

Draft Sawston Village Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Consultation Statement and Proposed Changes December 2019

1. Background

South Cambridgeshire District Council as the Local Planning Authority developed the draft SPD in collaboration with the local community and other stakeholders since autumn 2018. The Sawston Village Design Guide SPD has been prepared to assist in delivering the objectives as set out in Policy HQ/1: High Quality Design of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2018 as well as other related policies.

This consultation statement has been prepared in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012. Regulation 12 requires that SCDC prepare a consultation statement setting out the persons consulted when preparing the SPD, a summary of the main issues raised by those persons and how these have been addressed in the SPD.

2. Preparation of the draft SPD

The District Council as the Local Planning Authority contracted specialist consultants to work constructively with the local community and other stakeholders, through a series of workshops and events, during the autumn of 2018. A project champion was nominated by the village community and a community steering group was assembled comprising community members representing different interest groups, including the parish council.

Initial workshops were held with the steering group and other members of the local community to allow the community to voice their perceptions of the character of the village, and their priorities for design guidance to be included in the draft SPD. This input and how it is reflected in the document is captured in the Community Input section of the SPD (Chapter 3).

Further workshops and review sessions were held with the community steering group in early 2019 on drafts of the SPD to gain feedback on the emerging guidance and to ensure that it reflected community priorities and a consensus view.

Workshops were also held by SCDC with officers from the development management (planning) team as key users for the SPD. This has helped to shape the form and content of the draft SPD. The emerging draft SPD was further reviewed by a nominated senior officer from the development management team to comment in more detail on its structure and content from a user perspective.

The draft SPD sought to incorporate this feedback constructively and to balance the priorities and views of the village community with the requirements of a useful and robust policy document.

3. Consultation on the draft SPD

A public consultation on the draft Sawston Village Design Guide SPD was held for 6 weeks between the 15th April 2019 and 31 May 2019. The proposed modifications address the issues raised by the consultation responses. Consultation on the SPD was undertaken in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement adopted in 2010.

As the draft SPD supports the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, there was no further need to undertake a separate Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulations Assessment for this document, although screening reports were completed and made available during the consultation. An Equalities Impact Assessment was also completed and made available during the consultation.

The draft SPD and other supporting documents were available for inspection during the consultation period at the following locations:

- online on the Council’s website;
- at South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, CB23 6EA; and
- at a public exhibition at Sawston Village College on 9 May 2019 from 3.30-8pm, when officers were on hand to answer questions.

Comments could be made using:

- the online consultation system: <https://scambbs.jdi-consult.net/localplan/>; or
- by completing the consultation response form and either emailing or posting it to us at vds@scambbs.gov.uk or South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park, Cambourne, CB23 6EA.

The SPD consultation was advertised via a public notice in the Cambridge News on 10 April 2019, and on the Council’s website and social media.

4. Consultees

A list of the organisations who were directly notified of the draft Sawston Village Design Guide (SPD) in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) via email, or post where no email address was available, can be found as section 7. It should be noted that other individuals were also contacted that do not appear on this list.

5. Consultation Outcome / Key Issues Raised

During the consultation, 28 representations were received, made by 18 respondents. Of the representations 21% were supports, 18% were objections, and 60% were comments.

24 people visited the public exhibition where the main topics of discussion were:

- Character and impact of major new housing allocations on the edge of the village
- Public realm and regeneration of the High Street including vacant sites

The following series of tables identifies the written representations received to each part of the SPD, summarises the main issues raised, provides a Council assessment of the issues and where necessary what proposed modifications to the SPD are indicated.

1. Introduction (including general (not chapter specific) representations)				
Representations Received	Support: 5	Object: 0	Comment: 7	Total: 12
Main issues in reps 67909 67902 67895 67888 67881	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From what I have seen the group has the best interests of the village as a priority. • If we are to increase the demographic bulge in the High Street, we must address the narrowness of pedestrian and traffic access to the South end of the village. For parents with children, people with pets and for cyclists 			

67874
67854
67853
67850
76849
67698
67851

this area is already very dangerous. Increasing the population will exacerbate this.

