of St Neots Road and the Broadway, CP note that capacity assessments are not showing any improvements are required.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Section 1B should make reference to upcoming "South Cambridgeshire Cycle Design Toolkit".
- Section 1B - schools should be located in car-free zones, so as to encourage walking, cycling and "park and stride".
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Section 1D - commitment to provide "seating suitable for all age groups" is welcomed.
- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** Section 1D states new village will not be served by direct access from A428. This is making new policy, contrary to requirements of an SPD. Must be removed. Ruling out an option at this stage is completely unacceptable.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Section 1D - content with this section. 2nd bullet point may be a commercial point for consideration. However, it does not specify what this is. Note that not having direct access to A428 is reinforced here, consistent with meeting on 10th May 2019. Third paragraph - fully support implementation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure. Practical considerations and constraints must be considered with respect to installation, particularly points on residential

streets given such infrastructure will not be responsibility of Countryside to install or manage. Whilst clear and growing demand for electric vehicles, relative percentage of EVs is still small and demand is not present. Recommend policy is updated; 'should include appropriate provision for electric vehicle charging at all car parking locations, including provision of charging points, infrastructure or sockets within private dwellings.'

- **Aitchison Developments Ltd** Fix A important to ensure SPD is not too prescriptive and binding such that becomes unnecessary burden at decision making stage, that could ultimately prejudice delivery of this existing employment site. Figure 27 identifies main points of access and primary street but fails to reflect requirement imposed by Fix A for primary street to "serve the village centre and provide direct vehicle access to the existing employment site.". Amend to reflect Fix A and show existing employment site being served by primary street.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Fix A - consideration should be given to direct access to A428. Missed opportunity not to do this. 1st bullet - worried that if third party land may be needed to achieve this option, it raises the question of its deliverability and potential need to consider direct access onto A428.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Fix A - consideration should be given to direct access to A428 to avoid conflict with HQPT at point 1 and 3.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Fix A Point 1 should read "This should also prevent northbound traffic from the south accessing the site. To prevent rat running through the existing village of Bourn. It should be made clear that the junction design should restrict these left turn out and right turn in movements even if additional third party land is not able to be secured".
- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** Fix A western access from Broadway should be configured to give direct access to A428. Existing Childerley Roundabout must not just be enhanced, it must be reconfigured as it is 'planned' main access to site. Will be more dangerous than it already is, if not properly reconfigured. Existing pedestrian crossing too close to roundabout and been near misses with cars coming too fast from Hardwick direction into Highfields Road. Busy junction in morning peak hours already and visibility must be improved. Recommend SPD to require Childerley roundabout Highfields Road/St Neots road to be reconfigured and made safe, not just enhanced.
- Fix A - Green areas are being planned between houses and A428 to combat noise and encourage wildlife at Bourn. At Hardwick this barrier and wildlife area will be removed unless traffic uses A428. Essential an exit directly on to A428 is built otherwise noise and pollution from traffic along St. Neots Road will be disastrous.
- Fix A Needs to consider measures to mitigate traffic impact on surrounding villages and roads (Policy SS/7

	<p>8.c.i) - especially traffic heading south.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aitchison Developments Ltd Fix B identifies strategic pedestrian and cycle network cutting through existing employment site to link proposed public transport corridor to north with residential areas to south. Not objected to in principle, and indeed is provided within Development proposals for site, spatial fix needs to be applied flexibly to allow proposed employment layout to make most efficient use of space available. • Cambridgeshire County Council Fix B - Figure 28 - colour difference between traffic free and alongside streets pedestrian/cycle routes is not very clear. Different colours would be clearer. • Cllr Tumi Hawkins Fix B Include access to Highfields Road at top of West Drive. No possibility of access to Furlong Way (impossible to cross village sports field). Leaves access only to Grafton Drive through proposed development granted planning at appeal. Recommend add: Cycling and walking access provision to existing employment site including DB Group and Diageo site. • Fix B - Document in general, needs to clarify relationship with Caldecote Village SPD, and how any differences get resolved. Ideally they should be made consistent. E.g. current draft of Caldecote Village SPD proposes slightly different placement of strategic pedestrian routes vs. Fig 22 and Fig 28. • Cambourne Town Council Fix C - concerned regarding route of HQPT. Stops a long way from a lot of houses and it means the village centre is pushed towards Cambourne. Concerned proposal does not provide an integrated transport network for Bourn Airfield. • Cambridgeshire County Council Fix C - current position on route of rapid transit scheme has come out of numerous discussions with developer team and GCP. Concluded best located in north of site near A428 to best balance various needs of project (catchment, speed, engineering requirements etc.). Longer term, Mayor's innovative mass modes of transit - useful if land could be safeguarded, where practicably possible, to allow future evolution of the project. Ultimately, will need to offer high speed and reliability, should benefit from good catchment. Route as shown appears to meet needs of GCP. • Cllr Tumi Hawkins Fix C Whilst appreciate need for fast public transport, it is doubtful that any bus will be able to reach speeds of 55/60mph within development site. Negates the need to fix the bus route at top of site. Recommend shelter for waiting passengers should be enclosed to protect from inclement weather. Cycle stores be covered to provide protection and security. Use of multi-storey cycling pods be considered. See examples. • Fix C - Bus stop locations must not be to detriment of Caldecote residents. • Barton & District Bridleways Group Access to countryside for all users should be included in this
--	--

section. Not included in any of the other Strategic Objectives. Under 'Well Connected Places' heading, horse riding should be included. Last bullet point page 35 should be non motorised user routes. 4th bullet point page 39 - NMU routes should be considered for woodland? 5th bullet point page 39 - wording with title as is, only gives walking and pedestrian access to existing bridleway network and word 'path' in this context currently relates only to shared pedestrian and cycle access. Any links to bridleway network need to be NMU. 'Enhancement' also needs to be defined - putting a tarmac surface on a bridleway is not an enhancement.

