

Schedule of responses to the Technical Annex

Site Specific Policies - Responding to a Housing Shortfall - Technical Annex

Public Participation Report

Chapter 3 - Housing Shortfall Site Assessment Criteria

TA 3.11

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Chapter 3 - Housing Shortfall Site Assessment Criteria

TA 3.11

23270 - Natural England

Object

For general information regarding impacts on water quality and quantity, the Cambridge Water Cycle Strategy currently being prepared by Cambridgeshire Horizons could be referred to . Phase 1 of the project has recently been completed and it aims to ensure sustainable management of water resources (supply and disposal) as the area is developed, including protection of internationally designated conservation sites .

The documents of the Local Development Framework must be read together and the Development Control Policies DPD contains policies about water quality and quality and sustainable use of water. There is no need for specific mention of the Water Cycle Strategy in the Site Specific Policies DPD. It will be a material consideration in applying those policies at the planning application stage.

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Chapter 5 - Detailed Site Assessments: Sites Passing Tier 1 and Subject to Tier 2 Assessment
Tier 2 - Section C

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22668 - Unex Holdings Limited	Object	<p>The site details should be amended to note that in the planning history the appeal for residential development on both of the sites; number APP/W0530/A/08/2062801 was dismissed on the grounds of design , and insufficient contributions for affordable housing and renewable energy. The paragraph Deliverable Completions by 2016 and the Conclusion for Sites 1 and 2 should reflect that the sites are not viable, deliverable or developable for housing. Without these amendments the proposal will fail the tests of soundness.</p>	<p>The respondent argues that the site is not deliverable or developable. They refer to a recent appeal decision on sites 1 and 2 (RD/SSPEXAM/260) which was for 182 dwellings and was dismissed on the grounds of design and because it did not meet the development plan requirements for affordable housing and provision of 10% renewable energy. The respondent argues that the level of development assumed in the housing shortfall work would not be viable (100 dwellings). They say the SOS decision now imposes greater costs on the development to meet the policy targets in full. They say the SOS considered the density of the proposal to be acceptable although they recognise that the design was not accepted. They point to the requirements on the new parcels are higher than on the approved 900 units on Orchard Park and that the sites will therefore not come forward while there are sites that can be delivered at lower cost. They conclude that the appeal decision prevents viable development of the site.</p> <p>The Council notes that the appeal decision confirms that residential use on the sites is acceptable in principle, that the objective of providing a sustainable mixed use development would not be compromised, and that it would provide housing in a sustainable location consistent with regional and Core Strategy policies as the housing would be in a preferred location for development. It concludes that the proposal would be an efficient use of land and provide much needed housing in a sustainable location. It also concludes that the provision and range of employment land would not be materially affected. The appeal also confirms the proposal provides sufficient open space (through contributions) and adequate car parking provision. It confirms that the site would not be subject to unacceptable noise levels from existing noise sources and that it would provide a satisfactory environment in terms of air quality and would provide a safe environment for its inhabitants. It also confirms that there would not be a material adverse impact on the highway network in the am and pm peaks. The appeal identified specific problems with the development in terms of its design and in terms of affordable housing provision and renewable energy provision. In particular, the SOS commented that the appellant had made no efforts to optimize the chances of the scheme attracting grant and the conscious decision not to rely on Social Housing Grant has had consequences for the overall viability of the proposal.</p> <p>The Council notes the respondent's concerns relating to potential viability of these sites for residential development. However, the principle that residential use would be appropriate has been established and viability is an extremely sensitive calculation that depends to a significant extent on the assumptions built into financial modeling, the overall package of obligations and market conditions at the time of negotiations. In particular, a scheme which optimizes the chances of securing affordable housing grant would have a material impact on overall viability. Whilst the Council cannot give a guarantee to the respondent that a viable scheme can be granted planning permission, the Council does not accept on the basis of one particular scheme considered through the appeal process, that it can be concluded that a viable scheme will not be able to be permitted and developed by 2016. Viability is a relevant planning consideration, subject to the achievement of a scheme that is acceptable in planning terms. The affordable housing policy (Development Control Policies DPD, Policy HG/3) specifically states that viability will be taken into account in determining planning applications. The number of dwellings assumed for the housing shortfall work is not a ceiling on any scheme and it is possible that a suitable scheme in design terms could come forward that achieves a higher number of units whilst still meeting other policy requirements. However, the 100 dwellings over the 2 sites is considered a robust figure to use for the housing shortfall purposes. It is accepted that this is not clear in the proposed new wording for the</p>

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

supporting text and a change is proposed. The argument about these parcels being more expensive than the remainder of the Orchard Park development is not relevant in housing land supply terms, because the Council is assuming that the existing approved residential development will be completed by 2012/13. Even if there is some slippage on that timetable because of market conditions, it is reasonable to assume that the additional sites could be developed by 2016.

ACTION

Amend the 3rd sentence of proposed paragraph 2.3 to read:

"These known parcels could provide in the order of 220 additional dwellings, although the final number will be determined through detailed planning applications, and could be higher, although regard must be had to the constraints on these parcels."

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

Council's Assessment

Tier 2 - Section C

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22669 - Unex Holdings Limited	Object	The site details should be amended to note that in the planning history the appeal for residential development on both of the sites; number APP/W0530/A/08/2062801 was dismissed on the grounds of design , and insufficient contributions for affordable housing and renewable energy. The paragraph Deliverable Completions by 2016 and the Conclusion for Sites 1 and 2 should reflect that the sites are not viable, deliverable or developable for housing. Without these amendments the proposal will fail the tests of soundness.	<p>The respondent argues that the site is not deliverable or developable. They refer to a recent appeal decision on sites 1 and 2 (RD/SSPEXAM/260) which was for 182 dwellings and was dismissed on the grounds of design and because it did not meet the development plan requirements for affordable housing and provision of 10% renewable energy. The respondent argues that the level of development assumed in the housing shortfall work would not be viable (100 dwellings). They say the SOS decision now imposes greater costs on the development to meet the policy targets in full. They say the SOS considered the density of the proposal to be acceptable although they recognise that the design was not accepted. They point to the requirements on the new parcels are higher than on the approved 900 units on Orchard Park and that the sites will therefore not come forward while there are sites that can be delivered at lower cost. They conclude that the appeal decision prevents viable development of the site.</p> <p>The Council notes that the appeal decision confirms that residential use on the sites is acceptable in principle, that the objective of providing a sustainable mixed use development would not be compromised, and that it would provide housing in a sustainable location consistent with regional and Core Strategy policies as the housing would be in a preferred location for development. It concludes that the proposal would be an efficient use of land and provide much needed housing in a sustainable location. It also concludes that the provision and range of employment land would not be materially affected. The appeal also confirms the proposal provides sufficient open space (through contributions) and adequate car parking provision. It confirms that the site would not be subject to unacceptable noise levels from existing noise sources and that it would provide a satisfactory environment in terms of air quality and would provide a safe environment for its inhabitants. It also confirms that there would not be a material adverse impact on the highway network in the am and pm peaks. The appeal identified specific problems with the development in terms of its design and in terms of affordable housing provision and renewable energy provision. In particular, the SOS commented that the appellant had made no efforts to optimize the chances of the scheme attracting grant and the conscious decision not to rely on Social Housing Grant has had consequences for the overall viability of the proposal.</p> <p>The Council notes the respondent's concerns relating to potential viability of these sites for residential development. However, the principle that residential use would be appropriate has been established and viability is an extremely sensitive calculation that depends to a significant extent on the assumptions built into financial modeling, the overall package of obligations and market conditions at the time of negotiations. In particular, a scheme which optimizes the chances of securing affordable housing grant would have a material impact on overall viability. Whilst the Council cannot give a guarantee to the respondent that a viable scheme can be granted planning permission, the Council does not accept on the basis of one particular scheme considered through the appeal process, that it can be concluded that a viable scheme will not be able to be permitted and developed by 2016. Viability is a relevant planning consideration, subject to the achievement of a scheme that is acceptable in planning terms. The affordable housing policy (Development Control Policies DPD, Policy HG/3) specifically states that viability will be taken into account in determining planning applications. The number of dwellings assumed for the housing shortfall work is not a ceiling on any scheme and it is possible that a suitable scheme in design terms could come forward that achieves a higher number of units whilst still meeting other policy requirements. However, the 100 dwellings over the 2 sites is considered a robust figure to use for the housing shortfall purposes. It is accepted that this is not clear in the proposed new wording for the</p>

Representations**Nature Representation Summary****Council's Assessment**

supporting text and a change is proposed. The argument about these parcels being more expensive than the remainder of the Orchard Park development is not relevant in housing land supply terms, because the Council is assuming that the existing approved residential development will be completed by 2012/13. Even if there is some slippage on that timetable because of market conditions, it is reasonable to assume that the additional sites could be developed by 2016.

ACTION

Amend the 3rd sentence of proposed paragraph 2.3 to read:

"These known parcels could provide in the order of 220 additional dwellings, although the final number will be determined through detailed planning applications, and could be higher, although regard must be had to the constraints on these parcels."

