

## Appendix 2

# Core Strategy and Development Control Policies

# *Core Strategy & Development Control Policies*

## *Public Participation Report*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

### *Chapter 2. Strategy*

#### *CSI Strategic Vision - Preferred Approach*

2318

Object

I personally feel that the case still needs to be made by the Government that all these additional houses are necessary, and that if there is a real proven need then the necessary infrastructure (water supply, sewerage, drainage, schools, hospitals, etc.) are put into place by the Government. As a water engineer, I am particularly concerned at the impact on water resources in what is already a water stressed area. A few areas in the south east of England already have lower water availability per head of population than some Middle East countries, a fact that is often overlooked by the planners. Faced with the supposition that such wholesale development is necessary the emphasis must be on minimising the environmental damage and the loss of the unique character of large areas of Cambridgeshire and Essex.

Objection to general level of development noted. The development is required by Regional Planning Guidance and the Structure Plan, both of which have been subject to consultations and public inquiries. This is the framework that must be followed. Agree that water is an important consideration, as identified in the Sustainability Appraisal. Water Conservation as part of new developments has been given particular importance throughout the LDF.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2583 - East of England Development Agency	Object	The Strategic Vision and supporting text in policy CS1 should positively reflect the key role that the buoyant economy of Cambridge and its sub region plays in relation to the economic success of the region as a whole, and that South Cambridgeshire District Council should adopt a more positive stance, embracing sustainable opportunities to maintain and strengthen the economic growth of the sub region. In addition, the vision and strategy objectives should recognize the importance of supporting and securing the necessary infrastructure package and the role of Cambridgeshire Horizons in that process.	<p>South Cambridgeshire will be embracing sustainable opportunities to maintain and strengthen the economic growth of the sub region, through planning for Strategic Employment sites through the Area Action Plans, supporting existing sites, and the rural economy.</p> <p>The District Council is working closely with Cambridgeshire Horizons on the provision of necessary infrastructure to support growth. Agree this could be reflected in the vision.</p>	Insert new sentence after 1st sentence: 'The District will plan for enhanced infrastructure to meet the needs of the expanded population.'
2043 - W A Fairhurst & Partners	Object	Proposed new paragraph and appropriate amendments to CS1: 2.8(5) 6,000 units by 2016 and up to 10,000 by 2021 can also be provided at a new settlement at Waterbeach Barracks, in order to meet development needs in the District up to 2016. The land could also be safeguarded for development as a new settlement within the next Plan Period to 2021. Therefore, paragraph 2.8(2) should be deleted and the figure (9,600) should be reduced at (4).	Development of a new settlement at Waterbeach is not included in the Structure Plan, or the Draft RSS14, as is not required in order to meet the housing requirements in South Cambridgeshire up to 2016 that the LDF is planning for. Development of a new settlement should be pursued through the RSS review process, rather than the LDF.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3401	Object	The Objection relates to the failure of the Strategic Vision to take proper account of the future role of Cambourne as an emerging market town, and the substantial planning benefits that can be achieved in providing for additional growth to create a more sustainable settlement. The LDD has not properly and adequately re-examined the scale of growth planned at Cambourne as recommended by the Examining Panel in the Report on the Structure Plan.	The search sequence detailed in Structure Plan Policy P1/1 provides for a limited proportion of the overall development to take place in identified rural centres. In identifying sites, it requires first to look for brownfield sites within settlements, then other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites. Land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village framework through the urban capacity study, demonstrates that allocation of additional land outside rural centres is not required. This includes Cambourne, where additional housing can be accommodated within existing settlement boundaries. Expansion of Cambourne is examined in the Rural Centres Preferred Options Report. Large scale expansion would completely alter the character of the settlement, and create significant problems for service provision.	
4217 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 1.12  Amend the last sentence to read, "Until it is superseded, the Local Development Framework must be in general conformity with the Structure Plan, but should also have regard to the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy".	Agree	Amend reference in para 1.12 as follows: 'Until it is superseded, the Local Development Framework must be in general conformity with the Structure Plan, but should also have regard to the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy'.
4219 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4218 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4216 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Refer to employment growth, and high tech employment figures	The contribution of the high-technology sector to employment in the district is acknowledged. Employment statistics will be used in the core strategy where appropriate, particularly where they can provide reasoned justification for policy. The most up to date information available will be used, including that obtained from the County Council Research Group.	Utilise most recent employment statistics in reasoned justifications.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4221 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Suggest the final reference to Market Towns at the end is deleted as there are no Market Towns in or immediately adjoining SCDC.	Disagree. There a number of market towns close to the South Cambridgeshire border, and it is important to consider and maintain the separation of the nearest South Cambridgeshire villages.	
3186	Object	The Objection relates to the failure to properly recognise the scale and character of Cambourne - as an emerging market town - the administrative heart of the District of South Cambridgeshire. The LDF should recognise that South Cambridgeshire has a role in meeting sub-regional housing needs. Policy CS1 should recognise the opportunity to create a more sustainable settlement through provision for significant growth of Cambourne	<p>The search sequence detailed in Structure Plan Policy P1/1 provides for a limited proportion of the overall development to take place in identified rural centres. In identifying sites, it requires first to look for brownfield sites within settlements, then other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites. Land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village framework through the urban capacity study, demonstrates that allocation of additional land outside rural centres is not required. This includes Cambourne, where additional housing can be accommodated within existing settlement boundaries. Expansion of Cambourne is examined in the Rural Centres Preferred Options Report. Large scale expansion would completely alter the character of the settlement, and create significant problems for service provision.</p> <p>Cambourne is a village, and is not classified as a market town in the Structure Plan.</p>	
2509 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	The Trust supports the overall Preferred Approach set out in CS1 but objects to the fact that this approach makes no reference to the need to increase the level of provision of Affordable Housing and Key Worker accommodation within the District.	Provision of affordable housing is a central part of the vision of the Community Strategy. However, agree it should also be included in the vision for the LDF.	Add sentence to Strategic Vision: 'THE EMPHASIS WILL BE ON PROVIDING QUALITY HOMES FOR ALL, INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING, TO ENSURE THE CREATION OF SUSTAINABLE AND BALANCED COMMUNITIES.'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3152 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	<p>1. the plan should be based on the regional guidance in RSS14 for the East of England.</p> <p>2. the plan should incorporate growth proposals related to the M11 corridor proposed by ODPM.</p> <p>3. the plan should seek to encourage social and economic growth rather than simply seek to satisfy the development needs of the region.</p> <p>4. the plan should recognise the differing needs of settlements in the district and not seek to limit growth to a limited number of larger settlements.</p> <p>5. the plan should seek to encourage a range and mix of development proposals to help continue to economic success of the area</p>	<p>1) Draft RSS14 rolls forward the Structure Plan to 2016, with an additional requirement to 2021. The Structure Plan requires 20,000 houses in 17 years (1999 to 2016), giving an annual average of 1176.5 dwellings. Draft RSS14 requires 23,500 2001 to 2021, giving an average annual amount of 1175. Therefore the LDF is already planning for the rate of development required. 2) Draft RSS14 incorporates proposals for the M11 growth corridor. 3) Social and economic growth are integral to the LDF. The plan will be tested by a sustainability appraisal which considers the economy, environment, and social factors equally. 4) Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The Rural Settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. Development above a limited scale is likely to result in a disproportionate number of journeys. Policies will permit a level of development to meet local needs, but experience has shown limited or even modest levels of development do not provide significant additional support to village services. 5) Policies in the housing chapter seek a range and mix of housing types and tenures.</p>	