- **Bourn Parish Council SPD** sets out key access and movement principles, alongside a package of critical transport infrastructure, to support a shift from car to sustainable transport modes for journeys internal and external. Need more than platitudes. Need to know assumptions on how many people will use which modes and your targets. How many motorists will leave their cars to use more sustainable modes? What percentage of motorists will switch to more sustainable modes? What numbers will determine whether shift has been success or failure? What mitigation in place to deal with failure to shift sufficient number of motorists from cars?
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Chapter 5 agree the broad principles of setting a series of overarching guiding principles and key spatial fixes which are required to deliver on site. Purpose of SPD is to provide guidance in the form of a framework to guide preparation or determination of planning applications. 'Spatial Fixes' identified to reinforce 'Guiding Principles' are currently very specific and prescriptive. Waterbeach SPD sets out separately key Structuring Elements or 'Fixes' and Guiding principles, and style of language is less prescriptive and inflexible. Bourn SPD sets out Guiding Principles and Spatial 'Fixes' which are mixed up throughout Section 5. Revise draft SPD accordingly. Unclear whether diagrams are intended to be treated as Guiding Principles or Spatial Fixes - page layouts should be reordered to avoid any confusion.
- **Network Rail** concern that there doesn't appear to be much consideration of impact on infrastructure in general. Focusing on walking, cycling, in village where a proportion of people living in area are assumed to work locally. Recommend some assessment is made and consideration given to where people would work? Concern that significant numbers will add additional pressure to road and rail network. Significant impact on St Neots and Cambridge stations and would like to know if any consideration has been given as to whether there is enough parking at these stations? Includes references to 'high quality public transport' but unclear what this means. Public transport links to stations rather than private car preferable as to not add pressure on local road network

	<p>or on passenger parking. Should refer to East West Rail company for further input.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There must be no direct access from Bourn airfield into Bourn village and no access onto the Broadway from this new development. • Planning north of London is continuing piecemeal; different planning bodies within transport, housing and employment from Government down, own agendas. Uncoordinated, eventually leading to chaos. Live in Hardwick. Doctor and dentist ten minute drive in Comberton. Bus takes an hour by Citi 4 and number 18. Wishful thinking to expect many new residents to use bus, however swift. Residents will have a multiplicity of destinations inevitably involving impractical journeys using at least two buses. At least five or six thousand cars. No connection planned between A428 and M11 at Girton or direct connection to A428. Six planning objectives yet fail miserably on first aim: "A well-connected place". Traffic should be able to connect with national road network at earliest opportunity. Result will be thousands of cars trying to get onto faster road, meandering about on local minor roads seeking to avoid congestion. Adjacent villages have problems making right turn eastwards, across traffic, to leave for Cambridge. Causes traffic to pile up at village exit. Highways Agency has doubts about transport plans for development.
--	--

5. Creating the Place Section 2: Vibrant, Prosperous and Inclusive				
Representations Received	Support: 0	Object: 6	Comment: 10	Total: 16
<p>Main Issues in reps</p> <p>67950 67966 68020 68036 68038 68047 68108 68146 68180 68198 68217 68221 68247 68321 68322 68357</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>Object</p> <p>Village Centre Location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hardwick Parish Council position of Village Centre needs addressing. Being in NW corner it is nearer Cambourne and will be difficult to reach by walking from the south of development. Better position is as near as possible to actual centre, so shops etc. could be more easily reached by everyone and improve their quality of life. • Proposed village centre is not in centre of development; distanced from East and South houses, thus creating poor village community spirit. <p>Health care provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hardwick Evangelical Church Lack of health care facility in new development of this size, and expectation that this will be provided for by expanding the provision in Cambourne is short-sighted. Contradicts SDP which states, "It is essential that the new village has its own sense of public life and community: a place where people live, work, learn and socialise, which provides for 			

residents' changing needs throughout their lives, and for residents with different incomes, abilities and needs." Current plan forces most needy out of the development to find help.

- **Toft Parish Council** is very concerned about the lack of Healthcare provision in development.
- Development must have direct access to A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

Comment

- **Aitchison Developments Ltd.** In seeking to achieve a vibrant, prosperous and inclusive new village, SPD suggests that redevelopment of vacant and underutilised land within existing employment site could be redeveloped to provide premises for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). Important the site is not restricted in terms of the type/range of employment occupiers, as this will constrain the market. Furthermore, SPD proposes small scale employment uses at Neighbourhood Hub.
- **Cambourne Town Council** There should be separate provision for youth; a facility not incorporated in the allocation for community space.
- **Cambridge Past Present and Future** Concerns about adherence to Policy H10 Affordable Housing provision. SPD states it must be 40% "unless it can be demonstrated that an exception should be made". Unclear how exceptional circumstances criteria will be triggered and what level of measurable evidence is necessary. Council must be more specific about weight of evidence necessary to justify this exception.
- Unclear strategy for the provision of healthcare facilities (e.g. doctors, dentist) for residents.