Tier 2 - Section B

22767	Object	This area supports a number of protected species such as badgers, bats, water voles and brown hares. Such a large site development would create substantial ecological damage, especially if the rest of the surrounding area was infilled with major sporting and leisure facilities rather than wildlife facilities.	Whilst there will be a requirement to provide open space uses in accordance with the Council's open space standards, the proposed policy also includes subsection 15 which requires a full programme of ecological surveys and a Biodiversity Strategy to be prepared. Subsection 16 requires a Countryside Enhancement Strategy to be prepared and implemented to provide landscape, biodiversity and public access enhancements. An appropriate balance between these aspects will be necessary to ensure that the ecology of the area, and in particular protected species, are protected and enhanced.
22766	Object	There is a public right of way from Thornton Estate and the end of Whitehouse Lane to Histon Road, Impington which would be probably lost if site 6 was to be developed.	The public right of way running across the Green Belt area of separation between Cambridge and Girton and would need to be addressed through the detailed masterplanning of the site at the planning application stage. It lies outside the site proposed for development but may be affected by proposals for the green separation. Masterplanning will need to take account of the relationship of the site with adjoining new development in Cambridge City and the village of Girton. The future of the footpath will be a matter for detailed consideration at that time.
22765	Object	There is a serious problem of flooding in this area. The reference to the NIAB drainage ditch is incorrect. It is a local natural stream which used to be open but is now piped in some sections. It is slow flowing with limited drainage capacity. The area has flooded in the past and the building of an underwater lagoon in the meadows has not solved this flooding. All the field ditches were blocked off when the A14 northern bypass was built.	The issue of whether a satisfactory drainage solution could be achieved at the NIAB site was considered in some detail at a Technical Hearing at the public examination. The Environment Agency appeared and provided a statement that concluded that a satisfactory solution would be able to be found. This will need to take full account of the current drainage situation both on the site and impacts on adjoining areas and settlements downstream to ensure no worsening, and if possible an improvement, in the current situation. The proposed policy for the site addresses these issues at subsection 17.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
<i>Site 11 - The Ida Darwin Hospital, Fulbourn</i>			
22918 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The designation of Ida Darwin as a Major Development Site in the Green Belt, whilst offering some potential for redevelopment, would not facilitate the erection of 274 dwellings together with the required mental health facilities on the Fulbourn site.</p> <p>Whilst it is conceivable, although not certain, that the development might be provided within the same footprint, the resultant floorspace and height of the buildings would exceed that of the existing buildings.</p> <p>This needs to be addressed as suggested in accompanying representations.</p>	The matters raised by this representation have been addressed in response to representation number 22917.
22916 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	<p>Site Area:</p> <p>When referring to the site area, reference should be made to both Ida Darwin (14.1 ha) and Fulbourn Hospital (14.38 ha) as Policy SP/7c is thought to refer to both sites and they are intrinsically connected by ownership and development proposals.</p>	The "Responding to a Housing Shortfall" evaluation is intended to identify potential sites which would be appropriate for housing development and could therefore be relied upon to make up the housing shortfall identified by the Inspectors examining the Site Specific Policies DPD. The Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust has no aspirations to build housing on the Fulbourn Hospital site, rather it proposes to expand mental healthcare provision on that site. The Trust is only seeking housing development on the Ida Darwin Hospital site. Referring to the site area of both hospitals in this work would therefore be misleading.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22917 - Cambridgeshire & Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust	Object	<p>Housing Capacity:</p> <p>The overall conclusion that that the assumed capacity of the site is 250-275 dwellings is supported; however objections are raised on how the numbers are calculated.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A developable area of 8 ha at Ida Darwin East has a capacity to accommodate 274 dwellings at an average density of 33 dph, not 40 dph as stated. 2. No reference is made to the requirement to look at floorspace and building height in addition to building footprint. 3. The current building footprint is stated as 19,196.3 sqm excluding the Cook/Chill building and the Windmill School. The Trust calculates the current building footprint to be 18,416 sqm excluding the Cook/Chill building, the facilities building and the social club. The Windmill School is also excluded as it is now in separate ownership. 4. The theoretical calculation of capacity fails to reflect the private housing mix as required in Policy HG/2. 	<p>Support that the overall capacity of the site for housing development of 250-275 dwellings is noted.</p> <p>Concerns on how the numbers are calculated are also noted with the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Mental Health Trusts proposals have evolved since its evidence was presented to the examination inspectors in November 2007. At that time the Trust was proposing that 6.9 hectares of the Ida Darwin Hospital site be redeveloped for 250-275 dwellings at a specified density of 40dph. The Trust now proposes to develop the same number of dwellings over a larger site area resulting in a lower density of development, Masterplanning work undertaken by the Council's joint urban design team at the end of 2008 suggests that this lower density would be more compatible with the character of the site and adjoining development in Fulbourn village. 2. The requirement in respect of redevelopment and height of buildings in PPG2 and Development Control Policies DPD is that they should not exceed the height of the existing buildings. The Ida Darwin site comprises a mixture of single and two storey buildings spread across the site. When considering redevelopment, policy GB/4 and PPG2 Annex C require that proposals are determined having regard to all material considerations, including the overall impact on the purposes for including and in the Green Belt. PPG2 advised that the character and dispersal of proposed redevelopment will need to be considered as well as its footprint. In this case many houses with a smaller footprint on this part of the site would be acceptable because: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The overall height of existing buildings on the Ida Darwin site would not be exceeded (b) together with their gardens they would occupy just over half of the existing site and the remainder of which would be made open; and (c) the new buildings would be located on the lowest part of the site closest to the existing village with the buildings on the higher part being removed. 3. The building footprint information relied upon by the Council is that supplied by the Trust. At the time of the examination hearing, the figure supplied for the Ida Darwin site (excluding the Cook/Chill building and Windmill School) was 19,163.3 sq.m. The Trust now puts forward a figure of 18,416sq.m - it is a matter for the Trust to ensure that the floorspace information that it puts forward is correct. Nevertheless, the Council's calculation at the time of the examination was that the development of 250-275 dwellings was a "worse case" option based on 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings. Any development would include a proportion of 2 bedroom dwellings which would leave a greater amount of building footprint available for re-provision at the Fulbourn Hospital site. In responding to the NHS Foundation Trust's evidence the Council has repeatedly advised that Policy GB4/4 provides a framework which, together with the very special circumstances of the NHS Foundation Trust's to provide mental healthcare from the its estate at Fulbourn, provides a sufficiently robust and flexible policy basis for a housing redevelopment on the Ida Darwin Hospital site and for additional mental healthcare provision on the Fulbourn Hospital site. 4. The theoretical calculation of capacity included in the Council's examination evidence tested the floorspace requirement for 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings to test "worse case" options. A larger number of smaller units will mean that there would be a greater amount of floorspace available for the provision of new mental healthcare facilities on the Fulbourn Hospital site.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
<i>Site 14 - Land North of the A428, Cambourne</i>			
23188 - Martin Grant Homes Limited 23199 - Harcourt Developments Limited	Object	<p>We object to the Council's assessment of the suitability of our clients' site for development as set out in Chapter 5 of their Technical Annex. The majority of the Council's comments in relation to development of the site are matters that can be resolved at the master planning stage.</p> <p>Detailed representations have also been submitted on: sustainability, road capacity, archaeology, drainage, ecology, education requirements, settlement character, appearance and impact, and the relationship with the existing settlement.</p> <p>In supporting the merits of development north of the A428, we rely upon the findings of the technical paper prepared by Peter Brett Associates (dated 19 August 2008) and the ecological appraisal prepared by Cresswell Associates (dated August 2008).</p>	<p>It is not accepted that the key issues raised in the comparative site assessment, or indeed in the Council's evidence to the Examination, are matters that can be resolved at the masterplanning stage. Cambourne is at the bottom of the Core Strategy development sequence. There are also fundamental site specific concerns about the poor relationship of the site with the existing village of Cambourne that cannot be overcome, being physically and visually separated from it by both the A428 dual carriageway and the former A428.</p>
<i>Tier 2 - Section A</i>			
23190 - Martin Grant Homes Limited 23201 - Harcourt Developments Limited	Object	<p>The LPA have ranked Cambourne as the least sustainable of the Rural Centre locations in terms of its relative accessibility by sustainable transport modes to Cambridge. It takes little account of the availability of services and facilities within Cambourne, including retail, employment and education. The settlement will also become more sustainable with the quantum of development proposed on the omission site north of the A428. The provision of a secondary school on this site will also help to improve the sustainability merits of Cambourne generally.</p>	<p>The Council considered the relative sustainability merits of the 5 Rural Centres to test whether there was a distinction to be made that should inform the assessment of site options to make up the housing shortfall. That assessment (at Chapter 4 of the Technical Appendix) demonstrated that Cambourne is less sustainable than the other Rural Centres in terms of accessibility to Cambridge by sustainable modes of transport and that the level of services and facilities broadly reinforced that order. Even if a secondary school were provided at Cambourne (which the County Council is considering without any further allocations at Cambourne) this would not make it so much more sustainable as to change this position.</p>
23198 - Martin Grant Homes Limited 23209 - Harcourt Developments Limited	Object	<p>The County Council has advised that there is a need for a secondary school to serve Cambourne. This can be provided as part of a comprehensive approach to the development of the omission site north of the A428.</p>	<p>The County Council has advised that it is considering the provision of a secondary school to serve Cambourne without any further allocations. The District Council does not consider that site 6 would be a good location for a secondary school to serve the whole of Cambourne due to the physical separation from the main body of Cambourne by the A428 and the village approach roads.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
23189 - Martin Grant Homes Limited 23200 - Harcourt Developments Limited	Object	<p>The public transport strategy proposed to support development of the site is based on a hub and feeder approach comprising of a network of routes providing accessible and convenient public transport choices linking an enlarged Cambourne settlement with existing transport nodes to the north, south, east and west. The routes would be supported by effective public transport systems and infrastructure that would enable and ensure effective transport links between new and existing communities, employment, education and retail opportunities across the sub-region.</p> <p>There would also be the opportunity to improve interconnectivity between Cambourne and development north of the A428 in order to keep cross-development trips to sustainable modes.</p>	<p>The site assessment raises a number of difficulties with providing high quality public transport from this site. Cambourne is some distance from Cambridge and with delays beginning on the length of the single carriageway A1303 between the A428 and Cambridge the attractiveness of public transport would remain limited. Almost 80% of people drive to work from Cambourne with the current service of 3 buses per hour. The site could potentially provide its own bus service but this is unlikely to be independent of the existing Citi4 which is unlikely to divert through the site due to delays caused and may achieve 3 buses per hour, which is no improvement on the existing level of service.</p>
<i>Tier 2 - Section B</i>			
23192 - Martin Grant Homes Limited 23203 - Harcourt Developments Limited	Object	<p>Archaeology:</p> <p>We note that the ground is difficult for remote sensing and that there are medieval settlements, earthworks and mounds in the area. However, the key points are that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> there are no specific archaeological finds which would prevent development; the potential for finds has not prevented development in the past, for example major highway improvements, the construction of a new settlement or airfields; archaeological issues can be easily dealt with by a requirements to carry out a more detailed survey; and if finds occur, the site ownership is sufficiently wide to retain them in situ. <p>Against the above background, it is wrong to state that development would likely have a severe detrimental impact. We could accept that the site could have an impact on the archaeological landscape, the extent of which would then be determined by later study.</p>	<p>The view expressed by the County Council is on the basis of their expert understanding of the archaeological context of this site and their professional view is that there is "likely" to be a severe detrimental impact. If the site were otherwise determined to be a potential suitable site for development, this is an issue that would need to be explored further before any firm allocation could be made. In the context of the overall assessment which concludes this is not a suitable location or site for development, the potential archaeological constraints are part of the overall negative assessment and not on its own a deciding factor.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