4019 - Imperial War Museum	Object	<p>This Policy does not acknowledge the importance of tourism facilities within the District. It is requested that new wording be added to CS1 either to the last sentence of the first paragraph or by the addition of a totally new sentence stating "the District will continue to provide important tourism facilities for the sub-region and these will be supported, protected and enhanced as appropriate".</p>	<p>Tourism is dealt with in the Strategic vision, under the broader goal of 'maintaining and improving the economy of the villages and the countryside.' This will be expanded upon in the Economy chapter, which will acknowledge the importance of the tourism industry. An amendment is therefore unnecessary.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3636 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	The planning context is presented as a clear "predict & provide" model. It appears to abandon the "plan, monitor, manage" approach of the RPG. It is increasingly clear that even minor developments are being challenged on the basis of current and very visible constraints in service provision. On a wider scale other constraints, be they transport (A14 improvements, Guided Bus) or power, sewage treatment, doctors, drainage etc must be factored into the targets and timescales that drive the planning context. Monitor and manage must drive the process, since otherwise the LDF will not be realistic or deliverable. The mechanisms and processes for this need to be clearly specified in the LDF.	Disagree. The LDF is based on a plan monitor and manage approach to ensure delivery of RPG and Structure Plan housing requirements.	
3643 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Transport infrastructure has been identified as a key issue. However, the Infrastructure Partnership/Cambridgeshire Horizons has failed so far to deliver clear commitments for the required improvements. Specifically, the Highways Agency is apparently backing off from the requirements clearly identified via the CHUMMS study. No further developments north of Cambridge should be committed or started until there are clear commitments to the necessary improvements to the transport infrastructure.	The District Council will be seeking commitment from the Highways Agency to the A14 improvements, before planning permission is granted for Northstowe.	Ensure that the policies for Northstowe make provision for the planning permission to include development trigger points tied to improvements to the A14 trunk road.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3848 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)	Object	The Preferred Approach states "only limited development will take place in villages in the District , with most of that limited development focussed into those larger more sustainable Rural Centres where modest growth will bring about improvements in the relative sustainability of individual villages or groups of villages...". Duxford is a Group Village, and has not been considered as a Rural Centre. The potential capacity of this site has not been considered in terms of housing supply.	In the objective to secure maximum use of brownfield land, consideration must still be made as to whether a development is sustainable. In many smaller villages it would be unsustainable to permit development of unlimited scale simply because it was on previously developed land. It would also be inconsistent with the development sequence detailed in policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan, which details that in the rural area priority must be given to using previously developed sites within villages, then other sites within villages, and only then brownfield sites outside villages. As sufficient land has been identified to meet the housing requirement through sites further up the sequence, there is no need to allocate land at the former Ciba Geigy site outside village frameworks for development.	
5641 - Arrington Parish Council	Object	The impact of local areas just outside south cants such as Huntingdon, Royston, St.Ives, Potton etc. are not taken into account.	The development of the Cambridge Sub-Region is central to the vision. The strategy for the sub-region is promoting development close to Ccambridge. The growth of areas surrounding the District will be taken account of, including through future reviews of the LDF.	
4333 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The Strategic Vision could include a specific aim for employment and its nature - i.e. employment growth restricted to (i) hi-tech & knowledge-based industries, (ii) expansion of existing companies and (iii) local services to support the population/other employment - in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P2/1 and P9/7.	The Strategic Vision includes development of the cluster of research and development industries. The selective management policy is a tool for achieving this goal, therefore it would be inappropriate to refer specifically to it within the vision.	
4337 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	There should there be explicit mention of biodiversity and/or designated sites for conservation. The inclusion of biodiversity within new developments should also be mentioned, as well as the protection and improvement of the countryside.	Covered by Strategic Vision: 'preserving AND ENHANCING its rich built and natural heritage and distinctive character.' Designations are a tool for achieving that goal. Biodiversity is a form of natural heritage, and is dealt with more explicitly elsewhere in the plan.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4340 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The last sentence could be modified to state that although villages should be kept separate appropriate safe cycling/walking links should be developed as a network between the villages and with Cambridge to encourage walking/cycling and sustainable transport.	Such aims are reflected in the preferred option for the Travel Objectives.	
4330 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3874 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 3875 - Persimmon Homes 4521 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	An Area Action Plan should be prepared for North West Cambridge.	A commitment to preparing an Action Plan for North West Cambridge has been made through the Local Development Scheme, which will be published for consultation in early 2005. It will begin preparation in 2006. The review of the Green Belt in the area will take place at that stage.	
4315 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	There are limited references to monitoring in the core strategy document and none relating to review of existing land allocations and provision of mechanisms for continuous management of the form and phasing of development, as recommended by Policies P1/4 and P2/2 of the Structure Plan.	The submission LDF will include a monitoring strategy, to guide the LDF Annual Monitoring Report. This will support implementation of a plan, monitor and manage approach to development.	
4332 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4447 - Hallam Land Management Ltd	Object	Amend sustainability references, and refer to goal of improving jobs and homes balance.	Agree change to reflect national sustainability objectives. Agree the importance of the strategy to improve the balance of housing and jobs in the sub-region.	Amend national sustainability objective: 'effective protection AND ENHANCEMENT of the environment.' Amend 2nd paragraph of Strategic Vision: 'Much of the high level of development needed to support the cluster, AND IMPROVE THE BALANCE BETWEEN HOMES AND JOBS IN THE SUB-REGION, which must...'
4651 - Toft Parish Council	Object	Plans for an additional 20,000 homes in South Cambridgeshire are incompatible with a viable Sustainability Policy.	In sustainability terms it is inevitable that there will be conflict between social, environmental and economic objectives. The role of the LDF is to balance these objectives, and provide effective mitigations measures. It is assisted in this process by the sustainability appraisal.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4802	Object	Cambourne and Northstowe should be turned into proper cities , with employment and infrastructure within their own boundaries.	While Cambourne and Northstowe are both designed to include appropriate employment and infrastructure, Cambourne will remain a village, and Northstowe will be designed as a town.	
5732 - Bassingbourn cum Kneeworth Parish Council	Object	Size of developments should be limited and each site should include a mixture of housing sympathetic to the immediate environment.	The development of residential sites is dealt with through development principles, and other policies in the plan, to ensure developments are appropriate to their location and setting.	