- Strongly support principle of design guide. Introduction needs to clarify whether Design Guide applies within the Parish Boundary or within the Village Envelope/development boundary.
- **Cambridge Past Present and Future** Support the village SPDS. Green infrastructure is important and the principle of retaining or enhancing the connectivity of habitats is incorporated. [General comment submitted for all the Village Design Guide SPDs]
- **BPHA** Overall bpha are supportive of the approach taken within the South Cambridgeshire Village Design Statements. Affordable housing should be addressed in the Village Design Statements. The approach taken to the appropriate materials to be used within new development is broadly supported. The Village Design Guides should strike a balance between innovation and following a rigid design approach with reference to Modern Methods of Construction. We would strongly support improvements being made to the public realm to contribute towards the viability of local service provision within village centres. [General comment submitted for all the Village Design Guide SPDs]

Object - None

Comment

- How will developers be required to comply? There is insufficient parking now either in public areas or adjacent to houses. More is needed. Fig 24 shows Sawston Free Church (URC/M) [the former Methodist Church was approximately where Cambridge Bsoc is now. Accessible property is essential. So are accessible streets. Why move the War Memorial. It will make problems for buses. What are desire lines (Guidance 5.2)?
- **British Horse Society:** Unlike other Village Design Guides, the Sawston VDG draft makes no reference to public rights of way (PROW). Unlike other Village Design Guides, there is no 'wish list' of multi user access routes which could be provided by future development project funding. The representation includes suggestions for upgrades that could be included.
- **Forestry Commission** Tree species choice needs to be considered re climate change [General comment submitted for all the Village Design Guide SPDs]
- **Natural England** SPDs could consider making provision for green infrastructure, wildlife development and enhance character and local distinctiveness through green infrastructure and contact with nature. [General comment submitted for all the Village Design Guide SPDs]
- **Cambridgeshire Police** Secured by Design can be achieved, developers should seek advice at an early

	<p>stage from the Designing Out Crime Officer. [General comment submitted for all the Village Design Guide SPDs]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport England Supports the development of safe pedestrian and cycle routes through all new development, reference should be widened to refer to opportunities for all types of formal and informal sport and physical activity. [General comment submitted for all the Village Design Guide SPDs] • Cambridgeshire LLFA welcome the consideration of using flood risk management measures to promote biodiversity in the Village Design Guide SPD. It should further promote sustainable drainage techniques (SuDS). [General comment submitted for all the Village Design Guide SPDs]
<p>Council's Assessment</p>	<p><u>Welcome support</u></p> <p><u>Compliance:</u> The Village Design Guide, once adopted, will be a material planning consideration which will form part of the consideration and determination of planning applications.</p> <p><u>Parking:</u> Parking standards are addressed in the SCDC 2018 Local Plan. Regarding new car parking areas which could be created, this is outside the scope of the Village Design Guide but may be addressed in the draft Neighbourhood Plan under development.</p> <p><u>Accessibility:</u> this is contained in the document as a community priority and within the guidance in chapter 9.</p> <p><u>War memorial:</u> the Village Design Guide does not propose moving it, this can be clarified.</p> <p><u>Equestrian provision:</u> the feedback is welcomed and the guidance can clarify the requirement to accommodate equestrians.</p> <p><u>Tree species choice:</u> This is not specifically a Sawston issue and therefore not required to be covered in the Village Design Guide. Policies in Chapter 4 of the SCDC 2018 Local Plan cover the impact and mitigation of climate change. The new draft Sustainable Design and Construction SPD also contains guidance on trees and climate change resilience.</p> <p><u>Green infrastructure:</u> this is covered in chapters 6, 7 and 8 specifically which promote the role of green infrastructure in sustaining and developing the character of the village</p> <p><u>Secured by Design:</u> this is not specifically a Sawston issue and therefore not required to be covered in the Village Design Guide.</p> <p><u>Space for formal and informal physical activity:</u> the role of off-road routes and landscapes in new developments, in providing space for physical activity, is already mentioned in the Village</p>

	Design Guide. SuDS: This is not a specific issue to Sawston, specific guidance on this is contained within other policies of the SCDC 2018 Local Plan, as well as in the draft Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.
Proposed Modifications	Amend chapter 8 to add further guidance regarding equestrian provision. Amend Chapter 9 to clarify that it is not proposed to move the war memorial.