23193 - Martin Grant Homes Limited 23204 - Harcourt Developments Limited	Object	Drainage: The EA has expressed concern about the capacity of the Uttons Drove Sewage Treatment Works. A number of options are being explored in order to provide for the needs of the development. Details are set out in the technical note prepared by Peter Brett Associates.	The respondent's comments are noted. However, it remains the case that no evidence has yet been provided that a satisfactory solution to drainage issues could be found for this major site.
23194 - Martin Grant Homes Limited 23205 - Harcourt Developments Limited	Object	Ecology: We accept that further work would be required before the masterplan could be accepted. However, we note that the Council's assessment correctly identifies that development would have relatively few ecological impacts and that these could be mitigated by simple measures, all of which are proposed in the masterplan. In conclusion, there is no ecological constraint sufficient to prevent development. The Site Assessment Conclusion (page 225) is wholly wrong when it says there would be significant biodiversity impacts. An ecological appraisal has been prepared by Cresswell Associates.	It is accepted that the site assessment conclusion is expressed too strongly in respect of saying there would be "significant" biodiversity impacts from the particular masterplan accompanying the representation. However, the site assessment on page 220 does identify a number of ecological issues that would need to be explored further and it should be recognised that the masterplan has no weight in the plan making process and is only one example of a possible development approach and therefore should not be relied on. This does not alter the Council's overall assessment that Cambourne is not a sustainable location for major new development and that the site north of the A428 is highly unsuitable as an extension to Cambourne in principle and would function as a separate village.
<i>Tier 2 - Section C</i>			
23191 - Martin Grant Homes Limited 23202 - Harcourt Developments Limited	Object	Road Capacity: Achieving satisfactory road access to the site and the adequacy of the A428 junction capacity continues to be assessed and discussions with the County Council and Highways Agency are ongoing. It is not expected that there will be any capacity problems - unlike that relating to the A14 which is likely to prevent early implementation of the land between Huntingdon Road, Histon Road and the A14 within the period to 2016. There are no major capacity constraints with the A428 such that this does not represent a constraint to the development of the site.	The nature of the constraints to sites on the edge of Cambridge relating to the A14 improvements is becoming clear and the Highways Agency has confirmed its intention to build the central and eastern sections in parallel, resulting in the completion of the section necessary for the NIAB site to come forward by the middle of 2014. This enables a significant level of development in a sustainable location at the top of the search sequence to come forward by 2016 with the long term benefits of sustainable transport modes, cycling and high quality public transport. Cambourne, as the least sustainable Rural Centre, does not offer these benefits and the modal share by car is likely to remain high in the long term.
23197 - Martin Grant Homes Limited 23208 - Harcourt Developments Limited	Object	Sustainable Mixed Development: The scale of the proposed development is such that it could provide for an element of employment provision, leisure and retail uses, education provision and open space. This would be at a level that would not compromise the viability of the existing Cambourne centre. Rather, the development provides the critical mass and quantum of development to make Cambourne more sustainable.	The Council remains firmly of the view that development of a new village north of the A428 would not be an appropriate location to provide new community services and facilities to serve an enlarged Cambourne. It would be most likely to function as a separate village village village scale facilities rather than provide the opportunity for higher order services and facilities in a central accessible location that would be necessary in any major expansion. The limited physical space in Cambourne village centre makes it extremely difficult to make Cambourne significantly bigger with necessary higher order facilities.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
23196 - Martin Grant Homes Limited 23207 - Harcourt Developments Limited	Object	Local Character and Appearance: The site area is characteristic of its locality and is not designated for its importance. All of the existing features can be retained and, indeed, enhanced. To say that 'development would be extremely damaging to the landscape generally' is without justification. No reference has been made to our earlier visual assessment plans which show that the development would have only a limited zone of visual influence and that views can easily be mitigated. There will not be long views across the area and the site will not be seen from Knapwell with the planting proposed, which has been carefully considered and is suitable for the locality. Woodlands, footpaths and hedgerows (and appropriate buffer zones) have all been carefully retained in the plan.	The Council remains firmly of the view that the site would have an unacceptable visual impact on the landscape as set out in its site assessment and evidence to the examination.
23195 - Martin Grant Homes Limited 23206 - Harcourt Developments Limited	Object	Settlement Character and Relationship to Existing Settlement: We do not accept that the A428 necessarily forms a physical barrier that would prevent connectivity between Cambourne as existing and future development to the north of the A428. We see no reason that it would not fit into the landscape and believe that it could form a new neighbourhood linked by road, footpath, cycleway and public transport to the main settlement. In visual terms it would form part of a wider village grouping in the countryside.	The Council remains firmly of the view that development of a new village north of the A428 would not relate well to Cambourne and would suffer from both physical and visual separation as set out in the site assessment and the Council's evidence to the examination.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
<i>Tier 1</i>			
22818 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	Vehicle access onto the Broadway is not a necessity of the proposals and is more in keeping with bus, cycle and walking representing the main mode of travel between Bourn Airfield and Cambourne. The distances between Bourn Airfield and the High Street of Cambourne are comfortably within the distances that the Government sets out in PPG13 as having the greatest potential to be undertaken on foot and by cycle. If a vehicle access is provided, there is no reason with the use of traffic calming measures and maybe traffic monitoring, that a vehicle access onto the Broadway, which allows vehicle access only to the old A428 could not be provided. Therefore with full engagement with the Highways Authority we have no doubt that a satisfactory access arrangement can be agreed.	The nearest point of the site is just over 2km actual walking distance to Morrisons supermarket, located in the heart of the village centre, and the furthest point is 4.3km (4,270m, not 3,486m as in the Technical Appendix). PPG13 says that trips of less than 2km are most likely to attract trips on foot. A round trip to Cambourne village centre would be at least 4km in length, not a distance that many people would be prepared to walk. The site does lie within the 5km suggested in PPG13 for trips by cycle. However, there is a significant degree of separateness of the site from the planned part of Cambourne and routes would involve crossing of the Broadway, a physical and psychological barrier. The County Council's advice that there should be no direct link between the site and the rest of Cambourne for the private car also emphasises the separateness and potential capacity problems in the A428 junctions that would be used by cars travelling from this site to the rest of Cambourne and issue of local car trips being added to the A428 are not in favour of this site.
<i>Tier 2 - Section A</i>			
22822 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	A Transport Strategy has been developed for the site which encourages trips to be made by non-car modes. In particular, it is proposed that the layout of Bourn Airfield would allow a bus service to run through the heart of the site in a direct line to ensure that there are no time dis-benefits for the residents of existing parts of Cambourne. The existing settlement will benefit from the improved public transport services. The Department for Transport has recognised that Strategies, which encompass a package of measures, like that proposed for the expansion of Cambourne, can change how people travel.	Separate representations make clear the difficulties in attracting a significant proportion of trips away from the private car from a base of 80% journeys to work by car in 2006. Cambourne is principally served by the Citi 4 service which provides access to the City centre and Kings Hedges - a journey time end to end of 1 hour 15 minutes which compares with a 15 minute drive to the Science Park - Cambourne having been chosen as a location in part because of the good access it provides by car to employment destinations on the edge of Cambridge such as the Science Park and Addenbrookes. This supports the Council's view that Cambourne is not a sustainable location for major new development and is not consistent with the current development strategy for the Cambridge area.
22826 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	With regard to High Quality Public Transport, it has always been maintained as part of our proposals that this can be achieved. The site is located on an identified transport corridor with an existing number of bus services. The level of additional dwellings proposed could support its own bus service into Cambridge with a frequency of 3 to 4 buses an hour. This, coupled with the diversion of the existing Citi4 bus service would result in a High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) link between Cambourne and Cambridge. This represents an opportunity to not only provide a new development with a HQPT link, but also to improve the bus service for existing residents, increasing the proportion of trips by non-car modes.	The site assessment recognises that it may be possible to achieve a 10 minute bus frequency with this site. However, the effectiveness this would have in attracting new and existing residents to travel by car has to be seen in the context of a base case of 80% trips to work by car in 2006 and in the light of long queues on a regular basis beginning on the A1303 between the A428 and Cambridge.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22847 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	As identified in the Detailed Site Assessment, the 2006 Cambourne Study showed that almost 80% of people drive to work with the current level of public transport. The introduction of a package of measures, such as initial free bus usage, free and secure cycle storage, a car club for residents and providing a community travel website and folders to inform the residents of the local amenities and public transport could be introduced alongside an improved bus service. This would impact on new residents travel patterns from the start, but would also change travel patterns of some of the existing residents.	The representation supports the site assessment conclusion that there is a high level of car use at Cambourne at 80% with a 20 minute bus service frequency but journey times end to end of 1 hour 15 minutes and that it will be challenging to achieve a sustainable mode share in this location even if improvements were to prove possible to public transport provision. Distance from Cambridge and delays that begin on the section of the A1303 linking between the A428 and Cambridge make any significant improvements in modal split challenging.
22842 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	The developers are willing to make provisions for primary and secondary schools on the proposed development site. Our proposals locate the secondary school in the north-west corner of the site, in proximity to the emerging settlement. It is acknowledged that placing a secondary school on any urban expansion site will not be central to the settlement. However it should be noted that the location that we propose is preferable for new and existing residents to the existing situation where pupils have to travel to Comberton, which is 13 kilometres away. Indeed it would be possible to create a network of off-street cycle networks that would enable older pupils to use both schools. This will enable the Federation of Schools to widen the curriculum offer.	The County Council is considering the need for a secondary school to serve Cambourne as currently planned and is investigating suitable sites that would be accessible to the existing settlement. The respondent recognises that its site would not be central to Cambourne, even located as close to possible to the existing planned settlement.
<i>Tier 2 - Section B</i>			
