

## SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

**REPORT TO:** Conservation Advisory Group  
Conservation, Sustainability &  
Community Planning Portfolio Holder

**AUTHOR/S:** Conservation and Design Manager

26<sup>th</sup> April 2006

### DRAFT SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY

#### Purpose

1. To advise members of the Conservation Advisory Group on the outcome of the public consultation exercise for the draft South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity Strategy and seek support to recommend the adoption of the document as Council Policy, incorporating the proposed changes as outlined in the attached appendix 2.

#### Effect on Corporate Objectives

2. Quality, Accessible Services	The Biodiversity Strategy will be fundamental to the delivery of high quality planning services.
Village Life	The Strategy will have a significant impact upon the enhancement of village life by ensuring that new development seeks to conserve and further enhance biodiversity.
Sustainability	The Strategy will be fundamental to the achievement of sustainable development by seeking the conservation of priority species and habitats.
Partnership	The Strategy outlines the current extent of external and internal partnerships. Hopefully the Strategy will act as a catalyst for the forging of further partnerships.

#### Background

3. On the 26<sup>th</sup> January 2005 the Conservation Advisory Group considered a report on the developing *Biodiversity Strategy* that was to be statement of the Council's policy in respect of the preservation and enhancement of the district's biodiversity.
4. A further version of the Strategy was presented to the Group on the 27<sup>th</sup> April 2005 where the content and vision of the document was considered.
5. A final pre-consultation draft of the Strategy was presented to the Group on the 14<sup>th</sup> December 2005 for consideration and comment prior to its final draft production and undertaking of the consultation exercise.
6. Following printing of the draft Strategy, it was issued for public consultation via Members, all parish councils and selected conservation bodies and development organisations on the 10<sup>th</sup> March 2006. It was also published on the Council's website. The consultation period closed on 14<sup>th</sup> April. A number of comments were received after the end of the consultation period, but these have all been included in the appendix to this report.

## **Considerations**

7. Copies of the Strategy were also provided to relevant offices within Development Services, every Development Control Team, the Senior Ranger at Milton Country Park, the Land Drainage Manager, Huntingdon and East Cambs district councils, Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council, Government Offices for the East of England, CALC, CPRE, Cambridge Preservation Society, RSPB, English Nature, the House Builders Federation and many other local interest groups and multi-disciplinary practices. A full list can be found in appendix 1.
8. 24 responses were received and these are summarised in the appendix 2.

## **Options**

9. The Conservation Advisory Group are requested to either:
  - a) Recommend that the Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio holder presents a report on this matter to Cabinet seeking adoption of the draft South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity Strategy as Council Policy (subject to the incorporation of the changes outlined in appendix 2);
  - or
  - b) To require officers to bring a revised draft of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity Strategy to a future meeting of the Conservation Advisory Group incorporating additional amendments and revisions as agreed during the consideration of this matter by the Conservation Advisory Group at their meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2006.

## **Financial Implications**

10. The production of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity Strategy will be funded from existing departmental resources.

## **Legal Implications**

11. The draft South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity Strategy is to be adopted as Council Policy in the short term. Following adoption of the new LDF (due March 2007) the Strategy will be reviewed and cross-referenced to the relevant policies contained within the LDF. A sustainability appraisal will be prepared and the revised Strategy (together with the sustainability appraisal) will then be issued for further public consultation prior to adoption as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

## **Staffing Implications**

12. None specific.

## **Risk Management Implications**

13. The Council has identified the need to strengthen biodiversity conservation and to produce detailed biodiversity guidance for the development control process in accordance with PPS9: *Biodiversity and Geological Conservation*. Failure to complete

the publication and adoption of the Strategy may result in a lack of clear guidance and missed opportunities for biodiversity conservation.

### **Consultations**

14. The draft South Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Strategy was issued for public consultation as outlined in item 7 above.

### **Conclusions/Summary**

15. Members will be aware of the increasing need for biodiversity conservation and to deliver an enhanced quality of village life. The establishment and adoption of appropriate planning guidance on biodiversity is fundamental to the achievement of a high quality development.
16. It is perhaps relevant to note that PPS9: *Biodiversity and Geological Conservation* provides a significant steer for the planning guidance section of the Strategy and has been particularly well received by English Nature and the RSPB.
17. The Strategy will be an integral part of the emerging policy framework for the Council and will consequently have a major role to play in conserving biodiversity across the district. The full responses received in respect of the consultation exercise are set out in the attached appendix 2.

### **Recommendations**

The Conservation Advisory Group are requested to recommend that the Conservation, Sustainability and Community Planning Portfolio Holder presents the draft South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity Strategy to Cabinet to seek its approval and adoption as Council Policy, subject to the incorporation of the changes outlined in the attached appendix 2.

**Background Papers:** the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report: Planning Policy Statement 9: *Biodiversity and Geological Conservation*. ODPM, 2005

**Contact Officer:** Rob Mungovan – Ecology Officer  
Telephone: (01954) 713402

## Appendix 1 – Consultees in addition to those mentioned in paragraph 7

Mr Mark O'Connor Longstanton Action Group	Dr Roger Moreton Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group
Miss Sue Jeggo British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	The Director Friends of the Earth
The Director Forestry Commission	Mrs Jean Perraton Cam Valley Forum
The Director Cambridgeshire Association of Local Councils	Mr Gavin Stollar Network Rail - East Anglia
The Director Circle 33 Housing Trust	The Director Cambridge Housing Society Limited
The Director Granta Housing Society Limited	The Director Housing 21
The Woodland Trust Grantham	Mr B Jackson The Wilbraham River Protection Society
Mrs Julia Napier Secretary for the Friends of the Fleam and Dyke and Roman Road	Mrs Liz Kendrick Secretary for the Friends of the River Shep
Mr John Williamson Development and Infrastructure GO-East	Mr Mike Oxford Project Officer Association of Local Government Ecologists
The Wildlife Trust The Manor House Great Cambourne	Royal Society for Protection of Birds Eastern England Regional Office
English Nature, Bedfordshire Cambridgeshire and Northants Team	Januaries Cambridge
Mr Philip Clark Cambridgeshire County Council	Savills Cambridge
Highways Agency Operations Division Bedford	House Builders Federation Brightlingsea Essex
Bidwells Property Consultants Cambridge	Mr Roger Handford Environment Agency Brampton
Mr Don Proctor RPS	Carter Jonas 6 - 8 Hills Road Cambridge