2. About Sawston				
Representations Received	Support: 1	Object: 0	Comment: 0	Total: 1
Main Issues in rep 67843	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A good summary – no further comment. Object – None Comment - None			
Council's Assessment	Welcome support			
Proposed Modifications	No modifications proposed.			

3. Community Input				
Representations Received	Support: 1	Object: 0	Comment: 1	Total: 2
Main Issues in rep 67839 67836	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An accurate description of the process Object - None Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I challenge the supposition that Sawston has any truly special characteristics. The few and far between that are unique don't make the village significant. I further challenge the reactionary assumptions that multiple storey buildings are innately bad and that the village entrances are precious. 			
Council's Assessment	<u>Welcome support</u> <u>Special characteristics:</u> Local character and distinctiveness derives from many aspects of place. Sawston's distinctive character is already recognised through the designation of its conservation area and many listed buildings. Non-designated spaces, buildings and landscapes also contain distinctive features and responses to the consultation show that there is widespread support for the characterisation identified. <u>Multiple storey buildings:</u> The Village Design Guide does not state that multiple storey buildings are innately bad, but it advises			

	<p>how buildings above two stories should be carefully sited and located. It is agreed that the term 'multiple stories' is ambiguous and the text can be clarified to better represent the intention of the guidance. It is noted that Chapter 6 which expands on housing density and design, has been well supported in the representations to this consultation.</p> <p><u>Village entrances</u>: the relationship of any built form to its surrounding landscape is key to its character and identity. The guidance states that development should enhance the approaches to the village and create an appropriate transition to the open countryside.</p>
Proposed Modifications	Amend text to remove reference to multiple stories and replace with reference to appropriate scale and building form.

4. Village evolution				
Representations Received	Support: 1	Object: 0	Comment: 1	Total: 2
Main Issues in rep 67701 67696	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This may need a little modification. Although there are archaeological remains going back to the Mesolithic, the name 'Sawston' itself is almost certainly traceable to the early Saxon period. <p>Object - None</p> <p>Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para 3, page 9, says "Church Lane is also considered unsafe by the community". By way of clarification, although street-lighting is poor, it isn't necessarily unsafe at the moment, given the limited amount of traffic currently using it, but, because there is a "pinch point" by the church, where there is no kerbed pavement, it would undoubtedly become unsafe, and access would be an issue, if up-and-coming or future housing developments were to use it as an access route from the High Street. 			
Council's Assessment	<p>Welcome support</p> <p><u>Naming</u> – we believe that the text correctly represents the origins of the village</p> <p><u>Church Lane</u> – it is noted that views may vary about the safety and this should be reflected in the text.</p>			
Proposed Modifications	Amend description of Church Lane			

5. Village character				
Representations Received	Support: 1	Object: 0	Comment: 0	Total: 1
Main Issues in rep 67702	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The paragraph on Industry should include a reference to the former Spicers site of the A1301, but within the parish 			

	<p>boundary. This has recently been acquired by Huawei and is likely to see major development.</p> <p>Object - None</p> <p>Comment - None</p>
Council's Assessment	The Spicers site lies outside the village development framework and is designated as an Established Employment Area within the SCDC 2018 Local Plan. It was incorrectly omitted from the coloured area on the map describing industrial areas.
Proposed Modifications	Ensure map shows the Spicers site as industrial. Add mention to the commentary on the industrial areas.

6. Sawston housing and density

Representations Received	Support: 3	Object: 0	Comment: 0	Total: 3
Main Issues in rep 68341 67848 67703	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The guidance on design characteristics for future development has been identified following detailed consideration of the architecture and layout of the village. It should be adopted for all future developments. I particularly support the proposals regarding the landscape setting on the village edge. Add that average density throughout the village is around 30dph BPHA: the use of terraces to raise densities is supported. <p>Object - None</p> <p>Comment - None</p>			
Council's Assessment	<p>Welcome support</p> <p><u>Density:</u> It is not possible to accurately state the existing density without a highly detailed survey outside the scope of the Village Design Guide.</p>			
Proposed Modifications	No modifications proposed.			