22838 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	This site is not located within an area that experiences poor air quality. Although future circumstances in terms of additional developments and additional road usage are not known, air quality is unlikely to be a 'moderately significant' issue as identified by the Council. However, it is proposed that an Air Quality Study would be carried out and mitigation measures such as a buffer zone between the A428 and the development would be implemented.	The view expressed by the Council's Environmental Health officers is on the basis of a precautionary approach to the potential of air quality to affect this site given its proximity to a trunk road and the uncertainty over the future levels of use of the road, including if there were major development at Cambourne. If the site were otherwise determined to be a potential suitable site for development, this is an issue that would need to be addressed through planning policy as recommended by Environmental Health. This needs to be considered in the context of the overall assessment which concludes this is not a suitable location or site for development. Air quality issues were not a deciding factor.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22832 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	<p>Although there is ecological interest on this site, the proposals focus development on a smaller area of the site (i.e. on the area which currently comprises the runway) and therefore areas of ecological value can be protected and enhanced.</p> <p>Ecological Surveys were undertaken in 2006 by Faber Maunsell. These concluded that most of the site has low ecological interest and would be suitable for development.</p> <p>It is proposed that a masterplan will carefully incorporate the existing wildlife features, the ecological interests of the site could be further improved with an appropriate management regime designed to increase its biodiversity, particularly for both protected and notable local species. With the appropriate design and management, the site may be improved for nature conservation in line with the aims of PPS9.</p>	The site assessment identifies a number of ecological constraints that would need to be fully considered in any development.
22836 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	<p>Whilst the archaeological potential of the site is recognised as a possible constraint, this is not an unusual situation and it should not preclude development. At present there is limited information regarding archaeological remains, however further information of the archaeological landscape would be gained through the development process and archaeology would help to inform the design and layout of the site. The lack of information at present should not justify an objection from the County Council at this stage. It should be noted that it is possible there has been destruction of layers of archaeology in the past during the construction of the airfield and all its buildings, the foundations still being in situ.</p>	The view expressed by the County Council is on the basis of their expert understanding of the archaeological context of this site and their professional view is development "could" have a severe detrimental impact. If the site were otherwise determined to be a potential suitable site for development, this is an issue that would need to be explored further before any firm allocation could be made. In the context of the overall assessment which concludes this is not a suitable location or site for development, the potential archaeological constraints are part of the overall negative assessment and not on its own a deciding factor.
22834 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	<p>Whilst drainage will need to be addressed, it does not represent an insurmountable constraint to development.</p> <p>Discussions have been held with Anglian Water regarding the foul water drainage at this site. Although the solution has not been fixed at this stage due to capacity constraints, it has been agreed that a solution can be found when there is greater certainty in terms of timescales and quantum of development etc.</p> <p>With regard to surface drainage, it is proposed that a drainage retention scheme will be incorporated into a masterplan for this site.</p>	The respondent's comments are noted. However, it remains the case that no evidence has yet been provided that a satisfactory solution to drainage issues could be found for this major site.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22820 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	The extent of previously developed land (PDL) is questioned by the Council. It should be noted that 62% of the total land is previously developed as the airfield comprises 113ha (56%) and the industrial park comprises 13ha (6%). It is proposed that the built development would be located on the airfield and therefore the proposals would constitute 100% PDL.	The Council remains of the view that only the runways confirm to the PPS3 definition of previous developed land and the remainder of the airfield is in active agricultural use. Even if the whole site was considered to be PDL, PPS3 makes clear that large open areas of PDL are not necessarily suitable for development and decisions of the re-use of PDL do not override the overall sustainability disadvantage of a development in this location.
22840 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	The need for noise mitigation along the northern boundary is recognised and it is proposed that this would take the form of a landscaped and mounded buffer. The redevelopment of the existing industrial uses abutting Highfields will remove a considerable noise nuisance to local residents. With regard to noise from existing uses on or adjacent to the site, it is proposed that the masterplan can mitigate as necessary.	The site assessment identifies serious concerns about the potential for noise disturbance from existing employment uses close to the site and refers to noise complaints. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the site could be developed to provide a satisfactory noise environment. If the site were otherwise determined to be a potential suitable site for development, this is an issue that would need to be explored further before any firm allocation could be made. In the context of the overall assessment which concludes this is not a suitable location or site for development, the potential noise constraints are part of the overall negative assessment and not on its own a deciding factor.
<i>Tier 2 - Section C</i>			
22828 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	It is widely accepted that Cambourne has not achieved the levels of sustainability that were originally envisaged and therefore there is an opportunity to improve the new settlement. Cambourne, as planned, has a number of facilities that would not usually be expected in a settlement of its size, such as the Business Park, the supermarket, fire station and police station. Providing new housing in the vicinity of these facilities can provide the critical mass to help to support them. By expanding Cambourne onto Bourn Airfield, it will be possible to increase diversity of services, facilities and jobs. It is envisaged that there will be a strong relationship between Cambourne and the proposed extension / new village to the east. The sustainability and community success of many of the villages in South Cambridgeshire relates to the fact that many of the existing villages are part of a network of villages.	Cambourne was planned in the early 1990s and in a very large manner is performing as planned albeit it is taking longer to develop than originally envisaged. It is noted that there appears to be some acknowledgement that development on Bourn Airfield would function as a separate new village, rather than as an integrated extension to Cambourne as planned. It is not accepted that Cambourne has become out of balance by the level of services and facilities provided or that the provision of significant levels of new housing would be beneficial to that balance. It is interesting to note that the respondent goes on to argue that more facilities on the Bourn Airfield site would help the sustainability of the settlement given its concerns at the current levels of provision. The services and facilities in Cambourne relate to service providers assessments of need for the settlement and in some cases the surrounding rural hinterland in recognition of Cambourne as a service centre for the western part of the district or the Council's consideration of the appropriate and reasonable response to planning applications received. The relatively poor physical and functional relationship of this site with the rest of Cambourne is addressed in the site assessment and in response to other representations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22844 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	Gillespies undertook a Landscape and Visual Appraisal in relation to the Bourn Airfield site in 2006 which resulted in the production of a landscape concept which consists of a number of inherent landscape and visual mitigation measures. Landscaped buffer zones will be required in places to ensure the character of Highfields/Caldecote, mitigate noise and pollution and to protect and enhance ecologically sensitive areas. With regard to the A428, it was proposed that adverse visual, noise and pollution effects could be mitigated by the provision of a landscaped and mounded buffer. Further we have always proposed a substantial buffer between the development proposals and Highfields, supporting the existing woodland by new planting to create much better separation than exists between the village and the airfield at present.	The respondent's comments are noted. However, whatever measures might be proposed cannot overcome the concern that development on Bourn Airfield would result in a significant distance of virtually continuous linear development over a considerable length of some 7km to the south of the A428 between Cambourne and Hardwick from the edge of the Green Belt.
22830 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	The Council refers back to the original Section 77 Inquiry in 1992. In our view, the important point to note from this Call-in Inquiry is that the Inspector considered that Great Common Farm represented the most appropriate site, a site which spanned either side of the Broadway, i.e. similar to our proposals for an expanded Cambourne. The Secretary of State agreed that this was the best site in site specific terms but rejected some of the details of the proposal.	As made clear in the site assessment the inquiry Inspector supported a site that straddled the Broadway but rejected the proposal on Bourn Airfield for a number of reasons including lack of adequate separation with Highfields Caldecote. The Secretary of State did not support the Inspector for reasons including the impact on Bourn village as a result of levels of additional traffic generated on Bourn Broadway. However, what is now proposed is an extension to the existing planned form of Cambourne and must be considered in that context, although the Council remains concerned at the limited separation with Highfields and the impact that an extended length of development along the A428 would have on the character of this rural area.
22824 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	There is some surprise that the issue of capacity of A428 access junction has been mentioned. Clearly the construction of the off line A428 improvement has removed a significant amount of traffic from what was the A428, such that capacity analysis does not indicate any concerns. We would expect that with full engagement with the Highway Authority that this issue would be resolved.	The County Council has expressed these concerns and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this issue can be resolved. However, it must be seen in the context of the overall assessment of this site and is but one factor in the conclusion that this location and this site is not suitable for allocation to address the housing shortfall.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
<i>Tier 1</i>			
22819 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	Vehicle access onto the Broadway is not a necessity of the proposals and is more in keeping with bus, cycle and walking representing the main mode of travel between Bourn Airfield and Cambourne. The distances between Bourn Airfield and the High Street of Cambourne are comfortably within the distances that the Government sets out in PPG13 as having the greatest potential to be undertaken on foot and by cycle. If a vehicle access is provided, there is no reason with the use of traffic calming measures and maybe traffic monitoring, that a vehicle access onto the Broadway, which allows vehicle access only to the old A428 could not be provided. Therefore with full engagement with the Highways Authority we have no doubt that a satisfactory access arrangement can be agreed.	The nearest point of the site is just over 2km actual walking distance to Morrisons supermarket, located in the heart of the village centre, and the furthest point is 4.3km (4,270m, not 3,486m as in the Technical Appendix). PPG13 says that trips of less than 2km are most likely to attract trips on foot. A round trip to Cambourne village centre would be at least 4km in length, not a distance that many people would be prepared to walk. The site does lie within the 5km suggested in PPG13 for trips by cycle. However, there is a significant degree of separateness of the site from the planned part of Cambourne and routes would involve crossing of the Broadway, a physical and psychological barrier. The County Council's advice that there should be no direct link between the site and the rest of Cambourne for the private car also emphasises the separateness and potential capacity problems in the A428 junctions that would be used by cars travelling from this site to the rest of Cambourne and issue of local car trips being added to the A428 are not in favour of this site.
<i>Tier 2 - Section A</i>			
22823 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	A Transport Strategy has been developed for the site which encourages trips to be made by non-car modes. In particular, it is proposed that the layout of Bourn Airfield would allow a bus service to run through the heart of the site in a direct line to ensure that there are no time dis-benefits for the residents of existing parts of Cambourne. The existing settlement will benefit from the improved public transport services. The Department for Transport has recognised that Strategies, which encompass a package of measures, like that proposed for the expansion of Cambourne, can change how people travel.	Separate representations make clear the difficulties in attracting a significant proportion of trips away from the private car from a base of 80% journeys to work by car in 2006. Cambourne is principally served by the Citi 4 service which provides access to the City centre and Kings Hedges - a journey time end to end of 1 hour 15 minutes which compares with a 15 minute drive to the Science Park - Cambourne having been chosen as a location in part because of the good access it provides by car to employment destinations on the edge of Cambridge such as the Science Park and Addenbrookes. This supports the Council's view that Cambourne is not a sustainable location for major new development and is not consistent with the current development strategy for the Cambridge area.