## Appendix 2: Summary of Consultations Received on the Draft South Cambridgeshire District Council Biodiversity Strategy

Consultee	Nature	Representation	Assessment	Recommendation
Cllr Kindersley (Leader of the Council)	Support	<p>1) Thanks for the official invitation to comment on the Biodiversity Strategy.</p> <p>2) Two teeny questions: Page 66 has a pick of a bat box that looks extremely like a standard bird box. Is it? Proposals Map 3 (p 62) lists the Gamlingay to Wimpole CEA as chalk grassland in the key - is it?</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Minor points discussed, clearer pictures to be found. The Gamlingay to Wimpole CEA to be more accurately described.</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) Change supporting text of CEA 13, target habitat to, "<i>Acid to chalk grassland with associated woodlands</i>".</p>
Elsworth Parish Council (by Paul Harding)	Support and criticism	<p>1) You are to be congratulated on bringing together a host of information into what is an informative statement of the present and how the strategy may be taken forward. Inevitably, it is rather technical and the overall content is guided by SCDC's statutory obligations. These are not criticisms, merely statements of fact.</p> <p>2) If I have one criticism, the Strategy does not deal in any detail with the importance of roadside verges, both as relics of former agricultural grasslands and (in the case of new verges) as opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. Also roadside tree planting is an issue that perhaps should be considered more carefully in relation to the possible effects on biodiversity.</p> <p>3) It was good to see Elsworth featured several times, with the importance of both the Fardells Lane Village Green Space and Elsworth Wood being recognised.</p> <p>4) The introduction of the South Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Site Checklist, to accompany applications for new developments (infill, greenfield or brownfield) is an important step in attempting to control the progressive loss of local biodiversity. I foresee that its use will place an added burden</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted. The SCBAP BAPgr/1 seeks to specifically influence the management of road verges. It states that road verges represent a significant grassland resources. Tree planting schemes along roads should be considered for their impact upon existing grasslands of value.</p> <p>3) Noted</p> <p>4) Noted and agreed.</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) No change. However, ensure that the Tree and Landscape Officer shows due regard to the value of existing grasslands when taking forward the Tree and Hedge pack scheme and the Parish Planting initiative</p> <p>3) No change</p> <p>4) The Biodiversity Site Checklist should be amended to incorporate the following question before the section provided for any</p>

		on planning officials in ensuring that the information provided by developers is of sufficient quality and depth. I note that the Checklist, as included in the Strategy, does not ask for information about how the developer acquired the information provided. This would appear to offer opportunities for undocumented assertions to be made by developers, which would clearly go against the requirements outlined in the bullet points on page 81 of the Strategy.		additional information, <i>"Please list the source(s) of information used to complete this checklist"</i>
British Horse Society Cambridgeshire, Sue Jeggo Access & Bridleway Officer,	Comment	<p>1) Nothing in the strategy should impinge on public safety and/or rights of way. Rights of Way are protected by a number of Acts - The Wildlife &amp; Countryside Act 1981, Highways Act 1980, Rights of Way Act 1990 and Countryside Act 2000.</p> <p>2) Page 14 - Roadside Verges have become increasingly used by growing numbers of horse riders as a safe refuge to avoid the dangers presented by growth in traffic.</p> <p>3) Green strips around farmland can offer excellent opportunities for public access, as well as wildlife corridors.</p> <p>4) Please take into account the requirements set out in the County Council Rights of Way Improvement Plan, now a Statutory document.</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted</p> <p>3) Noted</p> <p>4) Noted</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) No change</p> <p>3) No change</p> <p>4) No change anticipated, however given the late date of the response further time is needed to read and consider the implications of the County Council Rights of Way Improvement Plan.</p>
Cambridgeshire County Council (Dominic Doble, Highways and Access Division)	Support and comment	<p>1) Broadly - after brief inspection, this document appears to be sufficiently well researched, clear and logically arranged to contribute usefully to the achievement of its ambition.</p> <p>2) It should be noted that in South Cambridgeshire there are significant coincidences of wildlife interest and public right of way, where it could be argued the latter has provided the protection that sustained the former. Roman Road and Ashwell Street are examples.</p> <p>3) I would suggest that provision of open space and routes</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted</p> <p>3) Noted, the Countryside Enhancement Area maps were provided to the consultancy team producing the Green Infrastructure Strategy</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) No change</p> <p>3) No change</p> <p>4) No change anticipated</p>

		<p>should be considered with current provision and current and likely future demand in mind. To this end I would recommend referral to the County (?) Greenspace Strategy. I would add that members of the public seeking a countryside experience could go home more satisfied if directed to an area of amenity open space having fed the ducks and seen a grey squirrel, than if they have been encouraged to use a site valuable for a species susceptible to trampling which they were unable to recognise. A lichenologist for example, would of course need to be treated differently to report a satisfactory visit. I am not sure that this level of sophistication is reflected.</p> <p>4) The Cambridgeshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan is not mentioned despite being occasional reference to countryside access for which it is the chief statutory guiding document in the county. The most pertinent Improvement Plan policies are Statement of Action Issue 6 action (6/3) calling for better conservation liaison and Issue 8 action 8/1 seeking an anti-fly tip programme on paths. The public right of way network is also the sensible basis for any attempt to provide attractive transport alternatives to the car, for instance for journeys to school from existing or new settlements (partly covered by actions under Issue 3).</p>	<p>and are suitably represented within it.</p> <p>4) Noted. Further consideration of the ROWIP against the Strategy required given the late date of the response. It is not envisaged that the implications of the plan against the Strategy will be significant.</p>	
<p>Little and Great Abington Parish Council (Patrick Daunt, Coordinator, Abington Naturewatch)</p>	<p>Support and comment</p>	<p><u>General</u></p> <p>1) This draft has been warmly welcomed in the Abingtons. The Strategy will both encourage and help to focus local activities to conserve and develop the natural environment within the framework of the Village Plan which the two Abingtons established last year. We particularly welcome the stress on partnership and general awareness, and the enhancement of widespread public enjoyment by these means and by means of improved access.</p> <p>2) Readers have had some difficulty with the structure of the document; we have not, for example, found the Proposals</p>	<p>1) Support for partnership and general awareness welcomed.</p> <p>2) Noted, it would appear that the maps may have been missed out during the printing process. No other responses have highlighted this problem. With respect to the use of various acronyms to</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) The maps contained within pages 41 to 55 should have designation type written in full, so that page 41 would read: <i>Local Biodiversity Area map 1. Beechwoods Local Nature Reserve, Great</i></p>

