

## Appendix 1 – Cambridge East Area Action Plan – Green Separation Consultation

### Representations from South Cambridgeshire District Council

Part of plan	Change sought	Reason for change
Policy CE/4 (1)	Retain policy as contained in the submission AAP but delete cross reference in part (1b) to Policy CE/6.	Even if the Green Separation policy is deleted, it remains an important function of the Green Belt to include land within it that provides green separation between Cambridge and the necklace villages.
Policy CE/4	<p>Include in Policy CE/4, new subsections to follow (f) that are moved from Policy CE/6 (3) and (5) and amended to take account of Inspector’s concerns, to read:</p> <p>“Green Belt treatment between Cambridge East and Teversham:</p> <p>2A. The landscape character of the Green Belt area that provides green separation with Teversham will ensure that open views from and into the Green Corridor from the “bell mouth” around Teversham at Airport Way enhance the sense of the village set in open countryside, whilst filtering views of the urban quarter.</p> <p>Green Belt treatment between Cambridge East and Fen Ditton:</p> <p>2B. Proposals for further development of existing rural uses in the Green Belt area that provides green separation with Fen Ditton will be considered in the context of the role and function of the area.”</p>	<p>The Inspector’s letter says that the problem with Policy CE/6 is that it duplicates Green Belt policy but with an even greater level of restriction, and is also over-prescriptive. Deletion of the policy designation and the restriction on open uses not prohibited by national Green Belt policy address those concerns. However, the landscape treatment of the areas providing green separation is a valid planning concern. Using the parallel of green separation at Northstowe, the Inspectors’ Report comments that “it is significant that the Council’s paper on green separation recognises that distance alone is not the key factor but that the treatment of the green separation is crucial” (paragraph 4.16). The adopted Northstowe AAP includes policies dealing with the appropriate landscape treatment of green separation to ensure it properly fulfils its function. Whilst the Inspector is minded to delete the green separation policy in the Cambridge East AAP, the same principles apply to the parts of the Green Belt that will provide green separation with Teversham and Fen Ditton. The submission AAP included a policy framework in Policy CE/6 to achieve this objective. The Council submits that these clauses should be moved to the Green Belt policy in a slightly modified form to reflect the Inspector’s</p>

Part of plan	Change sought	Reason for change
		concerns.
Para C2.4	Add to end of paragraph: “(see Chapter C3 on landscape)”	The tree belt within the site for Phase 1 was included in the green separation with Fen Ditton but is not within the Green Belt. Therefore with the deletion of the green separation policy there would be no policy framework highlighting the importance of the tree belt in maintaining adequate separation from Fen Ditton. This can be addressed through moving relevant text from the green separation chapter to the landscape setting chapter and adding a cross reference here.
After para C2.4	<p>Add 2 new paragraphs after C2.4, that have been drawn from C4.2 to C4.4 and amended to take account of the Inspector’s concerns:</p> <p>“C2.4A There are no clear features on the ground to assist with definition of the Green Belt in the vicinity of Teversham. The form of the new urban quarter will determine the eventual alignment and boundaries of the Green Belt at where it provides green separation with Teversham. The final extent and treatment of the Green Belt can be considered in more detail in the review of the AAP which will refine the Green Belt boundaries in the context of further work on the later phases of development, once Masterplanning is further advanced.</p> <p>C2.4B The landscape character of the Green Belt where it provides green separation with Teversham will be informal countryside as for the remainder of the Green Corridor but particularly so because it is at the meeting of the city and the countryside. The treatment</p>	<p>The Inspector’s letter says that the problem with Policy CE/6 is that it duplicates Green Belt policy but with an even greater level of restriction, and is also over-prescriptive. Deletion of the policy designation and the restriction on open uses not prohibited by national Green Belt policy address those concerns. However, the landscape treatment of the areas providing green separation is a valid planning concern. Using the parallel of green separation at Northstowe, the Inspectors’ Report comments that “it is significant that the Council’s paper on green separation recognises that distance alone is not the key factor but that the treatment of the green separation is crucial” (paragraph 4.16). The adopted Northstowe AAP includes policies dealing with the appropriate landscape treatment of green separation to ensure it properly fulfils its function. Whilst the Inspector is minded to delete the green separation policy in the Cambridge East AAP, the same principles apply to the parts of the Green Belt that will provide green separation with Teversham and Fen Ditton. The submission AAP included within Policy CE/6 and</p>