22827 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	With regard to High Quality Public Transport, it has always been maintained as part of our proposals that this can be achieved. The site is located on an identified transport corridor with an existing number of bus services. The level of additional dwellings proposed could support its own bus service into Cambridge with a frequency of 3 to 4 buses an hour. This, coupled with the diversion of the existing Citi4 bus service would result in a High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) link between Cambourne and Cambridge. This represents an opportunity to not only provide a new development with a HQPT link, but also to improve the bus service for existing residents, increasing the proportion of trips by non-car modes.	The site assessment recognises that it may be possible to achieve a 10 minute bus frequency with this site. However, the effectiveness this would have in attracting new and existing residents to travel by car has to be seen in the context of a base case of 80% trips to work by car in 2006 and in the light of long queues on a regular basis beginning on the A1303 between the A428 and Cambridge.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22848 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	As identified in the Detailed Site Assessment, the 2006 Cambourne Study showed that almost 80% of people drive to work with the current level of public transport. The introduction of a package of measures, such as initial free bus usage, free and secure cycle storage, a car club for residents and providing a community travel website and folders to inform the residents of the local amenities and public transport could be introduced alongside an improved bus service. This would impact on new residents travel patterns from the start, but would also change travel patterns of some of the existing residents.	The representation supports the site assessment conclusion that there is a high level of car use at Cambourne at 80% with a 20 minute bus service frequency but journey times end to end of 1 hour 15 minutes and that it will be challenging to achieve a sustainable mode share in this location even if improvements were to prove possible to public transport provision. Distance from Cambridge and delays that begin on the section of the A1303 linking between the A428 and Cambridge make any significant improvements in modal split challenging.
22843 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	The developers are willing to make provisions for primary and secondary schools on the proposed development site. Our proposals locate the secondary school in the north-west corner of the site, in proximity to the emerging settlement. It is acknowledged that placing a secondary school on any urban expansion site will not be central to the settlement. However it should be noted that the location that we propose is preferable for new and existing residents to the existing situation where pupils have to travel to Comberton, which is 13 kilometres away. Indeed it would be possible to create a network of off-street cycle networks that would enable older pupils to use both schools. This will enable the Federation of Schools to widen the curriculum offer.	The County Council is considering the need for a secondary school to serve Cambourne as currently planned and is investigating suitable sites that would be accessible to the existing settlement. The respondent recognises that its site would not be central to Cambourne, even located as close to possible to the existing planned settlement.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
<i>Tier 2 - Section B</i>			
22833 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	<p>Although there is ecological interest on this site, the proposals focus development on a smaller area of the site (i.e. on the area which currently comprises the runway) and therefore areas of ecological value can be protected and enhanced.</p> <p>Ecological Surveys were undertaken in 2006 by Faber Maunsell. These concluded that most of the site has low ecological interest and would be suitable for development.</p> <p>It is proposed that a masterplan will carefully incorporate the existing wildlife features, the ecological interests of the site could be further improved with an appropriate management regime designed to increase its biodiversity, particularly for both protected and notable local species. With the appropriate design and management, the site may be improved for nature conservation in line with the aims of PPS9.</p>	The site assessment identifies a number of ecological constraints that would need to be fully considered in any development.
22839 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	This site is not located within an area that experiences poor air quality. Although future circumstances in terms of additional developments and additional road usage are not known, air quality is unlikely to be a 'moderately significant' issue as identified by the Council. However, it is proposed that an Air Quality Study would be carried out and mitigation measures such as a buffer zone between the A428 and the development would be implemented.	The view expressed by the Council's Environmental Health officers is on the basis of a precautionary approach to the potential of air quality to affect this site given its proximity to a trunk road and the uncertainty over the future levels of use of the road, including if there were major development at Cambourne. If the site were otherwise determined to be a potential suitable site for development, this is an issue that would need to be addressed through planning policy as recommended by Environmental Health. This needs to be considered in the context of the overall assessment which concludes this is not a suitable location or site for development. Air quality issues were not a deciding factor.
22821 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	The extent of previously developed land (PDL) is questioned by the Council. It should be noted that 62% of the total land is previously developed as the airfield comprises 113ha (56%) and the industrial park comprises 13ha (6%). It is proposed that the built development would be located on the airfield and therefore the proposals would constitute 100% PDL.	The Council remains of the view that only the runways confirm to the PPS3 definition of previous developed land and the remainder of the airfield is in active agricultural use. Even if the whole site was considered to be PDL, PPS3 makes clear that large open areas of PDL are not necessarily suitable for development and decisions of the re-use of PDL do not override the overall sustainability disadvantage of a development in this location.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22835 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	<p>Whilst drainage will need to be addressed, it does not represent an insurmountable constraint to development.</p> <p>Discussions have been held with Anglian Water regarding the foul water drainage at this site. Although the solution has not been fixed at this stage due to capacity constraints, it has been agreed that a solution can be found when there is greater certainty in terms of timescales and quantum of development etc.</p> <p>With regard to surface drainage, it is proposed that a drainage retention scheme will be incorporated into a masterplan for this site.</p>	The respondent's comments are noted. However, it remains the case that no evidence has yet been provided that a satisfactory solution to drainage issues could be found for this major site.
22837 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	<p>Whilst the archaeological potential of the site is recognised as a possible constraint, this is not an unusual situation and it should not preclude development. At present there is limited information regarding archaeological remains, however further information of the archaeological landscape would be gained through the development process and archaeology would help to inform the design and layout of the site. The lack of information at present should not justify an objection from the County Council at this stage. It should be noted that it is possible there has been destruction of layers of archaeology in the past during the construction of the airfield and all its buildings, the foundations still being in situ.</p>	The view expressed by the County Council is on the basis of their expert understanding of the archaeological context of this site and their professional view is development "could" have a severe detrimental impact. If the site were otherwise determined to be a potential suitable site for development, this is an issue that would need to be explored further before any firm allocation could be made. In the context of the overall assessment which concludes this is not a suitable location or site for development, the potential archaeological constraints are part of the overall negative assessment and not on its own a deciding factor.
22841 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	<p>The need for noise mitigation along the northern boundary is recognised and it is proposed that this would take the form of a landscaped and mounded buffer. The redevelopment of the existing industrial uses abutting Highfields will remove a considerable noise nuisance to local residents. With regard to noise from existing uses on or adjacent to the site, it is proposed that the masterplan can mitigate as necessary.</p>	The site assessment identifies serious concerns about the potential for noise disturbance from existing employment uses close to the site and refers to noise complaints. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the site could be developed to provide a satisfactory noise environment. If the site were otherwise determined to be a potential suitable site for development, this is an issue that would need to be explored further before any firm allocation could be made. In the context of the overall assessment which concludes this is not a suitable location or site for development, the potential noise constraints are part of the overall negative assessment and not on its own a deciding factor.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
<i>Tier 2 - Section C</i>			
22831 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	The Council refers back to the original Section 77 Inquiry in 1992. In our view, the important point to note from this Call-in Inquiry is that the Inspector considered that Great Common Farm represented the most appropriate site, a site which spanned either side of the Broadway, i.e. similar to our proposals for an expanded Cambourne. The Secretary of State agreed that this was the best site in site specific terms but rejected some of the details of the proposal.	As made clear in the site assessment the inquiry Inspector supported a site that straddled the Broadway but rejected the proposal on Bourn Airfield for a number of reasons including lack of adequate separation with Highfields Caldecote. The Secretary of State did not support the Inspector for reasons including the impact on Bourn village as a result of levels of additional traffic generated on Bourn Broadway. However, what is now proposed is an extension to the existing planned form of Cambourne and must be considered in that context, although the Council remains concerned at the limited separation with Highfields and the impact that an extended length of development along the A428 would have on the character of this rural area.
22825 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	There is some surprise that the issue of capacity of A428 access junction has been mentioned. Clearly the construction of the off line A428 improvement has removed a significant amount of traffic from what was the A428, such that capacity analysis does not indicate any concerns. We would expect that with full engagement with the Highway Authority that this issue would be resolved.	The County Council has expressed these concerns and no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this issue can be resolved. However, it must be seen in the context of the overall assessment of this site and is but one factor in the conclusion that this location and this site is not suitable for allocation to address the housing shortfall.
22845 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	Gillespies undertook a Landscape and Visual Appraisal in relation to the Bourn Airfield site in 2006 which resulted in the production of a landscape concept which consists of a number of inherent landscape and visual mitigation measures. Landscaped buffer zones will be required in places to ensure the character of Highfields/Caldecote, mitigate noise and pollution and to protect and enhance ecologically sensitive areas. With regard to the A428, it was proposed that adverse visual, noise and pollution effects could be mitigated by the provision of a landscaped and mounded buffer. Further we have always proposed a substantial buffer between the development proposals and Highfields, supporting the existing woodland by new planting to create much better separation than exists between the village and the airfield at present.	The respondent's comments are noted. However, whatever measures might be proposed cannot overcome the concern that development on Bourn Airfield would result in a significant distance of virtually continuous linear development over a considerable length of some 7km to the south of the A428 between Cambourne and Hardwick from the edge of the Green Belt.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22829 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Limited	Object	<p>It is widely accepted that Cambourne has not achieved the levels of sustainability that were originally envisaged and therefore there is an opportunity to improve the new settlement. Cambourne, as planned, has a number of facilities that would not usually be expected in a settlement of its size, such as the Business Park, the supermarket, fire station and police station. Providing new housing in the vicinity of these facilities can provide the critical mass to help to support them. By expanding Cambourne onto Bourn Airfield, it will be possible to increase diversity of services, facilities and jobs. It is envisaged that there will be a strong relationship between Cambourne and the proposed extension / new village to the east. The sustainability and community success of many of the villages in South Cambridgeshire relates to the fact that many of the existing villages are part of a network of villages.</p>	<p>Cambourne was planned in the early 1990s and in a very large manner is performing as planned albeit it is taking longer to develop than originally envisaged. It is noted that there appears to be some acknowledgement that development on Bourn Airfield would function as a separate new village, rather than as an integrated extension to Cambourne as planned. It is not accepted that Cambourne has become out of balance by the level of services and facilities provided or that the provision of significant levels of new housing would be beneficial to that balance. It is interesting to note that the respondent goes on to argue that more facilities on the Bourn Airfield site would help the sustainability of the settlement given its concerns at the current levels of provision. The services and facilities in Cambourne relate to service providers assessments of need for the settlement and in some cases the surrounding rural hinterland in recognition of Cambourne as a service centre for the western part of the district or the Council's consideration of the appropriate and reasonable response to planning applications received. The relatively poor physical and functional relationship of this site with the rest of Cambourne is addressed in the site assessment and in response to other representations.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------