		<p>Map 3 mentioned in BS8 on page 60. We ask moreover whether there could be some simplification of terminology. In particular, it is not always easy to grasp or retain the distinctions between LBAs, SBGIs, SACs, SSSIs, LNRs, PPs, VGs and Wildlife Corridors, or to be sure how they are related to each other.</p> <p><u>Areas of Special interest or concern</u></p> <p>3) <u>The river Granta</u>. While none of the reaches of our river appears to be under serious threat of damage or deterioration, there is plenty to do both in surveying and recording diversity of species and in exploring how to increase public access. It is of course possible that in the course of this work we shall encounter more serious issues.</p> <p>4) <u>The disused railway</u> (between Great Abington village and the Land Settlement). This is an area of major concern; it has seen over the last two decades a severe decline in biodiversity which can only continue if counter measures cannot be devised. In the recent past SCDC's Ecology Officer has mentioned its possible designation as a Wildlife Corridor, and we hope that the Strategy will provide a policy basis for pursuing this or some effective alternative as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>5) <u>Diverse area to the south-west of Bourn Bridge Road, Little Abington</u>. An area bounded by Bourn Bridge Road, the old A11, the river Granta and the so-called Coach Road covers within a relatively small space and potentially rich variety of habitats (two diverse road verges including a PRV; an unpaved lane; arable; woodland; riverside; grassland grazed until recently). Results of our river survey, an improved mowing regime for the PRV and new farming practice could all promote biodiversity, while the pasture is at great risk owing to breach of planning regulations.</p>	<p>describe the range of designated sites, other readers have understood the distinctions between them. For example, table 8, page 39 lists all of the LBAs. Perhaps the full use of the wording (rather than PP or LBA) should be used more, especially upon the map headings</p> <p>3) Noted</p> <p>4) Noted. The disused railway line was visited in the summer of 2005 and was not considered at that time to be particularly noted worthy in terms of its flora or general continuity of habitats. A repeat visit could be arranged in the future with the respondent.</p> <p>5) Noted</p> <p>6) Noted. Partnership opportunities for conservation may exist and should be explored.</p>	<p><i>Shelford</i>. Page 48 would read: <i>Local Biodiversity Map 8. Fardell's Lane Village Green Space, Elsworth</i>. Page 53 would read: <i>Local Biodiversity Map 13. Babraham Pocket Park</i>.</p> <p>3) No change</p> <p>4) No change</p> <p>5) No change</p> <p>6) No change</p>
--	--	--	---	--



		<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>6) The above three items are exemplary rather than exclusive; the greatly increased awareness and exploration of our locality may well throw up other priorities. The Abingtons have established a means for engaging interested villagers in actively monitoring and promoting biodiversity, and for stimulating awareness among the public at large. Before long this endeavour may be checked unless there is practical support; meanwhile access to professional advice over a number of issues will be crucial, and we are confident that we can offer a framework for fruitful partnership.</p>		
Hazel Smith (Milton)	Support and criticism	<p>1) I really enjoyed reading the strategy - for a technical document it is interestingly put together and beautifully illustrated.</p> <p>2) In case you have not spotted them, here is a list of typo's (I don't feel qualified to judge anything else!)</p> <p>p19 bottom cell, first column - PrioRity</p> <p>p25 row3, col2 - siteS</p> <p>p31 under Prot of Priority Species and Habitats - SpecIAI Area of Conservation</p> <p>p38 under VGS 2nd line from bottom - SCDC</p> <p>p70 under the top right picture Wildlife Corridor</p> <p>p72 fullstop before Where in Guideline 4</p> <p>p79 Table 11 row3 col3 - even if IT only holds water seasonally (Full stops missing in these boxes)</p> <p>p80 Grass snake col2 - particularly THOSE? near to muck heaps Badger col2 full stops</p> <p>p81 2nd Col bullet point 3 needs closing bracket</p> <p>p82 3rd box Site totals 1 "ha" or more. Badger is not in the check list of Protected species</p> <p>p83 Summarised as. Box 3 - TemporarRy</p> <p>3) Congratulations on a very attractive and useful document.</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted and accepted</p> <p>3) Noted</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) Accept all identified typos</p> <p>3) No change</p>

Alan Alderson (Fen Ditton)	Support	<p>1) I must congratulate you on this. Given the amount of development that is being sought throughout South Cambs and the threat that poses to nature, you have very cleverly found a way to utilise almost any aspect of development to provide vital elements necessary for the biodiversity of wildlife. It has made excellent reading and I sincerely hope that it will be adopted.</p> <p>2) One plus for Fen Ditton, if I read it correctly, our recreation ground will be classified as an LBA. Is that right?</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted, respondent has understood it properly, the VGS falls within the LBA designation.</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) No change</p>
Meldreth Parish Council (Graham Borgonon)	Support	<p>1) Firstly congratulations on a very comprehensive document which was circulated to our councillors recently.</p> <p>2) It was good to see that the Melwood LNR was already mentioned in the document demonstrating everything is bang up to date.</p> <p>I have a couple of q's.....</p> <p>2a). The LBA map 5, which shows Melwood, also shows prominently the number of drains which used to flow in the direction of the River Mel.....</p> <p>2b). Re the Biodiversity Check List: this seems a good idea..... Whilst biodiversity may not be too much in the forefront of many parish councillors' minds, the checklist would be a useful reminder and locals may be able to add local knowledge. If/when the strategy is approved is the intention that this checklist be circulated to PCs with other planning application documents when appropriate?</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2a) Question addressed through discussion with the respondent.</p> <p>2b) The PC will not be expected to complete the checklist it will be the responsibility of the applicant. Text at the top of p82 explains this.</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2a &amp; 2b) No change</p>
RSPB (Kevin Middleton, Asst Conservation Officer)	Support	<p>1) Background South Cambridgeshire is located within the London-Stansted-Cambridge Growth Area. Therefore, the threats to biodiversity through development are likely to be great and only likely to increase. It is important that the Local Development</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted</p> <p>3) Noted. Whilst it is</p>	<p>1) to 10) No change</p>