Village Centre Location

- **Bourn Parish Council** concerned about locating Village Centre in NW corner: (1) motorists attracted to use the Broadway, (2) design argument for locating at end of second (main) runway, (3) people in south and east of site disadvantaged and difficult to access. Propose alternative location to include more residents within 800m.
- **Cambridge Past Present and Future** location in NW corner of development means it will be difficult for all to access. 'Neighbourhood hub' may not have sufficient provision to serve its purpose and it would be better to combine the two in a more central position.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Fix D - Village centre in north western corner of site. Transport Assessment Team previously recommended should be more central as some of site is not within 800m walk. Option may not be as sustainable transport wise. Excellent cycle links are essential to try to improve connectivity and discourage

	<p>car use for travel within site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr Tumi Hawkins village centre is shown at northwest corner, not geographical centre as preferred by stakeholder workshops attendees, so it is within 800m walking distance to most of village. Mitigation is to create a secondary neighbourhood hub, which could affect viability of one or both centres. In competition with Cambourne. New village 'sold' to residents as a standalone community with its own facilities. Recommend: 1. Located centrally - Option C. 2. North-South runway can be feature in its own right without tying it to village centre. • Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Section 2 - generally content but there should be flexibility in terms of providing an average density of 40 dwellings per hectare in order to reflect potential changing circumstances. Could include varying market and economic conditions, ability to have a dual use of secondary school sports pitches and resulting impact on total net development area and quantum of non-residential uses which come forward as development is built out. • Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Fix D - generally content but opportunity to broaden range of uses to allow a more flexible mix, including other employment-generating uses (B Use Class) and to create a balanced centre. Similarly, range of uses in Neighbourhood Hub could be broadened to accommodate other uses as well as 'modest retail and food and drink premises', provided the range and scale does not undermine the viability of primary centre. • If new community is to be encouraged to walk or cycle, it is essential the "Centre" be more central, to be within easy reach of majority of residents. Will put schools a good distance from pollution generated by vehicles on roads to north of site and reduce car journeys within village. Facilities in Centre needs to include a health centre. Getting an appointment with doctors in local surgeries is extremely difficult. Little scope for them to take on more patients.
--	--

5. Creating the Place Section 3: Locally Distinctive				
Representations Received	Support: 2	Object: 3	Comment: 17	Total: 22
Main Issues in reps	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – Fully support open spaces and landscape character requirements in section 3E. Support integration of new village with its landscape, incorporating and enhancing existing features and network of landscaped green, natural and multifunctional open spaces within and surrounding development. Support requirement for strategic landscaping including a county park. Requirements for a network of green corridors and other open spaces within easy walking distance of all 			
67785				
67915				
67986				
67991				
68009				
68021				
68033				

68034
68035
68037
68062
68112
68113
68131
68160
68181
68199
68200
68257
68307
68323
68360

residents is fully endorsed. Quantum and quality of open space is key to delivering numerous environmental services. To achieve benefits and avoid impacts to designated sites we advocate provision of SANGS. Identification of a management body and funding mechanism for long term maintenance will be critical. Quantum of informal open space is not clearly stated but suggests SANGS level (78ha.) is achievable – further detail would confirm this. Greenspace provision will ensure no adverse impact on nearby designated sites already under considerable pressure from visitors and help achieve net biodiversity gain in accordance with NPPF para 170 and DEFRA 25 Year Environment Plan.

- **Wildlife Trust** Supports Fix F. Provides an integrated green infrastructure network through and around the development site, that will provide a range of walking and recreational routes on-site that have potential to meet much of demand for recreational routes, without impacting other nearby more sensitive habitats and sites. However, likely to be contingent on delivery of a country park type space within strategic landscape area to south.

Object

- **Cambridge Cycle Campaign** Fix E: diagram shows highest density of dwellings is clustered around primary street. Appears to maximise exposure of people to road danger, pollution and noise. Oppose this arrangement of primary street and dwellings.
- Proposed 3-4 storey buildings are totally unsuitable and out of keeping for a rural village environment.
- Development must have direct access to A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents.