Chapter 6 - Partial Site Assessments: Sites Rejected After Tier 1 Assessment

Site 17 - Chesterton Fen, Milton

23223 - RLW Estates	Support	We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites on the edge of Cambridge. We object to these sites on the basis that release of further Green Belt sites, on top of those already released, would erode the setting of Cambridge as a compact, historic city. Furthermore this would be contrary to the sequential approach which the LDF is pursuing in line with the Structure Plan and RSS14, which is now carried forward by the Core Strategy. Having given priority to previously developed land opportunities, greenfield development should be confined to the strategic Green Belt releases specified.	Support and comments noted.
22725 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Site 17 -Cambridge City Council support the rejection of this site. The City Council originally put forward this site, but has reconsidered its position given the change in approach to pursue an employment led development for the rest of the Northern Fringe East site, which reduces the opportunities to adjoin residential development.	Support and comments noted.

Site 18 - Land west of Fulbrooke Road, Grantchester

23224 - RLW Estates	Support	We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites on the edge of Cambridge. We object to these sites on the basis that release of further Green Belt sites, on top of those already released, would erode the setting of Cambridge as a compact, historic city. Furthermore this would be contrary to the sequential approach which the LDF is pursuing in line with the Structure Plan and RSS14, which is now carried forward by the Core Strategy. Having given priority to previously developed land opportunities, greenfield development should be confined to the strategic Green Belt releases specified.	Support and comments noted.
---------------------	---------	---	-----------------------------