		<p>Framework (LDF) recognises this and sets out ways to conserve and enhance biodiversity. The RSPB is pleased to see that the Council is intending to adopt this Biodiversity Strategy as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), in support of the LDF.</p> <p>2) The conservation and enhancement of biodiversity are priorities of the RSPB and as such, we are pleased to see that the strategy sets out considerable scope for this to occur on both small and large scales and also within developments, a key principle in this region if development is to continue at its current rate.</p> <p>3) Biodiversity Action Plan 2005 - 2008 BAP rw/10 – we are pleased to see mention of the RSPB’s Fen Drayton Lakes proposal under the issue of creation of extensive new wetland habitats. However we believe that this is an even more appropriate point to mention the nearby Hanson-RSPB Wetland Project at Needingworth Quarry.</p> <p>4) Local Development Control Principles The RSPB is supportive of the Biodiversity Statements and the thirteen principle issues. These should, the RSPB believes, aid conservation and enhancement of biodiversity within South Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>5) The primary objective must be to protect the network of statutorily designated sites (i.e. Sites of special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs)). However, it is important that non-designated sites and the wider countryside are also protected from inappropriate development, as these too have vital biodiversity resources. We are pleased to see this recognised. Wildlife corridors and Local Biodiversity Areas (LBAs) are ways in which the wider environment can be conserved. BS3, BS4 and BS8 set out</p>	<p>acknowledged that the Hanson-RSPB project is undoubtedly a significant habitat creation project it lies over the district boundary in HDC it is therefore not considered a scheme that SCDC can any longer influence to any great degree. However, it is considered appropriate to make reference to the scheme with section 4.3 p.73 on good biodiversity design.</p> <p>4) Noted</p> <p>5) Noted</p> <p>6) Noted</p> <p>7) Noted</p> <p>8) Noted</p> <p>9) Noted</p> <p>10) Noted</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>how these are to be protected. It is also important that these areas are enhanced, either through habitat creation or biodiversity provision in developments, such as green spaces.</p> <p>6) Where development that is harmful to either a statutorily designated site is permitted, compensation and/or mitigation measures will have to be put in place, in line with nature conservation law. BS5 sets this out and also puts in place measures for compensation and/or mitigation for non-designated sites, i.e. LBAs. The RSPB regards this as a matter of best practice and supports this principle.</p> <p>7) The enhancement of biodiversity is a key issue for the RSPB. Large scale habitat creation and restoration is a way of providing major biodiversity gains. We are therefore pleased to see that the Council has included BS7 – Countryside Enhancement Areas. Sites identified for large scale habitat creation have the potential to benefit both people and biodiversity and also help to meet Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) targets.</p> <p>8) However, biodiversity enhancements are not confined to large scale habitat creation. In line with the Government's Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9), development proposals should incorporate beneficial biodiversity features. There is potential for developments of all sizes and scales to provide for biodiversity and could help to meet BAP targets. Biodiversity enhancements can often be simplistic and easily incorporated within developments (as BS11 concerning the building of green roofs shows). BS10 provides for this, whilst the RSPB is also supportive of the guidelines outlined on pages 71 and 72 and would hope to see developers following these as measures of best practice.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>9) As the strategy recognises, 70% of land in Cambridgeshire is used for agriculture. Therefore, it is important to maximise the potential of this land, something the strategy sets out in BS13. Those BAPs which cover farmland are clearly of importance and the RSPB would hope that these are considered carefully and targets met. We are also pleased to see mention of stone-curlew, as South Cambridgeshire is part of it's historical breeding range. With careful management it is hoped that this species will return to its former range.</p> <p>10) The RSPB is supportive of the Strategy, and are pleased to see that it conforms with the principles of PPS9.</p>		
Environment Agency (Julia Massey FRB Technical Asst)	Support and request for inclusion of additional partnership project	<p>1) The strategy provides a comprehensive insight into existing features within South Cambridgeshire, and highlights the future provision of habitats.</p> <p>2) This document will be a useful guide, particularly when completing planning applications.</p> <p>3) Would there be scope to incorporate the Great Ouse Vision (GOV) within the document? The GOV aims to deliver a catchment/landscape scale approach to river restoration and connecting the river to its floodplain - to benefit fisheries and biodiversity.</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted</p> <p>3) Whilst it is acknowledged that GOV project is undoubtedly a significant habitat creation vision the vast majority of the area lies outside of the SCDC it is therefore not considered a scheme that SCDC can influence to any great degree at present.</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) No change</p> <p>3) No change recommended.</p>
Roy Gawthorp & Linda Flavell Rampton	Support	<p>1) Having read your survey I wholeheartedly agree with it.</p> <p>2) As members of the Woodland Trust we are well aware of the lack of trees in this area ..... I think the general public is slowly waking up to this problem but lots more needs to be done about this issue.</p> <p>3) It is particularly worrying about the amount of new homes</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted. Two tree planting partnership projects are highlighted within the Strategy.</p> <p>3) Noted</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) No change</p> <p>3) No change</p> <p>4) No change</p>

		planned and obviously the ODPM office is not very concerned about it from what we can see.  4) Keep up the good work and let's have lots more of it.	4) Noted	
Friends of the River Shep (Liz Kendrick, Secretary)	Concern and request for recognition of partnership project	1) The committee of ForShep (Friends of the River Shep) have studied the document and are concerned about obvious omissions in two particular areas.  2) LBA's (page 38 onwards). The areas of Shepreth which would fall under LBAs are: The L Moor, the River Shep, Riverside Walk, Docwras Meadow.  3) Partnership working. We have a partnership history with SCDC which is not mentioned despite ForShep's importance as a beacon conservation group (recognised by its selection as the launch pad of the Biodiversity Action Plan for Rivers and Wetlands).	1) Noted.  2) L-Moor is a SSSI thus is in the broad class of SBGI, the River Shep is classed as a Wildlife Corridor thus is afforded a degree of protection through principle BS8, the Riverside Walk is an area owned by CCC where public access is encouraged. It fulfils the criteria of LBA under points 1,2&4. Furthermore it may be worthy of LNR status. Docwra's Meadow fulfils the LBA criteria under points 1,2,3,4,6,&7. Furthermore it may be worthy of VGS designation following discussion with the landowner.  3) Noted. The partnership opportunities with ForShep should be recognised.	1) Noted  2) Recommended that the Shepreth Riverside Walk and Docwra's Meadow are included within the Strategy as LBAs.  3) Recommended that ForShep are included as secondary partners within the BAP rw/2 and are acknowledged in table the Lead Partner Acronyms on p 92.
Grantchester	Support	1) On the whole this PC is very impressed with the	1) Noted	1) No change