5708 - Dixon International Group Ltd	Object	This policy repeats and reflects the RPG and Structure Plan Strategy of sustainable development. We agree with the general thrust but object to the lack of acknowledgement of recycling previously developed land above greenfield land releases. It is noted that this option is not contiguous with the development principles advocated by other Core Strategy Options, namely CS7 and CS8. CS1 should prevail and CS7 and CS8 should be deleted.	The strategy for development reflects RPG6, Draft RSS14, and the Structure Plan. It takes advantage of previously developed land at Oakington Airfield, Cambridge East, Chesterton Sidings and the Monsanto site. The strategy also limits the need for allocation of greenfield land in less sustainable locations further down the development sequence. The preferred options for rural settlement policy allows for the recycling of land where appropriate within village frameworks (including in group and infill villages). This should be reflected in the Strategic Vision.	Amend 2nd paragraph of Strategic Vision: 'Where modest growth will bring about improvements in the relative sustainability of individual villages or groups of villages AND THE RECYCLING OF PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND.'
5840 5855 5862 5811 - P B Moore & Sons 5766 - Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd 5783 - Stamford Homes Ltd 5801 - Westbury Homes Ltd	Object	Support principles of the option, but there is conflict with policies on rural centres.	Support noted. Disagree about conflict with RC3, as windfall development will provide growth within the Rural Centres above the level permitted in other villages.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1569 2853 - Januarys 6088 6542 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6540 - Centex Strategic Land 6090 5931 - Lighthouse Developments 6541 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	Settlement categories are too prescriptive, and there are sites in villages that could be developed for the benefit of the village, including to support services and facilities.	RPG6 sets out a strong sequential preference, for focusing development on Cambridge, and the new town, in preference to villages. This is reflected in policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan, and the Strategy for the LDF. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The Rural Settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. Development above a limited scale is likely to result in a disproportionate number of journeys. Policies will permit a level of development to meet local needs, but experience has shown limited or even modest levels of development do not provide significant additional support to village services.	
3637 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 3162 - RAVE 6582 - Banner Homes	Object	The Strategic Vision Statement does not contemplate the consequence of Marshall Aerospace not leaving Cambridge Airport before the end of the Plan Period. It should plan for possible delay in implementation of major sites.	The strategy for delivering the housing numbers detailed in the preferred options is the first choice for delivering the housing numbers required. It is premature to argue that the strategy cannot be delivered at this stage, or prepare an alternative strategy that could undermine it. A plan monitor and manage approach will be utilised, to monitor the delivery of housing numbers throughout the plan period, to ensure that requirements are met.	
3638 - House Builders Federation 4007 - Bidwells Property Consultants 6095 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6096 - Centex Strategic Land 6162 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	Plan should be based on the housing requirements of RSS14, rather than the Structure Plan.	Draft RSS14 rolls forward the Structure Plan to 2016, with an additional requirement to 2021. The Structure Plan requires 20,000 houses in 17 years (1999 to 2016), giving an annual average of 1176.5 dwellings. Draft RSS14 requires 23,500 2001 to 2021, giving an average annual amount of 1175. Therefore the LDF is already planning for the rate of development required. The strategy for development reflects RPG6, Draft RSS14 at least up to 2016, and the Structure Plan.	
6029 6022 - The Fairey Family 5983	Object	Object to the term modest growth in rural centres. The term 'appropriate' should be used.	The term 'modest' reflects policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan, which actually refers to it as a 'limited' amount of growth, reflecting the strong sequential preference set out in RPG6.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6084	Object	There should be a secondary school for Cambourne.	The scale of Cambourne, as proposed in the Rural Centres Preferred Options Report, does not warrant development of a Secondary School. A significantly larger settlement might be of a sufficient scale to need one, but it would require a substantial investment from developers, would cause problems for the recently expanded Comberton Village College, and it would completely alter the concept of Cambourne as a village.	
1114	Support	<p>If development is to be centred on the city of Cambridge and those surrounding communities for which it is the commercial centre, the centre itself must be vibrant, commercially attractive and accessible.</p> <p>Currently Cambridge is failing to some degree on all three counts, when compared with other nearby towns, and the situation would deteriorate further with the planned developments, which would have a 'strangling' effect of the city.</p>	Support noted. Retail policies will aim to support and enhance the role of Cambridge as sub regional centre.	
2039 - Boxworth Parish Meeting	Support	<p>Para 2.1 We support policies which enhance the environmental and social qualities of our village, and the 101 other villages set in some of the most attractive Landscape in Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>We cannot see that the siting of a windfarm 600m from our village is in line with this core strategy. Our difficulty lies in the fact that the immediate hinterland of the village is high quality Claylands landscape, undulating, wooded, but beyond is the A14 corridor. There is a danger of just seeing Boxworth from the A14 angle-from which it is pretty well invisible!</p>	This proposal is currently the subject of a planning application, that will be considered against the policies of Local Plan 2004.	
3141 - CPRE Cambridgeshire	Support	We would add the need to improve the quality of life of the people.	This is fundamental to the vision of the Community Strategy, which the Local Development Framework must implement.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4334 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Green/open spaces in urban environments should be mentioned as well as the wider countryside. The reference to tackling climate change in Para 2.4 is welcomed.	Support for dealing with climate change issues noted. This representation is seeking reference to green spaces in the vision of the Community Strategy. The Community Strategy has been adopted by the Council, following public participation. It can not be changed through the LDF process. Although not referred to directly in the vision, protecting and providing suitable green spaces in urban areas will be addressed in the LDF.	
4338 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Suggest 1st sentence could be improved by amending to read "while preserving and enhancing its rich built and natural heritage and distinctive character"	Agree.	Amend first sentence of Strategic Vision to read: 'while preserving AND ENHANCING its rich built and natural heritage and distinctive character.'
4339 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4220 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	A definition of sustainable development is required.	Agree. See Glossary of preferred options reports.	
4554 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support subject to agreeing how the Hauxton site might be treated in policy terms.	General support noted. This site is examined under option CS3.	
3646 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 5043 - Hatley Parish Council 2569 - FPDSavills 3767 - English Heritage 5545 3346 - English Partnerships 3573 - Cambridgeshire Horizons 5446 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 5529 - The Fairfield Partnership 5155 - Laing Homes North Thames	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
2495 - Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd 6076 - Network Rail	Support	Support sequential approach, and that development of Chesterton Sidings can move forward.	Support noted. The development at Chesterton Sidings has already been planned for in the Local Plan 2004.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6189 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	<p>Focusing new development in a small new town, north-west of Cambridge is welcomed.</p> <p>Final sentence of vision needs clarification. A revised wording is suggested (see main text).</p> <p>Gallagher accept need to protect the village character of Longstanton and Oakington and to make appropriate provision for green separation with Northstowe, but it is unrealistic and undesirable to propose completely separate developments.</p> <p>Sustainable development principles suggest the need for a positive, inclusive, relationship between the new town and these two villages, rather than a relationship that is based on segregation. This is not the intent of the Structure Plan which dictates that the new town should be at, not separate from, Longstanton/Oakington.</p> <p>Reference could be made to the need for successful, inclusive and balanced communities.</p>	<p>The Structure Plan requires green separation of Northstowe from Oakington/Longstanton, therefore by definition the settlements must remain separate.</p> <p>Agree that vision should refer to building communities.</p>	<p>Add sentence to 2nd paragraph: Much of the high level of development needed to support the cluster which must take place in South Cambridgeshire will be focused into urban extensions to the built-up area of Cambridge and in a small new town north west of the City. 'The objective is that these locations will become successful vibrant new communities.'</p>