7. Building scale, materials and details

Representations Received	Support: 1	Object: 2	Comment: 1	Total: 4
67717 67714 67704 67697	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly support, especially 7.3 <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It could be entirely possible to create a high quality development on the edge of the village that draws upon and respects the character of the existing settlement and, in doing so, demonstrates that buildings of three or more storeys can be accommodated 			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I take issue with the proscriptive nature of this section. New edge of settlement developments have little linkage with the historic centre of the village. If new developments were limited to terrace housing in buff bricks we could easily end up with some pastiche that failed to deliver the housing needs of the district. Good design, creative and imaginative layouts creating a sense of place are perfectly possible without proscribing anything but a limited form. <p>Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7.3 refers to an upper limit of 3 storeys in village edge developments. It is highly regrettable that SCDC Planning Committee have accepted Hills' plans for site H1/b, when a similar overall density could have been achieved by following the design guidance and going for 2/2.5 storey terraces rather than 4 storey blocks of flats, and space and energy wasteful detached houses. This should not occur on future developments.
Council's Assessment	<p>Welcome support</p> <p><u>Height</u>: It is acknowledged that a range of views have been considered in drawing up the design guidance regarding height, as well as the professional skill and judgement of the authors. The guidance does not prescribe any upper height limit for development in Sawston but clearly states that the placement and design of larger buildings should respect and reflect the distinctive character of the village. The landscape analysis in chapter 8 shows that many of the edges of the village are characterised by a relationship to open arable fields and are visible in long views. It is therefore appropriate that building design on the edges should respond appropriately and not diminish the value and character of the landscape setting of the village.</p> <p><u>Design</u>: the guidance does not prescribe terrace housing in buff bricks. It states that a 'broad range of materials and styles' are present in the village and that the community have expressed an 'openness to good modern design'. We do not consider that the guidance represents an inappropriate level of prescription.</p>
Proposed Modifications	Amend wording to 7.2 to provide further clarity regarding height.

8. Landscape setting and village edge				
Representations Received	Support: 3	Object: 2	Comment: 2	Total: 7
Main Issues in reps 67852 67730 67720 67719 67715	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need an additional reference to likely development on former Spicers site and need to preserve Dernford Fen SSSI. Woodland Trust: We support the proposal in this section to retain existing trees and hedges and to look for opportunities to plant new trees and hedgerows to 			

<p>67706 67705</p>	<p>provide boundaries at the edge of development. We would also like to see new street trees and trees on areas of greenspace planted within new development, wherever possible. There is strong evidence that planting of trees can help create pleasant, healthy environments for local residents, as well as encouraging wildlife and helping to tackle wider environmental problems such as climate change.</p> <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fig. 36 shows a landscape buffer between industry and housing of a minimum depth of 20m. This figure appears somewhat arbitrary and is not predicated on a detailed assessment. The need for a buffer, its design and depth is best addressed as part of the detailed design process. • Sawston is described as being located 'in the Area of Restraint South of Cambridge'. However, there is no such allocation in the Local Plan. The Village is designated as a Rural Centre (policy S/8), which are described as '...the largest, most sustainable villages of the district' (para. 2.55). As such 'there is no strategic constraint on the amount of development or redevelopment of land for housing that can come forward within the development frameworks' (para. 2.56). Far from being an area of restraint, Sawston has been allocated as a location that can accommodate growth. <p>Comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft VDG incorrectly labels an important existing Public Right of Way as a Permissive footpath (page 16, section 8). In fact this is now a Restricted Byway. This VDG/SPD needs to be much more ambitious about enhancing existing and providing new access routes available to all non-motorised users (NMUs) i.e. pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. • Question value of current village edge views
<p>Council's Assessment</p>	<p>Welcome support</p> <p><u>Landscape buffer:</u> Figure 38 is indicative and it is correct that an exact buffer distance will be dependent on design.</p> <p><u>Area of Restraint:</u> it is correct that this designation is no longer present in the SCDC 2018 Local Plan and this reference should be corrected.</p> <p><u>Public Right of Way:</u> this was incorrectly labelled and should be corrected</p> <p><u>Village edge views:</u> the analysis shows that there are long and open views which mean that the village is visible from the surrounding countryside and edges should therefore be treated carefully in any new development</p>
<p>Proposed Modifications</p>	<p>Correct Public Right of Way</p>