Parish Council (Spike Jackson, Chairman)	and amendm ent request	<p>scholarship and Thoroughness with which this document has been prepared.</p> <p>2) We were particularly pleased to note the support in the document for the Cam Valley Forum, and the inclusion of Byrons Pool LNR. Our only concern is regarding the status in the document of Grantchester Meadows (the area of grazing with public access which lies between the City boundary to the North, and the Mill Pool to the South). As I'm sure you are aware, this land has a very high public profile as well as a unique landscape character for this area. At present it is proving very difficult to find farmers willing to graze their cattle on this land, mainly due to market pressures on the cattle farming industry (but due also in part to issues around public access). This in turn is having an impact on the other flora and fauna of these meadows.</p> <p>3) Your draft document makes no explicit mention of this area of the river Cam, but we note that on Proposals Map 3 it is shown both as a wildlife corridor and as part of a "Countryside Enhancement Area". It is not clear from the map whether it should be considered as part of CEA 8, 11, or 15, since these all merge in the area South of Trumpington. Please could you clarify what value is attached, or what gain is to be expected, for an area identified as a CEA? Would it help attract funding for the preservation of Grantchester Meadows as an area of grazed water-meadows if it were given its own CEA tag?</p>	<p>2) Noted. Grantchester Meadows fulfils the LBA criteria under points 1,2,4,6,&amp;7. Furthermore it may be worthy of VGS designation following discussion with the landowner.</p> <p>3) Noted, P.59, BS7 explains the value of CEAs. It is felt that there would be an advantage in specifically defining the Granchester Meadows with its own CEA in order to raise its profile within the context of local development pressures.</p>	<p>2) Recommended that Grantchester Meadows is included within the Strategy as an LBA.</p> <p>3) Recommended that the area of land east of the M11 River Cam bridge (downstream) to the City boundary is classed as the Grantchester Meadows CEA (map to be presented at the meeting).</p>
Highways Agency (Andy Jobling)	Support	<p>1) Thank you for allowing the Highways Agency the opportunity to view the above-mentioned document. We welcome the strategy as a positive development to draw attention to the HABAP, which also contributes to the UKBAP</p>	1) Noted	1) No change
Horningsea PC (Michael Hellowell,	Support	<p>1) You'll be pleased to hear that your above draft publication has now been both well-thumbed and well received in Horningsea. We applaud your strategy in biodiversity,</p>	1) Noted	1) No change

Chairman)		(particularly in CEA ref: 4) and hope it will be adopted as a SPD, as we treasure our Wicken Fen vision and fully support The National Trust and all partners in The Bridge of Reeds project. We will be opposing all three CCC proposed WwTW sites (vaguely) in the Honey Hill area and requesting further searches for existing brown field sites closer to Milton.		
Home Builders Federation (Paul Cronk, Regional Planner)	Request for amendments	<p>1) General Points - In relation to the role and status of Supplementary Planning Documents, PPS12 makes the following points .....</p> <p>2) The Council will need to ensure that any requirements set out in the SPD clearly relate directly to specific policies in an adopted Development Plan Document. Appropriate cross-referencing will be required.</p> <p>3) The Council will have to assess the merits of any other planning requirements being sought (e.g. affordable housing, public open space e.t.c.) before coming to a decision as regards to the content of any Section 106 Agreement. It will also need to assess any such requirements in relation to the overall financial viability of any development.</p> <p>4) It should also be remembered that the advice from Government about what is appropriate to ask developers to contribute towards remains the tests set out in Circular 5/05. It cannot be stated that the developer should pay for the total cost for identified biodiversity schemes if these are also for the benefit of the wider public. The developer should only pay for those elements of improvement that meet the tests set out in Circular 5/05 and these cannot be known in advance, SPD or not.</p> <p>5) Detailed Points - BS6 Planning Obligations Circular 5/05 states that development should only be required</p>	<p>1) Noted. This version of the Strategy is not intended to go forward as SPD at present. Whilst the comments on the SPD process will be useful in the future at present comments on the content of the Strategy would have been more constructive.</p> <p>2) Noted</p> <p>3) Noted</p> <p>4) Noted. The view of the Planning Policy team is required</p> <p>5) Noted. The view of the Planning Policy team is required</p> <p>6) Noted. The need for a case-by-case assessment even for small developments is important with respect to</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) No change</p> <p>3) No change</p> <p>4) The comments on S106 funding and Circular 5/05 need to be considered in greater detail with the input of Planning Policy and reported verbally at the meeting.</p> <p>5) The comments on BS6 and Circular 5/05 need to be considered in greater detail with the input of Planning Policy and reported verbally at the meeting.</p> <p>6) No change</p> <p>7) No change</p>



		<p>to make provision for those facilities that are necessary as a direct result of new development and which fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the development proposed. Given the negligible impact from very small developments it has to be questionable whether a requirement for biodiversity provision from all developments does meet this requirement of 5/05.</p> <p>6) The suggested Planning Obligation requirement for the provision of at least 10 years site management costs should be deleted. Paragraph B19 of Circular 5/05 states that “as a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developer’s contribution should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested. Where contributions to the initial support (“pump priming”) of new facilities are necessary, these should reflect the time lag between the provision of the new facility and its inclusion in public sector funding streams, or its ability to recover its own costs in the case of privately-run bus services, for example. Pump priming maintenance payments should be time-limited and not be required in perpetuity in planning obligations”.</p> <p>7) Consultation - The HBF looks forward to being consulted on all future relevant LDF documents. It would appreciate being advised in writing either when any such document is being adopted, or when any DPD is being submitted to the Secretary of State. I look forward to the acknowledgment of these comments in due course, and seeing all the comments from respondents, and the Council’s responses to them, clearly set out in any final SPD document.</p>	<p>biodiversity. The need for 10 years worth of funding is based on the fact that many habitats take time to develop, such as grassland or may not need any significant intervention for a long period of time such as a pond. Therefore, the medium term management costs of these features is considered to be part of the “pump priming” that the Circular makes reference to. Furthermore, the overall cost is likely to be relatively small when considered against the money invested within a development.</p> <p>7) Noted</p>	
Shudy Camps	Support	1) I would like to congratulate you on an excellent document	1) Noted	1 to 3) No change