---

**Decision on CS1 Strategic Vision - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS2 Strategic Objectives - Preferred Approach*

987	Object	Object to housing development in Cambridgeshire, such large scale development is not needed and is likely to cause severe infrastructure and drainage problems.	Objection to general level of development noted. The development is required by Regional Planning Guidance and the Structure Plan, both of which has been subject to consultations and public inquiries. This is the framework that must be followed.	
1347	Object	450,000 new homes crazy and ill thought-out. Cambridge and M11 corridor already overcrowded with respect to infra-structure and has sufficient economic activity. Development of less-favoured areas much more desirable (e.g. N England). True that many affordable homes needed, but opportunities for supporting infrastructure greatly limited due to problems of access to Cambridge.	The regional housing requirement is currently the subject of consultation on RSS14.	
2036 - Boxworth Parish Meeting	Object	<p>Item 2 To protect the varied character of the villages of South Cambridgeshire by ensuring the scale and location of development is in character... We would wish to add that developments beyond the village envelope could drastically affect the character of the village. For instance a 16 turbine windfarm would have an industrialising effect.</p> <p>Item 4 The location of a windfarm here threatens biodiversity, as shown by consultee responses on bats birds, badgers and wildfowl. Access is not enhanced, as the turbines would tower over our bridleway to Conington</p> <p>Item 7 To minimise loss of the country side. Area 1.5 x0.75 miles -many acres- threatened by the windfarm proposal</p>	CS61 in the Energy section of the Core Strategy recognises that large wind farms would be likely to compromise the need to maintain the quality of the countryside. Proposals for wind farm are currently the subject of a planning application.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2044 - W A Fairhurst & Partners	Object	object to paragraph 2.8 (2), which does not comply with the CS2 objectives, and recommend it should not be included in the LDF. The 2000 units could be accommodated on sustainable brownfield land at Waterbeach Barracks, which can be made available for development as part of a larger masterplan for a new settlement.	Structure Plan Policy P9/2c includes the sites on the edge of Cambridge listed in paragraph 2.8 (2) of the preferred options report. They are appropriately included in the strategy, where as a new settlement at Waterbeach is not part of the strategy.	
2047 - W A Fairhurst & Partners 2048 - W A Fairhurst & Partners	Object	It should also refer to the ability of Waterbeach to provide housing post 2016.	Development of a new settlement at Waterbeach is not included in the Structure Plan strategy, or the Draft RSS14, as is not required in order to meet the housing requirements in South Cambridgeshire up to 2016 that the LDF is planning for.	
2587 - East of England Development Agency	Object	The Strategic Objectives and supporting text in policy CS2 should positively reflect the key role that the buoyant economy of Cambridge and its sub region plays in relation to the economic success of the region as a whole. South Cambridgeshire District Council is a key partner in securing the continued success of the Cambridge Sub region economy and consequently the East of England. The list of Strategy Objectives should explicitly outline the importance of the supporting infrastructure, and securing the necessary infrastructure package, and the role of Cambridgeshire Horizons in that process.	Agree new objectives required. A suitable objective was included in the economy objectives of the preferred options, that could be included as a strategic objective.	Include additional objectives: 'To support the Cambridge Area's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, higher education and research, particularly through the development and expansion of clusters.'  'To provide and enable provision of enhanced infrastructure to meet the needs of the expanded population.'
4223 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The final bullet point of CS2 identifies the maximisation of previously developed land. Whether in CS2 or elsewhere in the Core Strategy, it would be helpful to identify the additional selection criteria for development in Structure Plan Policy P1/1 to reinforce the position that there is a sequence of development with criteria, and that development will only take place elsewhere if the development opportunities at the preferred locations have been exhausted.	Agree. While the development sequence in P1/1 is central to the proposed LDF strategy, the submission LDF must make clear reference to this sequence.	Ensure the development sequence required in Structure Plan policy P1/1 is clearly stated in the LDF.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4018 - Imperial War Museum	Object	The Policy does not acknowledge the importance of tourism facilities within the District. It is requested that a new sentence is added to the first objective to state "to support, protect and enhance tourism facilities within the District, by recognition of their importance to the local economy and cultural heritage".	Tourism is dealt with in the Strategic vision, under the broader goal of 'maintaining and improving the economy of the villages and the countryside.' This will be expanded upon in the Economy chapter, which will acknowledge the importance of the tourism industry.	Ensure the Economy chapter to acknowledge the importance of the Tourism industry to the economy of South Cambridgeshire.
3142 - CPRE Cambridgeshire	Object	While in overall support of this option we do not support the guided bus and would prefer a rail based transport system for strategic reasons.	The County Council are promoting the Guided Bus, which has been through public inquiry, where such issues will have been considered.	
3155 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	<p>1. the plan should more specifically encourage appropriate development in rural locations. This may not necessarily be at high density but should reflect local character and surroundings.</p> <p>2. the plan should recognise the need to support, retain and enhance local services and facilities in rural areas be the positive allocation of new housing and other development.</p>	Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The Rural Settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. Development above a limited scale is likely to result in a disproportionate number of journeys. Policies will permit a level of development to meet local needs, but experience has shown limited or even modest levels of development do not provide significant additional support to village services.	
3505 - Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Object	The objectives assume some 900 houses at Chesterton Sidings in the framework period. This is only achievable if the adjacent sewage treatment works is relocated and if a comprehensive approach to the development of the whole of the Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) (CNF (East)) is agreed	900 houses can be accommodated on Chesterton Sidings. This is an allocation in Local Plan 2004 and subject to a separate Masterplan. A Plan monitor and manage approach will be utilised, and the strategy adapted if necessary if problems develop with the site.	