	Remove reference to Area of Restraint Remove 20m reference from figure 38.
--	---

9. High Street and public realm				
Representations Received	Support: 3	Object: 0	Comment: 0	Total: 3
Main Issues in reps 68342 67716 67707	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocating a High Street makeover • BPHA: The proposed public realm improvements and frontages is supported although an appropriate upfront capital budget is important it is also critical that there is a long-term revenue maintenance budget • Support strongly. Agree with recommendations re High St. Would the recommendations be strengthened by including the whole of the High St. within the conservation area? At present, parts are within it and parts excluded. In places the boundary is awkward and not particularly intuitive. Fig. 43 could specifically identify this building as the Greyhound! <p>Object – None</p> <p>Comment - None</p>			
Council's Assessment	Welcome support			
Proposed Modifications	No modifications proposed.			

6. Schedule of changes to the SPD

Chapter 3

Community priorities, bullet point 1: insert 'sustain and enhance' at the start of the sentence.
Community priorities, bullet point 2: amend to 'Achieving dense, sustainable development using appropriate scales and forms of housing, that reflect the varying types of historic and contemporary homes in the village.'

Chapter 4

Paragraph 3 – amend 'Church Lane is also considered particularly unsafe by the community' to 'Church Lane is also considered unsafe by some members of the community.'

Chapter 5

Amend map to show the Spicers site as industrial in the colour code.
Add bullet point to the 'Industry' commentary to read 'Established Employment Area at the Spicers site to the west of the village.'
Expand character guidance generally.

Chapter 7

Page 14 paragraph 2, add 'where viable options for conversion can be found' after 'preserved' and delete 'some are already at risk'.
Fig 24: Correct 'Methodist' to 'Free'

Point 7.3 – delete ‘should not form part of new village edge development’ and insert ‘should be carefully sited in order not to detract from the character of the village when seen from key routes and views across open countryside.’

Chapter 8

Paragraph 1: Amend first two sentences to read ‘Sawston lies within the Cambridge Green Belt and the East Anglian Chalk National Character Area (NCA).’

Fig 38 – remove ‘20m minimum’ from annotation

Map: Correct ‘Permissive footpath’ to ‘Restricted Byway’

Add ‘desirable new routes’ reflecting British Horse Society feedback

Chapter 9

Fig 37 caption: delete ‘Monument could move to the edge of the junction and’

7. List of consultees

3CT (Haverhill Community Transport)	Brinkley Parish Council
A2 Dominion Housing Group	British Gas
Abbotsley Parish Council	British Horse Society
Abellio Greater Anglia	British Romany Union
Abington Pigotts Parish Council	Building Research Establishment
Accent Nene Housing Society Limited	Caldecote Parish Council
Advisory Council for the Education of Gypsy and other Travellers (ACERT)	Cam Valley Forum
Affinity Water	Cambourne Parish Council
Age UK Cambridgeshire	Cambridge and County Developments (formerly Cambridge Housing Society)
Airport Operators Association	Cambridge Area Bus Users
Anglia Ruskin University - Cambridge Campus	Cambridge Campaign for Better Transport
Anglian Water Services Limited	Cambridge Council for Voluntary Service
Arrington Parish Council	Cambridge Cycling Campaign
Ashdon Parish Council	Cambridge Dial a Ride
Ashwell Parish Council	Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum
Babraham Parish Council	Cambridge Federation of Tenants Leaseholders and Residents Assoc.
Balsham Parish Council	Cambridge Forum of Disabled People
Bar Hill Parish Council	Cambridge GET Group
Barley Parish Council	Cambridge Inter-Faith Group
Barrington Parish Council	Cambridge Past Present and Future
Barrington Parish Council	Cambridge Peterborough and South Lincolnshire (CPSL) Mind
Bartlow Parish Council	Cambridge Race Equality & Diversity Service
Barton Parish Council	Cambridge Regional College
Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council	Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Bedford Borough Council	Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Bedfordshire and River Ivel Internal Drainage Board	Cambridge Water (South Staffs Water)
Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association	Cambridge Women's Resource Centre (CWRC)
Bidwells	Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Combined Authority
Bluntisham Parish Council	Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust
Bottisham Parish Council	
Bourn Parish Council	
Bovis Homes (South East)	
Boxworth Parish Council	
Braintree District Council	