PC (Roger Lemon)	and request for additional protection of species and habitats	<p>which is very nicely presented.</p> <p>2) In relation to our own parish, I would like to make a specific point regarding roadside verges. The current policy seems to be to protect only those verges which have sufficient rare species/ biodiversity interest to justify protection..... <i>(comments made on protected roadside verges).</i></p> <p>3) The next point is not directly related to Shudy Camps, but personally I have an interest in butterflies and note that none are included in the BAP priority species list. Of particular interest is the chalkhill blue, which was recorded on Fleam Dyke in 2005 for the first time in many years, the small blue, which has been recorded in very low numbers at Gog Magog golf course and Barrington cement works, the grizzled skipper at Over railway cutting (soon to be at least partly destroyed by the guided bus route) and the green hairstreak, low numbers of which are also recorded on Fleam Dyke.</p> <p>4) I note also that Butterfly Conservation is not listed under 6.0 Useful Contacts and Information.</p> <p>5) I note that Fleam Dyke and the Roman Road are not specifically listed as Local Biodiversity Areas and in view of their increasing importance as chalk grassland habitats, I wonder why this is. I see that you are in touch with the Friends of the Roman Road and Fleam Dyke.</p>	<p>2) Protected roadside verges are an issue for consideration by CCC.</p> <p>3) Noted. It is not considered to be advantageous to use any butterfly species as BAP species in this Strategy. Where a species is already the subject of a BAP, such as the chalkhill blue, it will be considered as a Priority Species by default.</p> <p>4) Noted</p> <p>5) Noted. The Fleam Dyke and Roman Road sites are both SSSIs, thus they are considered with the category of SBGI.</p>	<p>4) Include the details of Butterfly Conservation within section 6.0</p> <p>5) No change</p>
Gt Chishill PC (John Murgatroyd)	Support and request for a broader influence to conserva	<p>1) Your Biodiversity Strategy Draft Report is most impressive</p> <p>2) I moved into Great Chishill in 1972. Maltings Lane and May Street was known as bat alley. We had glowworms, slow worms, grasshoppers, huge quantities of moths, butterflies and other insects, grass snakes, barn owls, corn buntings, frogs, newts, hedgehogs, .....None of these things are really in evidence these days.</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted</p> <p>3) Noted</p> <p>4) Noted. BS13 seeks to maximise the biodiversity</p>	<p>1 to 4) No change</p>

	tion	<p>3) My housemartin (and swift) nest occupancy has declined... When I come back from France or own West Country I am struck by just how sterile our countryside around the Chishills is.</p> <p>4) ..... putting up all these nesting sites possibly is not the main priority. Just as important must be to discourage the use of pesticides, encouraging the growth and spread of a wide variety of indigenous plants, stop the ruthless cutting back of hedges at inappropriate times, especially by the farmers, etc.</p> <p>5) .....we must get our priorities right. Educating the people who can most affect our countryside and biodiversity, especially the farmers. Incidentally, two of the three main farming landowners in my parish are friends of mine, but I can't say I have had much success in converting them I regret to say.</p>	<p>potential of agricultural land.</p> <p>5) Noted. Biodiversity Statement 6 seeks to promote biodiversity conservation and the local farming community will continue to be included within this (past partnership project of the Cam Sustainable Farming Project should be remembered)</p>	
English Nature (Tim Barfield, Conservation Officer)	Support	<p>1) This is a very useful, informative, well written and beautifully presented document which sets a high standard. I have only a few specific comments:</p> <p>2) Page 5: English Nature's open standards are called the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGST).</p> <p>3) Page 7: Is the vision to 'preserve' rather than to 'conserve' biodiversity? The latter wording would imply some degree of dynamic change.</p> <p>4) Page 38: Under statutory sites, you might consider making reference to the protections of SSSIs under the Countryside &amp; Rights of Way Act 2000, and the duties of the Local Authorities under Section 28G and 28I.</p> <p>5) Page 70: Traditional orchards were once a common site</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted</p> <p>3) Noted</p> <p>4) Noted. The duties of Local Authorities under the CROW Act are important. Table 14, p.94, National Guidance would be an appropriate place to clarify the implications of the Act for SCDC</p> <p>5) Noted</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) Accept requested correction</p> <p>3) Recommended change, p.7, replace "preservation" within "conservation"</p> <p>4) Recommend that appropriate wording of the CROW Act is included within Table 14.</p> <p>5) Accept proposed</p>

		<p>(sight?) across...</p> <p>6) Tables 10 &amp; 11: These are very useful.</p> <p>7) Page 81: The Biodiversity Site Checklist looks to be an excellent initiative.</p> <p>8) Page 89: English Nature's contact details are – Bedfordshire &amp; Cambridgeshire Team, Ham Lane House, Ham Lane...</p> <p>9) In addition I wonder whether you had considered if this document could also cover geological conservation? Do come back to me if we can be of any help on this aspect.</p>	<p>6) Noted</p> <p>7) Noted</p> <p>8) Noted</p> <p>9) The breadth of the Strategy is already very broad and it strives to incorporate the "Geological" of PPS9 through the category of Sites and Biodiversity and Geological Interest. However, at present given the small number of geological sites within the district it is not felt necessary to expand the breadth of the Strategy.</p>	<p>correction.</p> <p>6) No change</p> <p>7) No change</p> <p>8) Accept proposed correction.</p> <p>9) No change</p>
Milton Parish Council		<p>1) Milton Country Park We are surprised to find only one explicit reference to the country park in this document (two lines on p87). We were led to understand that SCDC had already agreed to pursue Local Nature Reserve Status for the country park so we're surprised to see it is still being "considered". Is the country park going to be included in the audit of all SCDC maintained land proposed in BAP target BAP urb/6?</p> <p>2) Black Poplars The strategy states in several places (e.g. p13, p21) that there has been no survey of black poplars and BAP target BAP tw/8 calls for a database to be produced by August 2007. It is our understanding that a survey was undertaken in</p>	<p>1) Noted. Progress has been made since the text was written. A management plan has been drafted for the park.</p> <p>2) Noted. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Biological Records Centre are leading the 2006 survey, checks will be made with them.</p>	<p>1) Recommended change to update wording appropriately.</p> <p>2) No change at present.</p> <p>3) No change</p> <p>4) Recommend change to broaden the identified bodies. In place of PPC add "<i>those managing</i></p>