Comment

- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** 3E Open spaces and landscape character, 2nd bullet - Play space should not be placed at eastern edge. Private gardens on West Drive, Highfields Caldecote back onto Eastern boundary. Potential noise and light pollution from lighting on the fields and paths.
- Section 3E needs more details of the general character of country park and design approach. Large bland areas of open flat grass should be avoided. Instead space should be broken up/punctuated with native trees, bushes and wildflower meadows in a way which complements natural views. E.g. more like Wimpole Country Estate and not Trumpington Meadows Country Park.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** CP content with this section, except under Guiding Principle 3F Integrating inherited assets. In first sentence the words 'where possible' should be added, i.e. 'the site has a number of existing features which should where possible be preserved and/or incorporated into the development in order to protect existing character and contribute to the distinctiveness of the new village'.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council Fix E – Would like more detail on the nature of high density housing including height and storey limits. • Aitchison Developments Ltd Fix F identifies formal green landscape which creates a legible and direct route through employment site. Not objected to and is provided for within proposals for site. Fix needs to be applied flexibly to allow the proposed employment layout to make most efficient use of space available. • Cllr Tumi Hawkins Fix F Eastern Edge – SPD has not properly addressed issue of strategic landscaping and is missing a substantial part of it. Only 30m of woodland belt and not within site. No woodland to fill existing gap. Contradicts Policy SS/7 and Members’ intentions. Highfields gardens provide 'Countryside separation'. Recommend: (1) 50m woodland belt. (2) Gap filled both within and outside settlement boundary to same depth. (3) footpath within woodland is acceptable, location of playing fields is not, risk of noise and lighting pollution. • Cllr Tumi Hawkins Fix F North East Green Gap - SPD proposing planting that contradicts Draft Caldecote Village Design Guide. Openness must be maintained. No tree planting on southern boundary, enhance existing hedge. No playspace due to proximity of houses, to avoid noise nuisance and light pollution to residents. • DB Group (Holdings) Ltd Fix F Employment Site Edge - Essential the employment site edge takes full account of DB Group's existing operations and will not hamper future expansion plans. Require particular consideration is given to adequate distance separation from noise sources and the provision of acoustic barriers along this edge as deemed necessary (at the developer's expense) following detailed assessment in accordance with PPG. • DB Group (Holdings) Ltd Fix F Employment Site Link - Essential to ensure a safe route can be created which ensures that pedestrians and cyclists are separated from industrial operations vehicular traffic. Important DB Group retains flexibility for unfettered access to its site to enable existing operations, short term future expansion plans and company's continued long-term growth. • Cambridge Past Present and Future Concerns about major open space being N/S axis of the old airfield. Needs further explanation - is it to be 'greened'? Potential for it to be an exemplar of amenity, but SPD needs more precision on how this space is to be handled. • Cambridgeshire County Council Iron Age and Roman archaeological finds in the area. 20th C military aviation heritage. Suggest the historic environment could contribute to Key Issues 1, 3 and 4. E.g. open space and recreation could support heritage trails and interpretation for archaeological and military heritage. • Historic England Relatively little is mentioned on archaeology. Greater reference should be made to this. • Historic England Care should be taken with regard to
--	---

	<p>location of taller buildings and ensuring they do not compete with or dominate listed buildings of other landmark buildings offsite.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England Proposals to reflect the former airfield could also be extended to include the use of tools such as street naming to reflect this former use and provide local identity and connection with the past. • Shelford and District Bridleways Group Horse riding is not included in definition of active travel, equestrians are excluded from these opportunities. • Disgrace to the memory of those who died flying from Bourn Airfield with no proper named cenotaph. • Medium and high-density housing should remain away from site perimeter. Large hotel at main entrance would be same as Cambourne and so sites would actually be very similar. To be avoided if an independent identity is a 'real' consideration. Screening of hotel complex from Highfields is important so as not to detract from existing village outlook.
--	--

5. Creating the Place Section 4: Healthy, Active and Resilient				
Representations Received	Support: 2	Object: 4	Comment: 14	Total: 20
<p>Main Issues in reps</p> <p>67965 67992 67993 68003 68010 68015 68063 68128 68147 68148 68201 68223 68226 68227 68268 68306 68324 68325 68326 68327</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wildlife Trust supports Guiding Principle 4B Access to Natural Environments. • Support network of green spaces and routes throughout the development for informal recreation. Would like development of open green spaces carried out initially. Proposed bridleways will be asset to immediate and wider equine community, once joined up with existing bridleways, and together with cycling and walkways will make development attractive to prospective residents; green spaces to relax and exercise in will create clear minds, healthy bodies and improve well-being and will avoid need to travel to find informal recreation areas. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Cycle Campaign Guiding Principle 4C: safe routes for children should ensure all schools, parks and village centre reachable on foot or cycle using off-street paths or quiet streets. Oppose 'level carriageways' and 'shared surfaces', unless motor traffic levels are reduced to a bare minimum. • Cambridge Cycle Campaign Fix G: Oppose 'appropriate barriers' and 'soft surfaces' as discriminatory against people using adapted cycles. Only access controls we support are well-spaced bollards. Normal, utility cycle routes cannot have soft surfaces as not all-weather, all-year round surfaces. All routes must be fully accessible. • Allotments must be easily accessible from the MDS. • Existing healthcare facilities in Bourn and Cambourne cannot accommodate the increased demand. this will be detrimental for both new residents and existing patients. 			