3561 - Stannifer	Object	South Cambridgeshire District will not meet its housing requirements, particularly in respect of the release of Green Belt sites and at Northstowe. Many large sites have significant infrastructure requirements.	The strategy for delivering the housing numbers detailed in the preferred options if the first choice for delivering the housing numbers required. It is premature to argue that the strategy cannot be delivered at this stage. A plan monitor and manage approach will be utilised, to monitor the delivery of housing numbers throughout the plan period, to ensure that requirements are met.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3584 - GO-East	Object	<p>The first bullet should reflect that development locations can have the potential to be served by other modes of transport than the motor car.</p> <p>The final objective in the submission DPD should state that development will be located where there are OR WILL BE modes of transport available in addition to the motor car.</p> <p>While we support the overall intentions underlying the fourth bullet, the requirement set out could be demanding and potentially onerous depending on the type and location of any particular development.</p> <p>Consideration should be given in drafting the final objective for the submission DPD as to whether this requirement is reasonable and achievable in all instances (in particular what are the specific requirements to be achieved in new development that would meet the objective?)</p>	<p>As a vision of what the LDF is aiming to achieve, it would not be appropriate to insert 'or will be' modes of transport available in addition to the motor car unless there are guarantees that appropriate levels of public transport can be guaranteed.</p> <p>In respect of achieving a net gain in biodiversity as a result of development, it is considered that this is a valid objective but that there may be some development sites where a net gain in biodiversity may not be possible. Nevertheless, an appropriate level of protection and provision will still be required, including the possibility of off-site enhancement.</p>	<p>Amend the final clause first bullet of the vision to read "which minimise the need to travel and where there are modes of transport available (OR THE PROVISION OF NEW SERVICES CAN BE GUARANTEED THROUGH THE PLANNING PROCESS) in addition to the motor car."</p> <p>Amend the 4th bullet to read: "TO ENSURE THAT ANY NEW DEVELOPMENT RESULTS IN APPROPRIATE PROVISION FOR THE PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF NATIVE BIODIVERSITY"</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3994 - Bidwells Property Consultants	Object	The Policy is based on flawed assumptions.	In the objective to secure maximum use of brownfield land, consideration must still be made as to whether a development is sustainable. The Urban capacity does not survey all sites in all villages. In many smaller villages it would be unsustainable to permit development of unlimited scale simply because it was on previously developed land. It is necessary to maintain a settlement hierarchy that limits development in smaller villages. This ensures that development is of a sustainable scale taking account of village services and facilities. The strategy for delivering the housing numbers detailed in the preferred options is the first choice for delivering the housing numbers required. It is premature to argue that the strategy cannot be delivered at this stage. A plan monitor and manage approach will be utilised, to monitor the delivery of housing numbers throughout the plan period, to ensure that requirements are met.	
4440 - Hallam Land Management Ltd	Object	Structure Plan sets out a strategy for development in Cambridge Sub-Region. Bullet points in para 9,9 of structure plan include reference to importance of encouraging growth of high tech industries. CS2 fails to do this. Add additional bullet: To support the expansion of high tech clusters and knowledge based industries.	Agree that, reflecting the vision, an objective is needed relating to support for the expansion of high technology research and development clusters.	Include additional objective: 'To support the Cambridge Area's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, higher education and research, particularly through the development and expansion of clusters.'
4341 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The strategic objectives should include reference to climate change and reducing the impact of development on, or increasing its resilience to, climate change.	Whilst an objective was included in the preferred option for Natural Environment Objectives, this important issue could be included as a strategic objective, due to the wide range of issues that must be considered.	Include objective relating to the need to address climate change mitigation and adaptation issues.
4343 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	A strategic objective should be included to incorporate the need to support housing and employment opportunities which meet the needs of all sections of the community.	Supporting housing and employment opportunities are already central to the objectives of the Community Strategy, which the LDF will be aiming to implement.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4344 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The strategic objectives should include, "To create developments which minimize the use of resources and maximize recycling and re-use of resources".	This objective is covered in the development principles.	
4448 - RLW Estates	Object	An additional bullet point should be added to CS2 as follows:  - to safeguard land for a sustainable new town at Waterbeach in the event that an additional strategy site is needed to meet housing requirements. The new town will make best use of previously-developed land and will be connected to Cambridge by high quality road and rail-based public transport systems.	Development of a new settlement at Waterbeach is not included in the Structure Plan, or the Draft RSS14, as is not required in order to meet the housing requirements in South Cambridgeshire up to 2016 that the LDF is planning for. Development of a new settlement should be pursued through the RSS review process, rather than the LDF.	
4693 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Paragraph 2.8 suggests these are to be the extensions and, coupled with the village policies, the overall assumption reached is that smaller non-strategic development on the edge of the City may not play a part. This assumption is challenged in the case of Barton Road North where there is scope for a sustainable non-strategic development.	Allocation of additional sites in the green belt on the edge of Cambridge is not required. The land promoted in this representation would require a significant release of green belt land in a sensitive location on the western approaches to Cambridge. This would be contrary to Structure Plan policy and unnecessary, as sufficient housing land has been identified for the plan period.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4674 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	<p>9,600 homes in the Rural Area will be accommodated by existing "commitments" and by further windfall development on unallocated land in villages, and in particular the Rural Centres. This means the Plan will enable a continued "pepper-potting" of new development across the rural area.</p> <p>The Council should have considered whether or not general tightening of policy in the Rural Centres and larger villages could lead to reduced levels of intensification, infill and village expansion, thereby more effectively reducing the adverse effects of sporadic rural development.</p> <p>The level of development that might otherwise have been accommodated by "pepper-pooting" may then be redirected to the most sustainable location, which in our view is Cambourne.</p>	<p>The approach to rural centres is consistent with the Structure Plan. The rural settlement policies proposed permit a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. Development above a limited scale is likely to result in a disproportionate number of journeys. Policies will permit a level of development to meet local needs, and support recycling of previously developed land on a suitable scale. Policies are also proposed to protect the village environment from inappropriate development.</p> <p>A number of housing allocations have been 'rolled over' from Local Plan No. 2. Those allocations were subjected to detailed scrutiny by the Inspector who considered objections to Local Plan No. 2 who concluded that those allocations were an appropriate transitional arrangement whilst the Council prepares its next round of plans. Those allocations will allow development to continue until planning permission can be granted for the major developments at Northstowe, Cambridge East etc. Arguably they need not be shown in the LDF and are only included for completeness.</p>	