		<p>2001 and identified approximately 300 specimens in the district. The results are lodged at Monks Wood. It may be that this survey removes the need for BAP tw/8 or at least considerably reduces the work needed to produce the database.</p> <p>3) Management of Roadside Verges BAP target BAP gr/1 calls for the development of an Environment Management Programme for roadside verges and implies that treating them as grassland is the way forward. We would question whether this is the best strategy in all cases. We have one roadside verge which we maintain (on the A10 bypass) which are deliberately not cutting at all, so as to encourage species progression.</p> <p>4) Churchyards and Cemeteries As part of your work towards BAP target BAP urb/2 you propose to produce a model management plan for PCCs. In our village the parish council not the PCC is responsible for management of the cemetery, so you should probably prefer to “PCCs and PCs” or perhaps more generally as there may be other bodies involved too, “those managing churchyards and cemeteries”.</p> <p>5) Allotments We note your comments in the “Relevance to South Cambridgeshire” column against BAP targets BAP urb/4 and BAP urb/5 where you say that “Allotments are being lost through change affecting many villages”. This has not been our experience, in fact if anything the demand for allotments is rising and we are bring (sic) plots back into use at the moment.</p> <p>6) Development of Cambridge Rowing Lake We note that the strategy supports the development of</p>	<p>3) Noted. The management of verges to retain them as grassland habitats is important in order to prevent their invasion by scrub.</p> <p>4) Noted</p> <p>5) Noted</p> <p>6) Noted. Badgers are protected species and as such will be subject to an appropriate level of consideration</p> <p>7) Noted</p>	<p><i>churchyards and cemeteries”.</i></p> <p>5) No change</p> <p>6) No change</p> <p>7) Accept all minor typos</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<p>significant projects with biodiversity gain such as: the Cambridge Sports Lake; Coton Farming and Wildlife Reserve wetland area; the Wicken Fen expansion; the RSPB's Fen Drayton Pits. We would like it to be ensured that developments such as this have the appropriate protection measures in place during construction to sustain current biodiversity interest of these sites, as is stated in BAP urb/1 for urban developments. For example we are aware of at least two badger setts (one of which is certainly in use) in the vicinity of the proposed rowing lake, and would like to ensure their protection.</p> <p>7) Minor typos  Page 8, para 2.3.1 line 2 "it's" should read "its"  Page 11, table 3 "Summary" should read "Summary"  Page 25, BAP target BAP urb/3, "site" should read "sites"</p>		
<p>WSP for  Gallaghers  Longstanton  Ltd (Andrew  Ricketts)</p>		<p>1) BS3 – Designation of Local Biodiversity Areas (LBAs).  It is not clear what the difference between a Site of Local Importance for Nature Conservation (SLINC) and a LBA. A LBA is considered to be a recent term and therefore should be explained and described in context with other designations (i.e. within the hierarchy of ecological designations). Such explanation would clarify if a LBA is considered as an additional tier of wildlife designation, and prevent confusion from the public (particularly in relation to the significance of the designation).</p> <p>2) BS4 – Protection and management of LBAs  It is not clear the difference between a Site of Local Importance for Nature Conservation (SLINC) and a LBA. An LBA is considered to be a recent term and therefore should be explained and described in context with other designations (i.e. within the hierarchy of designations). Such explanation would clarify if a LBA is considered as an additional tier of wildlife designation, and prevent confusion from the public (particularly</p>	<p>1) Noted. SLINC are not contained within this Strategy. The respondent may be confused with another area, or may be mean SBGI. However, their meaning is explained on p.38.</p> <p>2) Noted, As for 1 above.</p> <p>3) The need for 10 years worth of funding is based on the fact that many habitats take time to develop, such as grassland or may not need any significant</p>	<p>1) No change  2) No change  3) No change  4) No change  5) Proposed change of wording to be: SCDC will expect: 1) <i>Development to maximise the provision for existing biodiversity upon a site.</i> 2) <i>Development proposals to make provision for habitat enhancement features</i></p>

		<p>in relation to the significance of the designation).</p> <p>3) BS6 – Planning obligations. The Biodiversity Strategy for SCDC stipulates that in securing biodiversity gain, the ongoing management of these new wildlife habitats will be required for at least 10 years. What is the evidence base for suggesting that the ongoing management of these new wildlife habitats will be for ‘at least 10 years’?</p> <p>4) It is suggested that the following text is added at the end of the ‘securing biodiversity gain’ paragraph on page 58: <i>“The period of time that any management plan is required to cover will be negotiated taking into account the viability of the development and whether there are any other planning objectives which need to be given priority.”</i></p> <p>5) BS10 – Biodiversity provision in the design of new buildings It is unclear the exact difference between expectation 1) and 2). The opportunities to maximise biodiversity (as expected in 1)) would be to provide habitat enhancement features, which is considered again in 2).</p>	<p>intervention for a long period of time such as a pond. Therefore, the medium term management costs of these features is considered to be part of the “pump priming” that Circular 5/05 makes reference to. Furthermore, the overall cost is likely to be relatively small when considered against the money invested within a development.</p> <p>4) Noted. The present wording is felt to be adequate as it includes the word “usually” which would therefore imply that a degree of negotiation would be necessary.</p> <p>5) Noted. There would appear to be a degree of repetition when the exact wording is closely considered.</p>	<p><i>upon new buildings and associated structures.</i> 3) As previous.</p>
Foxton PC (Rob Brooksbank)	Support	<p>1) I feel that in general it is an informative document which will be of assistance to us in considering the impact on biodiversity of any future planning applications.</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted. It is felt necessary to at least</p>	<p>1) No change</p> <p>2) No change</p>