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22726 - Cambridge City Council	Support	<p>Site 18</p> <p>Cambridge City Council support the rejection of this site. The site is within the Green Belt and part of the site falls within Flood Zone 2 which has a medium probability of flooding. Development of this site would result in the loss of private allotments, which although they are within South Cambridgeshire District Council, are used by residents of Cambridge. There is a shortage of allotments in Cambridge and the City Council would object to the loss of existing allotments.</p>	Support and comments noted.
<hr/>			
<i>Site 19 - Land south of Clay Close Lane, Impington</i>			
22773	Object	Suggest this as an alternative site.	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken.
22997 - Impington Parish Council	Support	<p>Support - this land should not be brought forward for development.</p> <p>The site is: Green belt, development at PPG3 scale would totally destroy the setting and environment, the highway network is totally inadequate, poor service (gas, water) infrastructure, drainage and flooding, rich archaeology, environmentally rich - a green lung that should be retained. Development would be extremely damaging and have a significant negative impact on the character of the area.</p>	Support and comments noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22647	Support	<p>As a resident of Impington I most strongly object to all new housing development in this area. The reason is sustainability. The now well evidenced catastrophe unfolding in our planets ecosystem is apparently still not taken seriously by our government or local planners, who are encouraging the building of more roads, more airport runways and more houses. WE ALL KNOW what the result will be.</p> <p>Is there any limit to how much damage is to be done to our quality of life? We have seen from experience that the answer to this question is a resounding 'No'.</p> <p>Are we going to stop environmental destruction before a runaway greenhouse effect takes hold? Tragically the answer to this will also be 'No'.</p>	Support and comments noted.
22989 - Histon Parish Council	Support	Histon Parish Council supports the District Council's view that this site is not suitable to be brought forward for housing being within the Green Belt on the edge of a rural centre.	Support noted.
23225 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Histon and Impington. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22646	Support	<p>As a resident of Impington I most strongly object to all new housing development in this area. We continue to see a steady deterioration in the quality of life in the village with ever increasing levels of air pollution, noise pollution, traffic congestion and dangerous roads.</p> <p>We now have to live with the permanent roar of traffic from the A14 reflected off the wall at Arbury Park and into the village. The noise and pollution level will get considerably worse when more lanes are added to the A14. The new park and ride site has created traffic speeding through the village creating more noise, pollution and risk. Northstowe is set to double the amount of traffic running through the village. The county's roads are permanently on the edge of gridlock with major traffic jams an almost daily occurrence. To add any more houses and cars to this situation is a madness clearly apparent to everyone in the region, apart from the planners it would appear.</p>	Support and comments noted.
<i>Tier 1</i>			
22505	Object	<p>Site fulfills no Green Belt functions and fails to take account of the Government advice on the selection of boundaries for Green Belts. The site is separated from the open Green Belt to the North of Impington by Clay Cross Lane and a number of existing houses and other buildings. It is isolated from the Green Belt. It should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for a small development of houses in this high sustainability Rural Centre. It is within walking/cycling distance to existing services in the village and within a short distance to the Cambridgeshire Guided Bus HQPT.</p>	<p>The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken. The Council's hearing statement makes clear its position that there are no exceptional circumstances in this case. The circumstances of the site have not changed since it was found to be a sound element of the Green Belt by the previous Local Plan Inspector. Furthermore, the site does not form part of the consolidated built up area of the village, and has correctly been excluded from the village framework. It is not a suitable site for allocation to address the housing shortfall.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
<i>Site 20 - Land north of the Holiday Inn, Impington</i>			
22774	Object	Suggest this as an alternative site.	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken.
22998 - Impington Parish Council	Support	Support - this land should not be brought forward for development. The site is: Green belt; unrelated to existing settlement; freestanding - not extension of the village envelope; not accessible from public highway; has no public transport access; the village centre & shops, schools are too distant; not sustainable.	Support and comments noted.
23226 - RLW Estates	Support	We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Histon and Impington. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy. Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.	Support and comments noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22648	Support	<p>As a resident of Impington I most strongly object to all new housing development in this area. The reason is sustainability. The now well evidenced catastrophe unfolding in our planets ecosystem is apparently still not taken seriously by our government or local planners, who are encouraging the building of more roads, more airport runways and more houses. WE ALL KNOW what the result will be.</p> <p>Is there any limit to how much damage is to be done to our quality of life? We have seen from experience that the answer to this question is a resounding 'No'.</p> <p>Are we going to stop environmental destruction before a runaway greenhouse effect takes hold? Tragically the answer to this will also be 'No'.</p>	Support noted.
22649	Support	<p>As a resident of Impington I most strongly object to all new housing development in this area. We continue to see a steady deterioration in the quality of life in the village with ever increasing levels of air pollution, noise pollution, traffic congestion and dangerous roads.</p> <p>We now have to live with the permanent roar of traffic from the A14 reflected off the wall at Arbury Park and into the village. The noise and pollution level will get considerably worse when more lanes are added to the A14. The new park and ride site has created traffic speeding through the village creating more noise, pollution and risk. Northstowe is set to double the amount of traffic running through the village. The county's roads are permanently on the edge of gridlock with major traffic jams an almost daily occurrence. To add any more houses and cars to this situation is a madness clearly apparent to everyone in the region, apart from the planners it would appear.</p>	Support and comments noted.
22990 - Histon Parish Council	Support	Histon Parish Council agrees with the District Council that this is an isolated site that does not link up with either the City or the villages of Histon and Impington and should therefore not be taken forward.	Support noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
<i>Site 21 - Land at Cabbage Moor , Great Shelford</i>			
22695	Object	Our clients site at Great Shelford (site 21) has been too readily dismissed by the Council in its first tier sifting of possible sites to make up the housing shortfall. The Council has ignored this site due to it being a site in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. Both the Structure Plan and the Core Strategy do in fact allow for such sites coming forward, and the Council is considered to need further sites given that the current housing shortfall proposals will not address the deficit in our opinion.	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken. Furthermore, there are no exceptional circumstances at this site for its release from the Green Belt. The 2004 Local Plan Inspector previously considered this site in his 2002 report and concluded "The site is within the Green Belt and forms part of the rural fringe of Great Shelford, within an area of mainly open land running down towards Hobson's Brook. In my view there are no exceptional circumstances warranting removal of the land from the Green Belt and, in any case, this part of Great Shelford mainly comprises ribbon development some way from the centre and not particularly well located in relation to local services." This remains the position and this is not an appropriate site for allocation to address the housing shortfall.
22775	Object	Suggest this as an alternative site.	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken.
23239 - RLW Estates	Support	We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Great Shelford and Stapleford. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy. Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.	Support and comments noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22556 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council is pleased that the sites 21,22,23,24,25,26 and 27 have been rejected , for as shown in its previous comments on the objection sites, the council believes they are all inappropriate for development.	Support noted.
<i>Site 22 - Land behind 34-60 Hinton Way, Great Shelford</i>			
22625	Object	Our clients site at Great Shelford (site 22) has been too readily dismissed by the Council in its first tier sifting of possible sites to make up the housing shortfall. The Council has ignored this site due to it being a site in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. Both the Structure Plan and the Core Strategy do in fact allow for such sites coming forward, and the Council is considered to need further sites given that the current housing shortfall proposals will not address the deficit in our opinion.	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken. Furthermore, there are no exceptional circumstances at this site for its release from the Green Belt. The 2004 Local Plan Inspector previously considered this site in his 2002 report and concluded "the site consist of attractive rising open agricultural land within the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify diminution of this protection." This remains the position and this is not an appropriate site for allocation to address the housing shortfall.
22776	Object	Suggest this as an alternative site.	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22683 - Ely Diocesan Board of Finance	Object	<p>This was submitted as one representation. For clarity each site has been separated therefore there are now two reps The following sites to be added to the list of proposed sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land behind 34 - 60 Hinton Way(Site 22) (Objector site ref. 51) (Rep no 22683) 2. Mingle Lane/Hinton Way (Site 23) (Objector site ref. 49) (Rep no 22810) <p>Reasons: In the current economic climate and considering Northstowe it is argued that the Council has not proposed a wide range of sites of different sizes and in different locations to guarantee that sufficient land is brought forward for development at an early stage in the LDF period. As a result the DPD is not deliverable and fails the 'Test(s) of Soundness' as it is not 'Effective'.</p>	<p>The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken. Furthermore, there are no exceptional circumstances at this site for its release from the Green Belt. The 2004 Local Plan Inspector previously considered this site in his 2002 report and concluded "the site consist of attractive rising open agricultural land within the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify diminution of this protection." This remains the position and this is not an appropriate site for allocation to address the housing shortfall.</p>
23240 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Great Shelford and Stapleford. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.
22557 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Support	<p>The Parish Council is pleased that the sites 21,22,23,24,25,26 and 27 have been rejected , for as shown in its previous comments on the objection sites, the council believes they are all inappropriate for development.</p>	Support noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
<i>Site 23 - Land at Mingle Lane / Hinton Way, Great Shelford</i>			
22619	Object	Our clients site at Great Shelford (site 23) has been too readily dismissed by the Council in its first tier sifting of possible sites to make up the housing shortfall. The Council has ignored this site due to it being a site in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. Both the Structure Plan and the Core Strategy do in fact allow for such sites coming forward, and the Council is considered to need further sites given that the current housing shortfall proposals will not address the deficit in our opinion.	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken. Furthermore, there are no exceptional circumstances at this site for its release from the Green Belt. The 2004 Local Plan Inspector previously considered this site in his 2002 report and concluded the site consists of "attractive rising open agricultural land within the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify diminution of this protection". This remains the position and this is not an appropriate site for allocation to address the housing shortfall.
22810 - Ely Diocesan Board of Finance	Object	<p>This was submitted as one representation. For clarity each site has been separated therefore there are now two reps</p> <p>The following sites to be added to the list of proposed sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land behind 34 - 60 Hinton Way (Site 22) (Objector site ref. 51) (Rep no 22683) 2. Mingle Lane/Hinton Way (Site 23) (Objector site ref. 49) (Rep no 22810) <p>Reasons: In the current economic climate and considering Northstowe it is argued that the Council has not proposed a wide range of sites of different sizes and in different locations to guarantee that sufficient land is brought forward for development at an early stage in the LDF period. As a result the DPD is not deliverable and fails the 'Test(s) of Soundness' as it is not 'Effective'.</p>	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken. Furthermore, there are no exceptional circumstances at this site for its release from the Green Belt. The 2004 Local Plan Inspector previously considered this site in his 2002 report and concluded the site consists of "attractive rising open agricultural land within the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify diminution of this protection". This remains the position and this is not an appropriate site for allocation to address the housing shortfall.
22777	Object	Suggest this as an alternative site.	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22558 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council is pleased that the sites 21,22,23,24,25,26 and 27 have been rejected , for as shown in its previous comments on the objection sites, the council believes they are all inappropriate for development.	Support noted.
23241 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Great Shelford and Stapleford. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.

Site 24 - Land north of Gog Magog Way , Stapleford

22792	Object	<p>Our clients site at Stapleford (site 24) has been too readily dismissed by the Council in its first tier sifting of possible sites to make up the housing shortfall. The Council has ignored this site due to it being a site in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. Both the Structure Plan and the Core Strategy do in fact allow for such sites coming forward, and the Council is considered to need further sites given that the current housing shortfall proposals will not address the deficit in our opinion.</p>	<p>The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken. Furthermore, there are no exceptional circumstances at this site for its release from the Green Belt. The 2004 Local Plan Inspector previously considered this site in his 2002 report and concluded "This site is within the Green Belt, forming part of a large field across which there is a view of attractive rising countryside. Development here would complete the enclosure of the large island of open land between Haverhill Road and Bar Lane, thereby reducing some of the potential attractiveness of the proposed extension to the recreation ground. In my view there are no exceptional circumstances to justify removing the objection site from the Green Belt and including it within the village framework." This remains the position. A previous attempt to gain planning permission for residential property has also been unsuccessful. This is not an appropriate site for allocation to address the housing shortfall.</p>
-------	--------	---	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22778	Object	Suggest this as an alternative site.	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken.
22559 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council is pleased that the sites 21,22,23,24,25,26 and 27 have been rejected , for as shown in its previous comments on the objection sites, the council believes they are all inappropriate for development.	Support and comments noted.
23242 - RLW Estates	Support	We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Great Shelford and Stapleford. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy. Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.	Support and comments noted.
<i>Site 25 - Land immediately south of Peacocks, Great Shelford</i>			
22561 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council is pleased that the sites 21,22,23,24,25, 26 and 27 have been rejected , for as shown in its previous comments on the objection sites, the council believes they are all inappropriate for development.	Support noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
23243 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Great Shelford and Stapleford. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.
<i>Site 26 - Land north west of 11 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford</i>			
22701	Object	<p>Our clients site at Great Shelford (site 26) has been too readily dismissed by the Council in its first tier sifting of possible sites to make up the housing shortfall. The Council has ignored this site due to it being a site in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. Both the Structure Plan and the Core Strategy do in fact allow for such sites coming forward, and the Council is considered to need further sites given that the current housing shortfall proposals will not address the deficit in our opinion.</p>	<p>The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken. Furthermore, there are no exceptional circumstances at this site for its release from the Green Belt. The 2004 Local Plan Inspector previously considered this site in his 2002 report and concluded "designated as an Important Rural Frontage (ICF) reflecting the way in which land with a strong rural character sweeps in to abut the village framework at this conspicuous point along Cambridge Road. In my view ICF designation emphasises the role of this Green Belt land in preventing the countryside from further encroachment". This remains the position and it is not an appropriate site for allocation to address the housing shortfall.</p>
22562 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Support	<p>The Parish Council is pleased that the sites 21,22,23,24,25,26 and 27 have been rejected , for as shown in its previous comments on the objection sites, the council believes they are all inappropriate for development.</p>	Support noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
23244 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Great Shelford and Stapleford. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.