Cambridgeshire ACRE
 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough
 Association of Local Councils
 Cambridgeshire Chamber of Commerce
 Cambridgeshire Community Foundation
 Cambridgeshire Constabulary
 Cambridgeshire County Council
 Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council
 Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service
 Cambridgeshire Football Association
 Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum
 Cambs Fire Service (Operational Support
 Directorate)
 Campaign to Protect Rural England
 (CPRE)
 Care Network
 Carlton Cum Willingham Parish Council
 Castle Camps Parish Council
 Caxton Parish Council
 Central Bedfordshire Council
 Centre 33
 Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the
 Univ. of Cambridge
 Childerley Parish Council
 Chrishall Parish Council
 Church Commissioners
 Circle Anglia Housing Trust
 Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)
 Clarion Housing Group
 Comberton Parish Council
 Confederation of British Industry - East of
 England
 Conington Parish Council
 Conservators of the River Cam
 Cottenham Parish Council
 Country Land & Business Association
 Countryside Properties Plc
 Croydon Parish Council
 DB Schenker Rail (UK)
 Defence Lands Ops North
 Department for Business Innovation and
 Skills
 Department for Transport
 Department of Environment, Food and
 Rural Affairs
 Design Council CABE
 Disability Cambridgeshire
 Dry Drayton Parish Council
 Dunton Parish Council
 Duxford Parish Council
 Earith Parish Council
 East Cambridgeshire District Council
 Education Funding Agency
 EE
 Elmdon and Wendon Lofts Parish Council
 Elsworth Parish Council
 Eltisley Parish Council
 Ely Diocesan Board
 Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards
 Environment Agency
 EON UK plc
 Essex County Council
 Everton Parish Council
 Eynesbury Hardwicke Parish Council
 Federation of Small Businesses
 Fen Ditton Parish Council
 Fen Drayton Parish Council
 Fenland District Council
 Fenstanton Parish Council
 Fields in Trust
 Flagship Homes
 Flagship Homes
 Forest Heath District Council
 Forestry Commission England
 Fowlmere Parish Council
 Foxton Parish Council
 Freight Transport Association
 Friends of the Earth
 Friends, Families and Travellers
 Community Base
 Fulbourn Parish Council
 Gallagher Estates
 Girton Parish Council
 Godmanchester Town Council
 Grantchester Parish Council
 Graveley Parish Council
 Great Abington Parish Council
 Great and Little Chishill Parish Council
 Great and Little Eversden Parish Council
 Great Bradley Parish Council
 Great Chesterford Parish Council
 Great Gransden Parish Council
 Great Ouse Boating Association
 Great Shelford Parish Council
 Great Thurlow Parish Council
 Great Wilbraham Parish Council
 Greater Cambridge Partnership
 Guilden Morden Parish Council
 Haddenham Parish Council
 Hadstock Parish Council
 Hardwick Parish Council
 Harlton Parish Council
 Harston Parish Council
 Haslingfield Parish Council
 Hastoe Housing Association
 Hatley Parish Council
 Hauxton Parish Council
 Haverhill Town Council
 Hazardous Installations Inspectorate
 Health and Safety Executive