4700 - Anglia Polytechnic University (Land North of Huntingdon Road, Girton)	Object	<p>The Options Reports for the SCLDF are fundamentally flawed as they fail to take guidance set out in PPS12 into account and the documents do not clearly demonstrate that the housing requirements as set out in the adopted Cambridgeshire Structure Plan (2003) can be met. The ability of South Cambridgeshire to accommodate new housing, for the edge of Cambridge in particular, is questioned.</p>	<p>The strategy for delivering the housing numbers detailed in the preferred options is the first choice for delivering the housing numbers required. It is premature to argue that the strategy cannot be delivered at this stage. A plan monitor and manage approach will be utilised, to monitor the delivery of housing numbers throughout the plan period, to ensure that requirements are met.</p> <p>The Structure Plan proposes only 2,000 houses on the edge of Cambridge within South Cambridgeshire on land that is currently green belt. That number should be capable of being met at Newmarket Road and at Trumpington during the period to 2016.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5187	Object	A new local bus service should be introduced to circulate Melbourn, Meldreth and Whaddon, returning via Kneesworth and linking up with Royston town bus service with connections to trains as well as for Tesco and Royston town centre, and should run between the hours of 7am to 10pm. This idea would detract from the regional policy of Cambridge being at the centre for access by public transport, however if we are to lessen the demand for cars in the future, then this is surely the way forward, if even the fares were to be subsidised.	The suitability of introducing new bus services will be addressed by the County Council in the new Local Transport Plan.	
4800 4799 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd	Object	Policy 22 of RPG6 states that new development should be in Previously Established New Settlements. Bar Hill is the only 'Previously Established New Settlements'	RPG6 sets out a strong sequential preference, for focusing development on Cambridge, and the new town, in preference to villages. This is reflected in policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan, and the Strategy for the LDF. Previously established new settlements fall at the same level as rural centres in the hierarchy. In fact, in the draft RSS14, they are not listed separately. It is correct that locations at this level are tested for their relative sustainability, using the tests for designating Rural Centres. This is consistent with policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan.	
6164 - NIAB	Object	The policy is wrong to imply targets, and, by implication, ceilings. To the extent that CS2 should be regarded as in any way qualified by the text which follows it, objection is made to its terms.	The approximation of housing numbers of the major housing sites is necessary in order to demonstrate how housing numbers will be achieved. These numbers are referred to as 'approximately', therefore they do not set a maximum at this stage.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5884	Object	Emerging LDF should be comparable with proposals within Cambridge City. The proposal in the City to remove land from within the Green Belt and promote extensive development north of Cabbage Moor should be reflected if it is intended to comply with CS2. Land adjoining the District/City boundary would be appropriate for removal from the Green Belt and allocated for development. This would facilitate development on the Great Shelford Camping and Caravan Club land.	Proposals for the Southern Fringe of Cambridge are dealt with in a separate Area Action Plan. In this area, the AAP is seeking to increase public access and complement development in the city, as opposed to proposing major built development. The allocation of this Green Belt site, even in the proposed rural centre of Great Shelford, would be contrary to the search sequence for housing sites detailed in policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan.	
3828 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford) 6184 - Executors of the Late John Sheldrick 6183 - Executors of the Late John Sheldrick 5750 5759 6178 6177	Object	Brownfield sites adjoining village frameworks should be developed. Object to strategy that provides too little housing in villages	In the objective to secure maximum use of brownfield land, consideration must still be made as to whether a development is sustainable. In many smaller villages it would be unsustainable to permit development of unlimited scale simply because it was on previously developed land. It would also be inconsistent with the development sequence detailed in policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan, which details that in the rural area priority must be given to using previously developed sites within villages, then other sites within villages, and only then brownfield sites outside villages. As sufficient land has been identified to meet the housing requirement through sites further up the sequence, there is no need to allocate land outside village frameworks for development.	
6603 6607 6596 6600 - J W Burgess & Son	Object	Public participation is greater at 'local plan level' than structure plan or regional level. Hence to increase democracy the LDF should be able to develop its own requirements for settlement policy.	The RPG and the Structure Plan were subject to public participation, and independent Enquiry in Public. The LDF must be in conformity with the RPG and the Structure Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6190 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Principle of new town at the location outlined in sixth bullet point is welcomed. Requirement for the new town to be "close to, but separate from, the villages of Longstanton/Oakington" does not represent an accurate reflection of policy objectives. The bullet point should more closely reflect strategic aims outlined in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan (2003). A revised wording if bullet point six is suggested (see main text).</p> <p>It is not realistic or desirable to propose completely separate developments as implied.</p> <p>The promotion of compact development forms (described in P1/3 Structure Plan) could be viewed as a strategic objective that will help underpin the development strategy for the Sub-region and might be included in CS2.</p>	<p>The Structure Plan requires green separation of Northstowe from Oakington/Longstanton, therefore by definition the settlements must remain separate.</p>	
4901 - Cambridgeshire Recycling 5219 5251 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 5232 5276 5277 5299 5308 5323 5385 5395 5403 5411 5422 5430 5362 5370 2854 - Januarys 6359	Object	<p>Bullet 4 is unrealistic to expect to ensure "any" new development will result in a net gain in biodiversity and enhanced access to the countryside. Some forms of new development, some locations and some very small scale developments cannot be reasonably expected to meet these expectations. The bullet point should be amended to say "where appropriate, subject to form, location and scale, new development should result in an overall net gain..."</p>	<p>Agree a re-write is needed to offer a degree of flexibility where development sites themselves may not be able to provide biodiversity gain. However, it makes it clear that an appropriate level of protection and enhancement provision shall be required. Whether this is on or off-site should be determined on a case-by-case basis. The re-written text meets with the draft PPS9 Key Principles i, ii, vi &amp; vii.</p>	<p>Replace 4th Bullet as follows: To ensure that any new development results in appropriate provision for the protection and enhancement of native biodiversity in order to contribute towards biodiversity gain, whilst having regard to the site's current biodiversity value. Opportunities for increased access to the countryside and enjoyment of biodiversity should be viewed as integral requirements of new development;</p>