Part of plan	Change sought	Reason for change
	<p>of this area providing green separation will have a landscape character which ensures that open views from the “bell mouth” around Teversham at Airport Way into the Green Corridor enhance the sense of the village set in open countryside, whilst filtering views of the urban quarter.”</p>	<p>supporting text clauses to achieve this objective. The Council submits that the relevant supporting text should be moved to follow the Green Belt policy in a slightly modified form to reflect the Inspector’s concerns and support the change sought to Policy CE/4.</p>
<p>Para C3.5</p>	<p>Split para C3.5 and insert between the 2 parts, 2 new paragraphs drawn from paragraphs C4.7 and C4.8 and amended to address the Inspector’s concerns to read:</p> <p>“C3.5 The area north of Newmarket Road has tree belts that have been specifically planted as buffers. The main tree belts include a variety of species planted in a dense 30m deep screen surrounding what will be the first phase of development between the North Works and the Park and Ride site.</p> <p>C3.5A This tree belt is essential to provide adequate separation from Fen Ditton and should be retained and enhanced to maximise its benefit in providing separation from Fen Ditton (see Site and Setting chapter). Whilst in physical extent, the Green Belt providing green separation at Fen Ditton is limited, the width of the dense tree belt is such that it provides a strong visual barrier between the development and the village.</p> <p>C3.5B It is therefore crucial that the existing tree belt is retained and enhanced as part of the development to provide strategic landscaping. This could include, for example, extensions to the tree belt to vary its width creating a more interesting natural form, with selective</p>	<p>The tree belt within the site for Phase 1 was included in the green separation with Fen Ditton but is not within the Green Belt. Therefore with the deletion of the green separation policy and supporting text there would be no framework highlighting the importance of the tree belt in maintaining adequate separation from Fen Ditton. This can be addressed through moving relevant text from the green separation chapter to the landscape setting chapter.</p>

Part of plan	Change sought	Reason for change
	<p>additional planting and management of the existing tree belt with predominately native species. The tree belt should also link into other green areas such as the urban park on the Park and Ride site and Green Fingers through the development to provide a comprehensive network for amenity and wildlife.</p> <p>C3.5C The Park and Ride site itself has a rich and mature landscape, and is the remnant of the estate landscape that previously occupied this piece of land and includes a wooded belt featuring a wider range of species and ages. It forms the best landscape feature on the whole of the site.”</p>	

**Appendix 2**

**INDEPENDENT EXAMINATIONS**

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

**SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE**

---

INSPECTORS

Cliff Hughes BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI  
Terence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPi MCMi  
PROGRAMME OFFICER: Gloria Alexander  
Public Examination Office, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne Business Park,  
Cambourne, Cambridge, CB23 6EA  
Tel: 01954 713306  
Email: public.exam@scambs.gov.uk

---

Our Ref: GA/CE/Insp

Your Ref:

21<sup>st</sup> September 2007

Mr D Roberts, Planning Policy Manager  
Cambridge City Council

Mr K Miles, Planning Policy Manager  
South Cambridgeshire District Council

Dear Mr Roberts and Mr Miles

**Local Development Frameworks – Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire  
District – Cambridge East Area Action Plan**

The Inspector has asked that I pass on the following to you.

The Inspector is preparing his report on the Cambridge East Area Action Plan. On the basis of present evidence the Inspector concludes that the inclusion of Policy CE/6 (Green Separation from Fen Ditton and Teversham) will lead to a finding of unsoundness for the AAP. The Policy duplicates Green Belt policy but with an even greater level of restriction, and is also over-prescriptive. It fails tests iv, vii and ix.

The deletion of the Policy and its supporting text would render the plan sound. However, the plan has not been the subject of consultation on the basis of the exclusion of this material, and the deletion of this Policy is likely to be a matter of interest to local residents and other parties. To overcome this procedural defect and make the plan sound, the Councils should advertise the following proposed changes to the submitted AAP:

- 1) the deletion of Section 4 of the AAP i.e. Policy CE.6 and its supporting text
- 2) the deletion of the corresponding Proposals Map designation
- 3) the deletion of references to green separation in other policies and text, and the inclusion of editorial changes necessary as a result. The Councils should identify these deletions and the resulting wording.

Representations received as a result of the advertisement of the changes would be taken into account by the Inspector when he reviews his conclusions on green separation.

Yours sincerely,

Gloria Alexander  
Programme Officer

*Please note change of postcode to CB23 6EA. Please update your records.*