Comment

- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Guiding Principle 4D final bullet should more positively encourage shared use. Clustering sports pitches allows for economies of scale, more efficient use of land, better quality facilities in terms of size of pavilion, changing and other related facilities and efficiencies in terms of maintenance. May reduce total space needed. Final sentence on demonstrating agreement is overly prescriptive. CP set out its outdoor sports proposals on basis that Education Authority were supportive of principle at pre-application stage. Multiple benefits to locating sports pitches adjacent to eastern boundary - additional buffer between communities, access to sports pitches more evenly spread throughout, and increased open space in important ecological corridor. Proposed amendments, including potential for hatched areas to provide certainty in both eventualities, are set out in full in design appendix.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Guiding Principle 4F – first bullet very inflexible, and largely outside the control of the developer, and as such the bullet should be revised to: ‘Should provide opportunities for a range
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Fix G - these principles have been taken into account and enhanced in the revised proposals shown in the attached document.
- **Wildlife Trust** generally supports Fix G Recreational walking, cycling and horse-riding routes. Appears to be a lack of circular routes connecting back into Bourn Airfield from Caldecote-Highfields or Bourn. Provision of missing links important, otherwise there may be unintended damaging consequences of promoting access, such as an increase in visitor numbers to Hardwick Wood SSSI beyond its carrying capacity.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Fix H - Whilst wording provides flexibility and allows for dual use, CP concerned Fix H could be cited as a reason not to reduce overall playing field land area of 15.5 ha and/or to allow for residential development on two areas shown mid east and mid west for ‘outdoor sports facilities’ on the Spatial Framework. Suggest two outdoor sports sites should be shown in different colour or hatched to denote that they are an either/or depending on dual use agreement. Approach would provide greater certainty for all parties.
- **Barton and District Bridleways Group** Appreciate creation and inclusion of equestrian routes but do not understand need for separate walking and cycling routes where there is a bridleway available to all users? Support Figure 47 Recreational walking, cycling and horse riding. Include a circular Restricted Byway open to carriage drivers - bold and progressive step, much same as hugely popular Cambourne peripheral bridleway.
- **Barton and District Bridleways Group** support references to bridleway creation in woodland settings, although it appears to conflict with comments referred to

	<p>in other sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barton and District Bridleways Group Various reasons to include equestrians – contributes to rural economy, rely on safe network, costs no more, share paths less than 3m, no injuries by horse, inadequate bridleway network, activity for females, mental and physical benefits, vulnerable road user. East of England one of highest equestrian accident rates. SPD helps link fragmented network and enables route from Cambourne to Coton. Support inclusion of equestrians in plans for new/improved accesses. Perimeter track should be Restricted Byway suitable for carriage drivers. • Cambourne Town Council Easily accessible sports pitches enables growth of sports teams that support forming an identity and bring people together, reducing isolation. Outdoor bowls extends age range that gets together. Greater need for formal pitches than informal due to number of teams generated by new development. • Cambourne Town Council Careful thought needed on shared and dual use sports facilities. Use during week by school and weekends by clubs could lead to over-use and leave unplayable. Additional burden on budget of school (maintenance), which income would not cover. Schools would need additional staff to monitor use and booking. New school would have difficulty funding this. • Cambridgeshire County Council SPD should show clear intentions regarding controlling fast food outlets. • Cllr Tumi Hawkins SPD places a small area of fields on eastern edge. Grass pitches for informal recreation is unsuitable in this location as It would cause noise nuisance and light pollution to Highfields Caldecote. • Shelford and District Bridleways Group Concern with the wording of SPD and exclusion of horse riders this creates. • Sport England (1) Support s106 contribution towards indoor provision in Cambourne, enhancement of leisure centre, provision of swimming pool and other expansion proposed. (2) Support limited public access to indoor facilities at school, to help to take pressure off Cambourne. (3) Informal recreation and physical activity - welcome promotion of Sport England's 'Active Design' guidance. (4) Formal pitch provision - could be mixed approach to on-/off-site provision and contributions. (5) All new facilities must meet Sport England's technical guidance.
--	--

5. Creating the Place Section 5: Responsive and Sustainable				
Representations Received	Support: 7	Object: 9	Comment: 6	Total: 22
Main Issues in reps	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England Section 5A support detail which seeks to ensure protection and enhancement of natural 			

67786
67982
67987
67994
67995
67996
68022
68046
68055
68056
68095
68114
68124
68163
68162
68202
68219
68252
68260
68328
68329
68230

environment through requirement of a programme of ecological survey and monitoring, restoration of key habitat and corridors and creation of new habitat. We welcome implementation of our suggested amendments to ensure mitigation of impacts to most ecologically sensitive environments within and beyond site boundary.

- **Wildlife Trust** supports guiding principle 5A Biodiversity and Habitats, including the principle of achieving a measurable net gain in biodiversity.
- **Wildlife Trust** supports guiding principles 5B Flood Risk & Resilience; 5C Integrating Sustainable Drainage; and 5D Sustainable Buildings, including commitments to integrating biodiversity into SUDS, inclusion of water efficiency measures and a step change in energy efficiency and renewable energy provision
- **Wildlife Trust** supports Fix I - Protected Biodiversity Areas & Corridors.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Supportive of Sustainable Drainage methods proposed. We encourage applicant to engage with Lead Local Flood Authority throughout the design and submission stages.
- **Natural England** Note and welcome requirements relating to protected biodiversity areas and corridors (Page 69), delivering multi-functional SUDS (section 5C) and larger open spaces with naturalistic environments within 400m of everyone's home.

Object

- **DB Group (Holdings) Ltd** Section 5G bullet points fail to mention the need for the proposed development to take full account of existing employment development. An additional bullet point should be added which reads as follows: "Planning applications should be accompanied by a Noise Impact Assessment and Air Quality Assessment, and the new village will be required to mitigate the impact of noise and air quality from existing employment uses by virtue of suitable design. For example, a buffer using acoustic screens if appropriate, building layout and orientation and suitably ventilated buildings."
- Nursery, school and college are on or nearby main roads - this means added pollutants for young - in direct conflict with CCC signing UK100 clean energy pledge and protection of young.
- Concerned there will be increased noise from light industry, impacting the neighbourhood and personal wellbeing.
- Use of mass air source heat pumps is not acceptable due to low pitch hum emitted, especially during cold weather. Sound carries at night especially. Noise pollution. Hotel contribute to background noise from air conditioning etc. Serious and careful consideration to problems associated with new technologies is a must! Added to noise from vehicles to industrial site is highly likely to cause undue distress to residents of nearby local villages.
- SPD seeks to minimise skyglow and be minimum

required to ensure public safety, for crime prevention, living, working and recreational purposes. Require all lighting be of full cut-off design and set goals for maximum acceptable illumination levels. Work with Commission for Dark Skies to ensure site lighting sets and meets sensible thought-out standards.