Site 27 - North of Stonehill Road / South of Westfield Road, Great Shelford

22886 - Great Shelford Ten Acres Limited	Object	<p>The Plan fails to meet the tests of soundness because discounting Site 27 at Tier 1 Stage is not supported by strategic policy and because the conclusion that Site 11 is suitable for development as a Major Development Site in the Green Belt is also not supported by strategic policy. Site 11 should not be identified for housing whereas Site 27 should be identified for 150 dwellings. A detailed site assessment of Site 27 has been carried out.</p>	<p>The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken. Furthermore, there are no exceptional circumstances at this site for its release from the Green Belt. The Core Strategy Inspectors' Report considered the principle of Green Belt release around Great Shelford and concluded "From my site visits I conclude that the existing Green Belt boundary includes in the Green Belt land, which is largely open, rather than developed. The Green Belt land forms part of the countryside by reason of its open nature and connections with other open land. The Green Belt boundary follows recognisable features like roads and the curtilages of housing areas. A relaxation of the Green Belt around Great Shelford would not accord with national policy or be justified by the evidence, and would not be the most appropriate response to the shortage of housing land". Whilst the scale of housing shortfall has changed since that time, the Council's site assessment process has concluded that sufficient land can be identified higher up the search sequence or on sites consistent with other planning policy and the Inspectors' conclusions remain the position. This site also lies a considerable distance from the village centre where services and facilities are provided. This was a factor taken in to account in a recent appeal decision for an exceptions site development on part of the site. It is not an appropriate site for allocation to address the housing shortfall.</p>
--	--------	---	---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22779	Object	Suggest this as an alternative site.	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken.
22564 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council is pleased that the sites 21,22,23,24,25, 26 and 27 have been rejected , for as shown in its previous comments on the objection sites, the council believes they are all inappropriate for development.	Support noted.
23245 - RLW Estates	Support	We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Great Shelford and Stapleford. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy. Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.	Support and comments noted.
<i>Site 28 - Land west of Station Road / north of the Chantry, Fulbourn</i>			
22780	Object	Suggest this as an alternative site.	The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22645 22661 22769 22908	Object	Respondents support of using the land west of Station Road Fulbourn to build a range of houses for local people. Reasons given include that a new railway station and northern relief road will benefit the local population in reduction in noise and traffic movements, and improvement in safety, development would help support dying high street businesses, starter homes are needed in this wealthy village, would be better than the Ida Darwin site.	<p>The site lies in the Green Belt on the edge of a Rural Centre. The site therefore failed at the initial assessment on the basis that it is unlikely that there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt at the bottom of the search sequence if there are other suitable sites higher up the search sequence or at Rural Centres that are not in the Green Belt. As set out at paragraph D.14, the only possible circumstances where this could arise is if there were a need to look at one of the Rural Centres that is significantly less sustainable than the others, such that it would be appropriate to carry out an assessment of potential Green Belt sites around more sustainable Rural Centres. An assessment of Green Belt sites at Rural Centres would therefore only need to be carried out if suitable new allocations could not be found higher up the settlement hierarchy, which has not proven to be the case and no such assessment has been undertaken.</p> <p>Furthermore, this is an extensive site that rises up from the edge of the village to the north from Barleyfields and to the west from Station Road. Whilst the site is bounded to the north by the railway, this is not visible in views from the main part of the village to the south and the site reads as part of the wider countryside in views from the south. A new railway station at Fulbourn does not form part of proposals in the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan or the TIF proposals recently published by the County Council. No evidence submitted by the promoter that a station is achievable or viable, particularly in view of the improvement of the bus service to Cambridge in recent times since the closure of the station. They refer to correspondence from rail operators that indicate further work is required to demonstrate it is feasible. The idea of an additional station on this line further west to serve the Cambridge East development has been considered and rejected in favour of a high quality public transport service based on buses, despite the major scale of that development. It is considered highly unlikely that the scale of development proposed on this site would be sufficient to make the opening of a new Fulbourn station viable. The identification of Ida Darwin Hospital as a suitable site for residential development is put forward in the context of it being a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt, where redevelopment can be appropriate subject to no greater impact on the Green Belt than the current built footprint. Redevelopment of the Ida Darwin site is proposed by the National Health Trust as part of a wider proposal to relocate mental health facilities to the adjacent Fulbourn Hospital site, which would be part funded by the residential development. It is therefore a proposal that could come forward under existing planning policy and is identified in that context, not as a new allocation for residential development at a Rural Centre. For these reasons, the site west of Station Road / north of the Chantry is not an appropriate site for allocation to address the housing shortfall.</p>
22639	Support	Land west of Station Road should NOT be used unless it is quite essential as it opens up the possibility of endless development both westward and, even worse, to the north.	Support and comments noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
23230 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Fulbourn. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.
<i>Site 29 - Land at Home End, Fulbourn</i>			
23231 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Fulbourn. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.
<i>Site 30 - Land either side of Hinds Loder (track), Fulbourn</i>			
22568	Support	<p>Rejected site - either side of Hind Loder which is a nature walk to Fulbourn Nature Reserve starting at the Balsham Road outside the 30 mile limit which would mean access to a very dangerous road, if housing were to be built on this site it would create chaos. It would have been more sense to have let Fulbourn Institute have part of the site for thier new football ground giving more sporting facilities to the younger generation of the village instead of turning down their application two years ago.</p>	Support and comments noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
23232 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Fulbourn. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.
<i>Site 31 - Land at 41 Mill Lane, Sawston</i>			
22504 - Freshwater Estates Limited	Object	<p>Clear specialist evidence was presented to the Local Plan Examination that this site was not in an area of flood risk even taking account of future sea level changes. No evidence by specialist witnesses to support the council's contention. We await the Inspector's conclusions on this point. This is a site within the built up area, close to the centre of a Rural Centre and close by to a secondary school and is therefore in a highly sustainable location. Its omission as a housing development site against a clear under-provision in the LDF is perverse and illogical.</p>	<p>The site is situated within an area identified as being at risk of flooding, identified in the Environment Agency's Flood Zone 2. National policy is very clear that sites within areas at risk of flooding should not be allocated for development where there are suitable alternatives available (PPS25, paragraph 16). Only if suitable sites outside the floodplain could not be identified would you move to the Exception Test. The Council's evidence to the examination hearing noted the respondent's FRA and subsequent letter from the Environment Agency, that indicated that flood risk mitigation would be required to enable development of the site, which would not be the case with other alternative development sites. Therefore, the sequential test has not been demonstrated. The fundamental question in identifying land for development is whether it is in the floodplain. There is a strong objection in principle to the allocation of this site. The Council's site assessment process has identified sufficient land higher up the search sequence or on land consistent with existing planning policies and there has not been a need to consider land at Rural Centres, notwithstanding that this land is not in the Green Belt.</p>
22660	Support	<p>I was appalled to learn that this site is to be reconsidered for development, in spite of the fact that it has been rejected as unsuitable on at least 2 previous occasions.</p> <p>Access to the proposed site would be at the point where Mill Lane is at its narrowest and it is already a busy narrow road where congestion occurs frequently.</p> <p>Mill Lane lies on a flood plain and residents are concerned that flooding will happen again and more development will cause more run-off by reducing the area of absorbent surface of the natural landscape.</p>	Support and comments noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
23247 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Sawston. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.
22538	Support	<p>Oppose site at 41 Mill Lane, Sawston being re-considered for development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The area is on the flood plain and has flooded on more than one occasion. ii) Increased traffic on an already very busy narrow road and the access to the site joins Mill Lane at its narrowest part and extremely close to entrances to two small scale developments. iii) The inadequacy of the Sawston Sewage Works. <p>This site has been rejected at least twice before as being unsuitable for development and this has been well documented. Site should continue to be rejected as unsuitable for development.</p>	Support and comments noted.
<i>Site 32 - Land behind Whitefield Way, Sawston</i>			
23248 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Sawston. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
<i>Site 33 - Land at 64 Cambridge Road, Sawston</i>			
23249 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Sawston. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.
<i>Site 34 - Land at Deal Grove, Sawston</i>			
23250 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support South Cambridgeshire District Council's rejection of the alternative sites at Sawston. Although the allocation of small sites at this Rural Centre could potentially be consistent with the Core Strategy DPD reliance on such sites, even to a relatively small degree, would support the dispersal of growth towards the rural areas, which are inherently less sustainable than other options in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Were other sites at the top of the search sequence rejected through this process it would be unacceptable and unsustainable to rely on these sites to meet the growing shortfall.</p>	Support and comments noted.
<i>Site 35 - Land to the north of the A428 and east of A1198, Cambourne</i>			
23233 - RLW Estates	Support	<p>We support the rejection of the alternative sites at Cambourne on the basis that further development at Cambourne would be inherently unsustainable and in any event represents a scale of growth that should be considered in the context of the RSS Review.</p> <p>Cambourne is the least sustainable of the Rural Centres identified in the Core Strategy. The allocation of further housing development at Cambourne would therefore form a version of a dispersal strategy for which there is no provision in the Core Strategy or strategic planning policy.</p>	Support and comments noted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Council's Assessment</i>
22640	Support	<p>The rejected sites, north of the A428 (two sites) and BOURN AIRFIELD (two sites), would have detrimental effect on villages in the BOURN VALLEY.</p> <p>There would be no control over traffic attempting to enter/exiting the M11 junction at BARTON.</p> <p>This extra traffic, together with the increase caused by the expansion of COMBERTON COLLEGE, would make for an unacceptable safety situation.</p>	Support and comments noted.
22787	Support	<p>I don't support any of the sites around Cambourne being built, including Bourne Airfield, unless there are more facilities in Cambourne, such as more shops and a police station. Morrisons is already very full at some times of day, and I would support an expansion of that shop. Also, Morrisons petrol station is not worth queuing up at sometimes because the queues can be so long. Finally, if more people came to live here, the A428 would start to feel like the A14 in terms of amount of traffic. We came to live here partly because the lighter traffic meant it was easier to get into Cambridge for work.</p>	Support and comments noted.