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6133 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6093 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6094 - Centex Strategic Land 6132 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	More development should be permitted at rural centres. LDF should be prepared in accordance with emerging RSS14 rather than Structure Plan, as housing requirement to 2021 is greater. Over reliance of a few strategic sites is to inflexible.	Draft RSS14 rolls forward the Structure Plan to 2016, with an additional requirement to 2021. The LDF covers the period up to 2016, providing for an annual rate of housing development similar to that required by RSS14. Allocation of additional land in rural centres is not required, as demonstrated in the land supply calculations included in the preferred options report. This includes Cambourne, where additional housing can be accommodated within existing settlement boundaries. The focus on strategic locations for major housing development is required by the development sequence in RPG6, and the Structure Plan.	
869 - The National Trust	Support	Would like to add a further comment to that I have just submitted :- To ensure that new development is truly sustainable the Trust would like to see reference to a strategic objective of ensuring access to properly managed greenspace.	Bullet point 2 provides for the protection for green spaces, and bullet 4 improved access to the countryside.	
1115	Support	But - disagree that any new developments on the outskirts of Cambridge, which is essentially a rural city, would 'enhance' the area, either visually or operationally. More sprawl equates to more congestion and more dis-incentive to those outside the city from using its commercial services and amenities.	Support noted. RPG6 sets out a strong sequential preference, for focusing development on Cambridge, and the new town, in preference to villages. This is reflected in policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan, and the Strategy for the LDF.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3648 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 2745 5127 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 1287 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire) 2570 - FPDSavills 5546 2497 - Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd 2629 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 3849 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford) 3858 - The Woodland Trust 4660 - Grantchester Parish Council 6077 - Network Rail 5448 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company (TMLC proposed Monsanto Site) 5158 - Laing Homes North Thames 6181 - Executors of the Late John Sheldrick 5743 6175 6452 - The Countryside Agency 4555 - Bayer CropScience Ltd 1657 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support for various objectives listed in the preferred option.	Support noted.	
3348 - English Partnerships	Support	These objectives should emphasise opportunities for existing communities in South Cambridgeshire whom as part of the sub regional growth area will be able access new and improved local services, new public transport, housing, and employment contributing to the long term sustainability of South Cambridgeshire and the sub region.	New objectives proposed will further emphasise potential local improvements.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3939 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature supports the preferred approach taken in CS2, as it establishes a set of objectives helping achieve a more sustainable approach to development throughout the District. We particularly support bullet point 4. The term 'biodiversity' should be clarified to 'native biodiversity' avoiding confusion with non-native species which do not need protection or enhancement and are not listed in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. We support proposals for improvements in biodiversity, and would include habitat management, restoration and creation. We would wish that the LDF recognises the significant biodiversity resource of County Wildlife Sites, together with statutorily designated sites.	Agree that the focus should be on protecting and enhancing native biodiversity.	Amend 4th bullet: '...an overall net gain in NATIVE biodiversity...'
868 - The National Trust 3772 - English Heritage	Support	Include a reference to new development responding to and protecting environmental qualities, and the landscape.	Agree the importance to taking account of the character of the landscape, but an amendment should be made to the 3rd bullet point.	Amend 3rd bullet: '...protects cherished townscape assets of local urban design and conservation importance, AND CHARACTER OF THE LANDSCAPE.'
5528 - The Fairfield Partnership	Support	Support CS2 on the basis that there will be equality of separation to Longstanton and Oakington in the new settlement at Northstowe and that in accordance with the definition of previously developed land in Annex C of PPG3; The definition includes defence buildings, but in relation to the curtilage does not mean that the whole area of the curtilage should therefore be redeveloped.	General support noted. The sites and green separation issues for Northstowe are covered by the Northstowe Area Action Plan.	