- Serious concerns this development will cause flooding; home and garage was flooded in 2013 and concerned about a reoccurrence.
- Much has been made of Sustainability and Environmental Issues through preparation of SPD. Cannot be claimed in this Development if it is negated by causing problems for Neighbouring villages. Destroying mature greenery that protects St Neots Road, Hardwick from A428 is hardly example of delivering sustainable development.
- Be prepared for a very public fight over the line of trees in St Neots Road!!! I have contacted Extinction Rebellion and am taking further legal and professional advice.
- Development must have direct access to A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, development will have unacceptable negative impact on surrounding villages and its future residents.

Comment

- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** section 5D - support deployment of Solar PV along northern bank. Exact renewable energy generation and carbon reduction is subject to detailed design and carbon emissions factors at time of construction - recommend remove figures. Flexibility required to respond to future changes in technology which should be recognised with addition of bullet point: ‘• Given the construction programme, it is recognised that flexibility will be necessary with the carbon reduction strategy to respond to changes in technology and energy markets.’ Given the long term nature of development it is considered these statements be re-worded as key design considerations rather than specific requirements as future detailed design of development may require alternative strategies as technology changes. Requirement for a sustainable show home in each development parcel goes beyond Policy CC/3. Text should be amended to be consistent with Local Plan.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Section 5E First paragraph - wording inconsistent with Policy CC/3 with regard to reduced emissions not onsite energy, across development as a whole. Recommend reworded to; ‘the new village aspires to be an exemplar and developers should explore, on a site-wide basis, opportunities to incorporate on-site renewable energy low carbon energy generation with a view to exceeding the baseline requirement for a 10% reduction in anticipated carbon emissions through the installation of an integrated system on homes and non-residential buildings or site wide

	<p>solutions as set out in Policy CC/3'. Paragraph 3 - requires site wide energy solutions including CHP. Decarbonisation of electricity network. Predicted electricity emissions will fall below gas, favouring electricity based heating systems and remove carbon benefit of gas based CHP. Development of heat networks requires a critical mass of heat requirements. Low energy homes, beyond Building Regulations, reduces heat density. Occupational hours of schools mean these buildings are not generally considered in practice to be high energy users. Without gas CHP, currently no proven large scale technologies that are commercially and technically viable replacements. Recommend text amended: 'Site-wide energy solutions and/ or the deployment of energy networks should be considered and implemented where feasible and viable.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Fix I support these key elements of placemaking, which have been adopted in the landscape led illustrative masterplan and green and blue infrastructure strategies. • Cllr Tumi Hawkins Key Issues 2 seeks to ensure existing biodiversity and habitats are retained where possible and opportunities taken to secure enhancements and/or form new habitats to achieve an overall net gain. Green Infrastructure element of SPD is weak and should be strengthened by referring to Building With Nature standards. • Cambridgeshire County Council Require any noise and air quality mitigation required to deliver both schools along A428 boundary is fully evaluated as part of planning application. Mitigation in the form of landscaping and bunds cannot encroach on land reserved for education purposes. • National Trust Commitment to net gain as Guiding Principle helpful, but no specific measurable requirement as a Spatial Fix. SPD should set out further detail in terms of delivery of new priority habitat as integral component of green infrastructure provision, consistent with Government's commitment to mandating measurable biodiversity gain. Also consistent with the objectives of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and Developing with Nature Toolkit. Intention to seek minimum 20%. NT shares this ambition. 20% appropriate target for Bourn Airfield. • Healthy air quality for Bourn is being created at the expense of Hardwick.
--	--

5. Creating the Place Section 6: Cohesive, well-planned and well-governed				
Representations Received	Support: 0	Object: 1	Comment: 2	Total: 3
Main Issues in reps	Support Object			

<p>68023 68331 68336</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development must have direct access to the A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents. <p>Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Section 6C - text acknowledges this is beyond the scope of SPD yet it is included as a Guiding Principle. Requires preparation of Community Development Strategy but does not indicate when it should be provided. Unnecessary detail which repeats Local Plan Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs. SPD should be simplified in this respect Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd Section 6D - considers this too prescriptive and suggest that it is shortened. It is suggested that after the word 'should' be qualified by adding the words: 'should explore opportunities for ...'. CP propose the early delivery of village centre, which will reduce the need, if any, to provide transitional or temporary uses.
----------------------------------	---