Helions Bumpstead Parish Council
 Hertfordshire County Council
 Heydon Parish Council
 Highways England
 Hildersham Parish Council
 Hilton Parish Council
 Hinxton Parish Council
 Histon & Impington Parish Council
 Historic England
 Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council
 Home Builders Federation
 Homes and Communities Agency
 Horningsea Parish Council
 Horseheath Parish Council
 Hundred Houses Society Limited
 Huntingdonshire Association for Community Transport (HACT)
 Huntingdonshire District Council
 Hunts Health - Local Commissioning Group
 Icení Homes
 Ickleton Parish Council
 Institute of Directors - Eastern Branch
 IWM Duxford
 Kelshall Parish Council
 Kier Partnership Homes Limited
 King Street Housing Society
 Kingston Parish Council
 Knapwell Parish Council
 Landbeach Parish Council
 Linton Parish Council
 Litlington Parish Council
 Little Abington Parish Council
 Little Shelford Parish Council
 Little Thurlow Parish Council
 Little Wilbraham and Six Mile Bottom Parish Council
 Littlebury Parish Council
 Local Nature Partnership
 Lode Parish Council
 Lolworth Parish Council
 Longstanton Parish Council
 Longstowe Parish Council
 Luminus Group
 Marine Management Organisation
 Marshall of Cambridge (Holdings) Limited
 Melbourn Parish Council
 Meldreth Parish Council
 MENTER
 Middle Level Commissioners
 Milton Parish Council
 National Association of Health Workers with Travellers
 National Grid
 National House Building Council
 National Housing Federation
 National Travellers Action Group
 Natural England
 Network Rail
 Network Regulation
 Newton Parish Council
 NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Group
 NHS England (Midlands & East)
 NHS Property Services Ltd (Midlands & East)
 North Hertfordshire District Council
 Nuthampstead Parish Council
 Oakington and Westwick Parish Council
 Office of Rail and Road
 Offord Cluny and Offord Darcy Parish Council
 Openreach
 Orchard Park Community Council
 Ormiston Children's and Family Trust
 Orwell Parish Council
 Over and Willingham Internal Drainage Board
 Over Parish Council
 Pampisford Parish Council
 Papworth Everard Parish Council
 Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
 Papworth Saint Agnes Parish Meeting
 Paradigm Housing Group
 Persimmon Homes East Midlands Limited
 Peterborough City Council
 Planning Inspectorate
 Post Office Property
 Potton Town Council
 Ramblers' Association [Cambridge Group]
 Rampton Parish Council
 Renewable UK
 Road Haulage Association
 Romany Institute
 Royal Mail
 Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
 Royston Community Transport
 Royston Town Council
 Sanctuary Housing Association
 Sawston Parish Council
 Scottish and Southern Electricity Group
 Shelter
 Shingay-cum-Wendy Parish Council
 Shudy Camps Parish Council
 Skills Funding Agency
 Smithy Fen Residents Association
 South Cambridgeshire District Council
 South Cambridgeshire Youth Council

Sport England
 St Edmundsbury Borough Council
 St Ives Town Council
 St Neots Rural Parish Council
 Stagecoach East
 Stapleford Parish Council
 Steeple Morden Parish Council
 Stow-cum-Quy Parish Council
 Strethall Parish Council
 Stretham Parish Council
 Suffolk County Council
 Sustrans (East of England)
 Swaffham Bulbeck Parish Council
 Swaffham Prior Parish Council
 Swavesey Internal Drainage Board
 Swavesey Parish Council
 Tadlow Parish Council
 Taylor Wimpey East Anglia
 Teversham Parish Council
 The Amusement Catering Equip. Society
 (ACES)
 The Association of Circus Proprietors
 The Association of Independent Showmen
 (AIS)
 The Cambridgeshire Cottage Housing
 Society
 The camToo Project
 The Crown Estate
 The Equality and Human Rights
 Commission
 The Gypsy Council (GCECWCR)
 The Kite Trust
 The Lawn Tennis Association
 The Magog Trust
 The National Trust
 The Papworth Trust
 The Showman's Guild of Great Britain
 The Society of Independent Roundabout
 Proprietors
 The Theatres Trust
 The Traveller Law Reform Project
 The Traveller Movement
 The Varrier Jones Foundation
 The Wildlife Trust
 Three
 Thriplow Parish Council
 Toft Parish Council
 Toseland Parish Council
 Travel for Work Partnership
 Traveller Solidarity Network
 UK Power Networks
 University of Cambridge - Vice
 Chancellor's Office
 Uttlesford District Council
 Visit East Anglia Limited
 Vodafone and O2
 Waresley Parish Council
 West Suffolk (Forest Heath and St
 Edmundsbury Councils)
 West Wrating Parish Council
 Weston Colville Parish Council
 Whaddon Parish Council
 Whippet Coaches Limited
 Whittlesford Parish Council
 Wicken and Upware Parish Council
 Wilburton Parish Council
 Willingham Parish Council
 Wimpole Parish Council
 Withersfield Parish Council
 Wood Plc
 Woodland Trust
 Wrestlingworth and Cockayne Hatley
 Parish Council
 Yelling Parish Council