		<p>2) I would question how realistic it is to expect a checklist to be accurately filled out and advice sought from a professional ecologist for small scale planning applications and listed building applications although the implication from table 10 is that such an assessment should be included. Clearly for new builds or applications on or adjacent to Local Biodiversity Areas such an impact assessment is reasonable. Perhaps clarification of which applications would require such an assessment could be included in the document.</p> <p>3) I notice that BAP targets BAP urb/4 and urb/5 pertain to allotments. I understand that my fellow councillor David McKeown has already discussed the recreation ground extension project with you. I would like to clarify that a large part of that project involves the creation of allotments which will include hedgerow and wilderness areas to encourage biodiversity. Whilst I appreciate that the urb/4 target date of February 2006 has passed, we would welcome your advice on how best to create these areas and also on how to seek Wildlife Enhancement Scheme grants to contribute to this work.</p>	<p>have the expectation on the Council's side that the checklist should be completed, especially where sites may be complex rather than simply large. Furthermore, it clearly places a requirement upon applicants to show regard for biodiversity.</p> <p>3) Noted</p>	<p>3) No change</p>
<p>The Magog Trust (Michael Bond Lucy Evans, Governors)</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>1) We welcome the consultation document and find little to fault with it. The Policies and Guidance appear to us to be appropriate.</p> <p>2) The Trust's land falls wholly within Area 7 on Proposals Map3 and we strongly support the safeguarding of this area. The Trust has made representations to Cambridge City Council in respect of Omission sites that border the District boundary as we regard it as essential that there should be no encroachment onto the Gog Magog Hills from new development in and adjacent the City's southern boundary. Moreover we would wish to see a substantial green corridor</p>	<p>1) Noted</p> <p>2) Noted, SCDC are not able to determine landuse within the City boundary.</p> <p>3) Noted. It would be too restrictive if all areas of historic or potential chalk grassland were identified within CEAs.</p>	<p>1 to 5) No change</p> <p>6) Recommended that CEA 4 is expanded southwards to incorporate Fulbourn Fen SSSI (map to be presented at the meeting)</p>



		<p>within the City boundary opening up into the proposed Countryside Enhancement Area.</p> <p>3) We need to emphasise the importance of including all areas that have the potential to revert to chalk grassland if opportunities arise from the changes in climate and it's impact on the profitability of these shallow soils. This could be facilitated under the Environmental Stewardship Schemes..... <i>(detail regarding species edited out)</i>..... The area was famous for extensive sheep walks well into the 19th century.</p> <p>4) Perhaps the East Anglian Chalklands should be viewed in a similar way to the Great Fen Project.</p> <p>5) We are puzzled by the omission of Whitehill (TL 51 53) from the proposed Countryside Enhancement Areas leaving a gap between Areas 5 and 7. We also consider that Signal Hill and Meggs Hill (TL 51 51/2) are worthy of inclusion and believe that there is still an area of chalk grassland to be found at this location.</p> <p>6) Similarly we do not understand the omission of Fulbourn Fen SSSI from the Countryside Enhancement Areas given the importance placed on such habitats in the consultation document. It would be desirable to prevent it becoming surrounded by urban development given the pressures for new housing in the Cambridge area.</p> <p>7) We note that Fleam Dyke and the Roman Road are seen as forming the principal boundaries to Area 5. Yet both are designated as wildlife corridors. Some extension of the area to bring in the northern and southern margins of these routes appears desirable.</p>	<p>Furthermore, the Strategy is trying to draw attention to projects that have a degree of achievability about them, rather than simply being visionary.</p> <p>4) Noted. There is a concept project to focus on the Chalklands and their restoration. The detail of such is not for inclusion within this Strategy. However, the support for such a project would probably make an excellent partnership.</p> <p>5) Noted. There is no specific reason for omitting the sites referred to. The boundaries are partly arbitrary and in this case were taken from concept projects being developed for the Gogs area. In order to keep the Linear Sites project areas separate from the Gogs areas It is not felt desirable to join CEA 5&amp;7.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

		8) The Magog Trust would wish to be represented at any future discussions of the proposals and is willing to share information on its activities and the species diversity on our land with the District Council.	6) Noted. It would appear appropriate to include Fulbourn Fen SSSI within an CEA.	
Old Chesterton Residents Association (Michael Bond Secretary)	Support and amendm ents	<p>1) Old Chesterton Residents Association (OCRA) has been made aware of the Draft South Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Strategy and wishes to comment on the Countryside Enhancement Area 3: Milton to Waterbeach wetland habitats, inc. fen and wet grassland. We would ask that the strategy include the area of Milton up to the Cambridge City Council boundary within Area 3, i.e. Chesterton Fen. This area is part of the river habitat and active flood plain yet has apparently been abandoned to its fate in terms of its biodiversity.</p> <p>2) OCRA's interest stems from the fact that this area was, until recent incursions by illegal industrial activities, regularly used by residents for recreational purposes as the Fen Road provides a route parallel to the river and accords the opportunity for circular walks of varying length through potentially pleasant countryside. We consider that the area is inappropriate for the level of development already existing and action is needed to stem the growth of activities that are imposing undue burdens on an inadequate access.</p> <p>3) We note from pages 31 and 32 that the District Council will consider using Article 4 Directions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 to control development that is of potential harm and maximise opportunities for biodiversity within new developments. We consider that the area of Chesterton Fen constitutes a particularly sensitive area as it lies within the Green Belt and has very limited access by virtue of being circumscribed by the Cambridge Northern Bypass, the railway and the river. The greater part lies within Milton Parish but the impact of</p>	<p>1) Noted. The area is known to have areas of damp grassland.</p> <p>2) Noted</p> <p>3) Noted</p> <p>4) Noted. Discussion also required with the Planning Policy team</p>	<p>1) Recommended that the CEA3 be extended southwards taking in parts of Chesterton Fen up to the railway line on the western side and the Cam on the east (map to be presented at the meeting).</p> <p>2 to 4) No change</p>

		<p>development falls on Chesterton village, as all traffic has to pass through the village to access Chesterton Fen.</p> <p>4) I am copying this to the City Council as it is essential that the two authorities adopt a mutually consistent approach to this area that will result in long-term benefit to the settled traveller community in Chesterton Fen and to our members.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