6. Delivering the Place				
Representations Received	Support: 3	Object: 7	Comment: 18	Total: 28
<p>Main Issues in reps</p> <p>67916 67997 67998 68025 68048 68064 68096 68152 68153 68154 68155 68161 68189 68204 68205 68206 68228 68253 68256 68270 68271 68288 68291 68292 68332 68333 68334</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambourne Town Council Indoor Sports Facilities (Item 31) Support expansion of existing sports centre to provide a more sustainable indoor and swimming facility for both communities. Should be contribution for ongoing maintenance. National Trust Early implementation of accessible open space important to ensure its immediate availability to new residents to avoid pressure on nearby sensitive designated sites. We welcome that phasing requirements detailed on section 6.5 seeks to ensure this. Wildlife Trust Figure 57 Indicative Land Budget - Support inclusion of 89ha country park and strategic green infrastructure. Approximately 36% of SPD area. With other more formal open spaces, total green infrastructure approaches 50%. Quantum provides significant scope to achieve biodiversity net gain through creation of high quality habitats and multi-functional and formal open spaces. Any significant reduction is likely to lead to measurable net losses in biodiversity or require off-site biodiversity offsetting. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development must have direct access to the A428 and its own healthcare facilities. Without these, the development will have unacceptable negative impact on the surrounding villages and its future residents. <p>Infrastructure Delivery Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridge Cycle Campaign Walking and cycling 			

68335

network within site and connections to nearby villages and Cambridge (Item 1) - non-specific trigger that could result in delivery being delayed too long. Must be delivered before occupation to ensure good habits are developed, and sustainable transport modes are natural and obvious ways to get around from day one.

- **Knapwell Parish Council** Public Transport Infrastructure (Items 5 to 8) ban buses routing through the village before starting their services, due to increased noise, vibration, pollution. Enforce 7.5T weight limit.
- **Knapwell Parish Council** Highway Infrastructure (Items 11 to 15) road north to Knapwell equally vulnerable. A14 traffic. Need for S106 monies for the High Street (similar to Bourn) - minimise rat running, monitoring and traffic calming.
- Highway Infrastructure (Items 10 to 15) Infrastructure dependent on Transport Assessment (TA). Scrutiny of TA needs to be mandated. Countryside's plans do not bear scrutiny. Trip rates and modal shift from cars to buses not experienced anywhere and not evidenced. Traffic levels local roads cannot support. Costs rightly allocated to Developer and CCC. Price of inadequate delivery will be for villages. Must include Village representation throughout, setting triggers, ongoing monitoring, agreement to physical remedial measures and timing of such. Too easy for Developer to under-provide.

Comment

- **Cambridgeshire County Council** SPD identifies the potential to explore the sharing of sports provision with schools by providing community access. This is welcomed, however any reduction should not be at the expenses of other informal or formal green space.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Planning Application Requirements section should also include the need for a Health Impact Assessment to be submitted as part of any site wide outline application as per South Cambridgeshire District Council Planning Policy.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Section 6.6 – development will need to comply with the Minerals & Waste Plan, including the submission of a Waste Minimisation Audit and Strategy to demonstrate measures to minimise waste, and steps to recover and recycle waste.
- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** Figure 57: Indicative land Use Budget shows employment area 13.3ha. Figure 21: Key Constraints and Figure 55: Infrastructure Delivery Plan shows only the existing employment site. SPD is not clear if that is the only employment site to be provided. New village should provide more employment sites, as per Local Plan policy.
- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** – Section 6.5 outlines the principles which will apply and be secured via the planning application process. SPD is specifying off site mitigation

to traffic problems that will be created by the site. Unacceptable. Passes responsibility to Cambridgeshire County Council. As worded, accepts there will be impacts on neighbouring villages. Site can mitigate its own problems with direct A428 access. CCC committee accepted in principle.

- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Section 6.3 CP are generally content with this.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Section 6.4 – revisions to landscaping on eastern boundary lost 1ha developable area. If dual use of sports pitches agreed could gain 4-8ha. developable area. Dual use essential to provide flexibility in facilitating lower net density or increase in capacity, and broaden house types. Fig 55 – schools should state gross area.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Section 6.6 Concerned SPD has stricter requirements for preparation and submission of planning applications, compared with Waterbeach SPD. Should be a consistent approach.
- **National Trust** Figure 57 Indicative Land Budget - welcome 89ha for a Country Park within the site. Notwithstanding proposed onsite provision, development should take account of interface between new communities and their wider surroundings. Likely increase in off-site recreational visits to adjacent outdoor recreation sites; National Trust's Wimpole Hall Estate. Welcome opportunity to engage with local authority, developers and community representatives to encourage sustainable travel patterns and responsible recreational activity.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan

- **Aitchison Developments Ltd** – Employment space (Item 44) employment space will be delivered through each phase. Overwhelming need it to come forward at the earliest opportunity. Figure 58 Potential early phases plan indicates redevelopment of existing employment site in the early phases of delivery. Supported and reflects development intentions.
- **Barton and District Bridleways Group** – Non Motorised User Infrastructure. Item 1 Improved walking and cycling network - Refers to riding in the text so horse riding should be included in the first column. Item 2 Cycleway Improvement - What provision is being made for equestrians on this route? Item 3 Rights of Way Network - Does not include access for carriage drivers.
- **Cambridgeshire County Council** Foul Water Network (Item 23) – welcome recognition of Bourn WRC as potential constraint. Within 400m safeguarding area there is a presumption against development which would be occupied by people. Require submission of an Odour Assessment.
- **Cambourne Town Council** – Burial Grounds (Item 33) Approximately 300m² of land is too low. The 0.83 ha to be

provided in the funding column would allow 30 years of burials based on the guidance in Arnold-Baker on Local Council Administration. Generally, you allow for a 30-year supply: 2.058 acres / 0.83ha.

- **Cambourne Town Council** Special Educational Needs (Item 38) contributions for Cambourne and Bourn Airfield should be pooled and used to provide a special school in Cambourne or Bourn Airfield to better cater for the local need, more sustainable, and reduce carbon footprint.
- **Cambourne Town Council** Health (Item 41) Question the capacity of Sackville House to take 1000sqm and additional parking. Monkfield Medical Practice already being extended for West Cambourne. Concern whether it can be expanded further for total population 28,800.
- **Cllr Tumi Hawkins** – Health (Item 41) Provision for health is woefully inadequate. Cambourne surgery is already over capacity and takes weeks to get appointments. Extension is not sufficient for additional 9000+ residents. No capacity at other local surgeries for example at Bourn. Recommend: require provision of a standalone doctor's surgery.
- **Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd** Comments on a number of items: Transport Infrastructure - Items 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15 & 16 - CP are content with these. (4) Trigger is pre-occupation and not specified which bus stops. (13) This is correct and CP have no issue with this. Waste, Water, Energy and Telecoms - No comments except for item (27) Potential feasibility and viability issues with the deployment of CHP. Recommend is updated: 'which could include a heat network where feasible and viable'. Affordable Housing - CP are content with this. Community Facilities – (31) Does not refer to potential dual use at schools. (36) School site areas are high. Suggest flexibility is added. Need flexibility over need for a 4FE school. (36) 'Provider/partner' - be clearer that it is CCC and/or approved academy operator. (40) Inflexible, especially given rate of change in nursery sector. (41) 'Description' and 'provider' - include more caveats e.g. Subject to NHS/CCG agreement etc. (42) Include caveats relating to market conditions/viability. (44) Refer to existing employment and be more flexible. (45) Correct measure to use when applying it to number of dwellings is "per dwelling" figure, not per household - correct figure to use is 2.7 not 2.8. (45) Developer should not be required to make contribution toward artificial pitch if they are already being provided on-site in-kind. (48) Should this reference a community trust as a potential 'partner/provider'?
- **Wildlife Trust** omits provision for the long-term, sustainable management of the strategic green infrastructure including biodiversity areas, green corridors, and country park within the strategic landscape area. Failure to address would undermine Local Plan policy and many good Fixes and Guiding Principles

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> relating to the natural environment within SPD. Country Park is missing from Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Triggers, phasing and funding must be described.
--	--

Supporting Documents

SA / HRA Screening Report				
Representations Received	Support: 1	Object: 3	Comment: 1	Total: 5
Main Issues in reps	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England Welcome amended SA / HRA Screening Report includes more through consideration of potential impacts on Eversden and Wimpole Woods SAC through increased recreational pressure and to SAC barbastelle bats supporting habitat. Generally agree with assessment that SPD unlikely to have any significant effect on SAC, including barbastelle bats and supporting habitat. Agree with conclusions that Plan can be screened out of requirement for SEA and SA. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knapwell Parish meeting Nature Reserve, Wildlife Trust managed Overhall Grove is a designated SSSI, and recognised Ancient Woodland. Conservation Area. Village contains the RSPB's own national farm. Protected verges due to a range of extremely rare flora, including Sulphur Clover. These are not referenced in the Sustainability and Habitats Appraisal, which requires further investigation. Request explicit reference in SPD to correct this oversight, with recognition that as such, specific measures are put in place to actively manage traffic volume in this sensitive Parish ecosystem. <p>Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England we would concur with your assessment that the document is unlikely to result in any significant environmental effects and will simply provide additional guidance on existing Policies contained within a Adopted Development Plan Document which has already been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal/SEA. As a result, we would advise that it is not necessary to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment of this particular SPD. 			

Equalities Impact Assessment				
Representations Received	Support: 0	Object: 2	Comment: 0	Total: 2
Main Issues in reps	<p>Support</p> <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knapwell Parish Meeting Knapwell residents have 			

	<p>responded to previous consultations concerning Bourn Airfield, and Local Plan, to highlight range of concerns but do not see evidence of their voice being acknowledged in consultation summary reports or draft SPD. Obligation B4 not been adequately met by Planning Policy Team and wish to offer opportunity to engage and rectify this prior to publication of the final SPD. Wish to work in partnership with development team to minimise negative external impact on local historic local communities and specifically historic rural and residential nature of Knapwell, which, due to further development of Boxworth services A14 junction will be exposed to high levels of infrastructure damage, community impact and dangers if it is perceived to be the direct route to and from A14 households at Bourn airfield. Heartened to see clear acknowledgement in draft SPD of likely impact of traffic resulting from 3500 homes on character of the Broadway, and to Bourn village - a constructive finding. Frustrated to see that, despite raising concerns in previous consultations, there is no acknowledgement of Knapwell being directly affected by every negative impact that has been highlighted in draft SPD on Bourn, and Broadway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• States stakeholders have been consulted. Hardwick has not been consulted as a community stakeholder, or invited to workshops, although clearly very affected. Wrong and disrespectful to a neighbour that will be recipient of development's east-bound traffic and from an infrastructure perspective a new busway proposal that will see our village road turned into an urban stretch of 8 lanes of tarmac. Did anyone read our Village Plan that concluded Hardwick wants to "maintain its character with many trees, greenery and tidy streets - a lovely peaceful village home to come back to after a day at work or school". Proposed busway will require removal of all mature trees and greenery which protect us visually from A428 (proposed effect is available from GCP).
--	--