#### **Decision on CS2 Strategic Objectives - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS3 Village Frameworks - Preferred Approach*

1037 (Land to the Rear of former Castle Camps Public House, High Street, Castle Camps)	Object	That the rear area of previous car park area serving the former Castle Camps public house at Camps Castle, Castle Camps, Cambs be included in the village framework. Existing development exists to the rear boundary line on both adjacent parcels of land.	This site (within the framework) is currently undergoing conversion to residential development. The former pub car park to the rear is outside the framework. The framework should remain tight to the buildings, given the open nature of the land to the countryside to the rear of the site.	
2026 - Boxworth Parish Meeting	Object	Para 2.11 There is a need to point out that the demarcation of a village framework is not simply a policy tool to separate policies for built up areas from policies for the countryside. Developments in the countryside, even those associated with agriculture can impinge upon the character of the village itself, in conflict with policies applying "internally" to the village. Large windfarms certainly can.	The Framework is a tool for defining the built up area of villages. All development will be subject to development principles policies, and other policies in the plan where relevant.	
6543 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Seeking redevelopment of Bayer Cropscience factory at Hauxton for mixed use development.	Allocating sites for residential development adjoining group villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan, even as part of a mixed-use site. Any future reuse of the site would be considered under other policies in the plan.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3197 (Land West of Cambourne)	Object	<p>The Objection relates to the failure of the LDD to make provision for significant growth of Cambourne in the context of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Making a more efficient use of land within the confines of the approved Master Plan</li> <li>- Providing for the enlargement of the urban form to create a fourth neighbourhood area.</li> </ul> <p>Such a scale of planned growth will enable Cambourne to be provided with a Secondary School; enhanced facilities within Cambourne, including quality public transport services.</p>	<p>The search sequence detailed in Structure Plan Policy P1/1 provides for a limited proportion of the overall development to take place in identified rural centres. The Cambridgeshire Structure Plan identifies Cambridge and Northstowe as the most sustainable location for 10,400 additional dwellings.</p> <p>When considering the capacity of the rural area, the Structure Plan sets out a sequential approach to site selection: first to look for brownfield sites within settlements, then other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites. Land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village framework through the urban capacity study, demonstrates that allocation of additional land outside rural centres is not required. This includes Cambourne, where additional housing can be accommodated within existing settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Expansion of Cambourne is examined in the Rural Centres Preferred Options Report. Large scale expansion would completely alter the character of the settlement, and create significant problems for service provision.</p>	
2844 - CLIFF WALSINGHAM & COMPANY	Object	<p>The concept of a village framework should be extended in the Group Villages, to include suitable sites for limited development by way of rounding-off.</p>	<p>Village frameworks in South Cambridgeshire have been defined in the local plan, and refined in the recent local plan review. A full review of frameworks at this stage is unnecessary. 'Rounding off' must be considered on a case by case basis, as it would be inappropriate to include large areas of land within frameworks that do not relate to the built up area of the village.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2027 - Boxworth Parish Meeting 6453 - The Countryside Agency	Object	Concerns about definition of uses permitted in the countryside.	Agree that the policy should reflect PPS7, which was published after the preferred options were published for consultation. Other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be detailed in other policies in the plan, including the employment and housing chapter.	
3774 - English Heritage	Object	Part 2, amend to '...landscape, ecological and historic importance'	Agree	Amend part 2 of preferred option: The development would be sensitive to the character of the village, local features of landscape, ecological or historic importance and...
5309 (Land at Preist Lane, Willingham)	Object	Care is needed to define settlement boundaries in a logical and reasonable way, given the national policy impetus to make the most efficient use of land, especially previously developed land, in providing for new development. Amend village framework to include land at Priest Lane, Willingham.	Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The village framework currently defines a clear edge to the settlement. The inclusion of the land within the village framework would lead to an intensification of development, contrary to the open character of this area.	
5652 (Land NW of 7 Primrose Walk, Little Gransden) 5653 (Land NW of 7 Primrose Walk, Little Gransden)	Object	Seeking an extension of the western boundary of the village framework at Little Gransden by one housing plot.	Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The inclusion of the land within the village framework would lead to an intensification of development, contrary to the open character of this area.	
4282 (Land adjacent to Clive Hall Drive, Longstanton)	Object	Seeking a minor amendemnt to Longstanton village framework, on land adjacent to Clive Hall Drive. The land in question related to the existing built up area of longstanton and not the proposed green belt or green separation areabeyond the existing mature hedge. The parcel of land would have no impact on green belt or green separation between longstanton and proposed new town of Northstowe.	This site has previously been considered for inclusion within the village framework by the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector and rejected.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4326 (Land adjacent to 66 Station Road, Over) 4378 (Land adjacent to 66 Station Road, Over)	Object	Object to the non-inclusion of land adjacent to High Piece Crescent, Over within the Village Framework.	Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The village framework currently defines a clear edge to the settlement. The inclusion of the land within the village framework would lead to development detrimental to the character of this wooded area.	
4329 (Land to rear of Hatton Farm, Brewers Close, Longstanton)	Object	Land between the south western boundary of the golf course and the residential area of Ladywalk and Prentice Close should be included within the Village Framework.	This land falls within the proposed site area for Northstowe, as proposed in NS1-NS3, and future uses will be considered in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.	
4882 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Land between South End and Spring Lane, Bassingbourn)	Object	Bassingbourn while discounted from being a Rural Centre could sustain a level of development given its overall size and nature. A logical expansion of the village in this site would allow for development on the appropriate scale coming forward.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre or lower order village. Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The inclusion of the land within the village framework would lead to an intensification of development, contrary to the open character of this area.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6568 6583 6588 2856 - Januarys 3158 - McCann Homes Limited 6547 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department 6556 6571 - P B Moore & Sons 6572 - Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd 6576 - Stamford Homes Ltd 6585 6587 6564 6562 - Lighthouse Developments 6579 - Westbury Homes Ltd	Object	To achieve number of windfalls and the overall housing numbers required, frameworks will need to be changed.	The urban capacity study indicates the number of windfalls that can be achieved in the plan period up to 2016 from various types of land within the Local Plan 2004 village framework boundaries. It is not necessary to adjust frameworks specifically to achieve this aspect of the land supply calculations.	
5278 (Land behind 69-71 Willingham Road Over) 5279 (Land behind 69-71 Willingham Road Over)	Object	Care is needed to define settlement boundaries in a logical and reasonable way. Whilst the village frameworks have been "defined and refined" in two Local Plans, there are still situations where the boundary is illogical and unreasonable and needs to be amended. Amend the village framework at Willingham Road, Over.	Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The village framework follows the curtilage of number 67 and a tree/hedge boundary. Land beyond this better relates to countryside and therefore, the village framework should not be amended.	
4823 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Land South of Walnut Farm, Landbeach)	Object	Infill development in gaps on built-up frontages will be allowed in infil villages (according to CS8). To this end we hope the village frameworks will be reassessed, to ensure that logical sites will not be excluded from villages. For example this site, which forms an integral part of Landbeach and is separated from the countryside by a clear boundary.	The land is within the Green Belt and a significant amendment to the Green Belt boundary would be contrary to the strategy, which proposes to only make significant amendments at the major development locations on the edge of Cambridge, and at Northstowe. Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. It is not considered appropriate to amend the village framework to include farm buildings as farms are a countryside use and do not constitute previously developed land according to the definition in PPG3.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4675 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	<p>The Council should have considered whether or not general tightening of policy in the Rural Centres and larger villages could lead to reduced levels of intensification, infill and village expansion, thereby more effectively reducing the adverse effects of sporadic rural development.</p> <p>Alternative option for CS3: Instead of maintaining Village Frameworks as existing, consider the option of reducing the number of settlements covered by these designations, tightening the definition of the built-up areas, or tightening the criteria of the policy itself to reduce the scale of sporadic development in the countryside.</p>	<p>The frameworks reflect the nature of the villages. Reducing the number of villages covered by frameworks could restrict appropriate development to meet local needs.</p>	
4704 - Anglia Polytechnic University (Land North of Huntingdon Road, Girton)	Object	<p>Land north of Huntingdon Road and to the west of Whitehouse Lane, Cambridge, does not serve the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, and therefore this designation should be removed from this site. The land should be allocated for residential development in order to contribute towards the requirements for a significant level of housing on the edge of Cambridge, in accordance with the Adopted Structure Plan.</p>	<p>This land falls within the wider area known as North West Cambridge, identified as land "between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c, for housing and mixed-use development. Future development in this area will be the subject of an Area Action Plan at a later date.</p>	
5229 (Land at rear of 138 Hinton Way, Great Shelford)	Object	<p>Part of garden of 138 Hinton Way is in Green Belt and part within village framework. Move green belt boundary level with adjacent gardens.</p>	<p>Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. It is not the intention that village frameworks will form neat lines across the backs of rows of properties. At Hinton Way the framework closely follows the edge of the rear gardens to the properties and features on the ground. There is no reason to remove land from the Green Belt in order to straighten the framework and create a neat line.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4804 (Land between 63 and 71 Spring Lane, Bassingbourn)	Object	A slight alteration to the development framework of Bassingbourn is suggested for the sake of consistency with the adjacent line.	Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The inclusion of the land within the village framework would lead to an intensification of development, contrary to the wooded character of this area.	
4820 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Land in front of The Windmill School, Fulbourn)	Object	Fulbourn is identified as a Rural Centre, which allows for larger forms of development. The Windmill School will close in 2006, and will become a brownfield site adjacent to existing residential development within Fulbourn. This site should be redeveloped.	The land is within Special Policy Area Fulbourn 1 which guides any future redevelopment of the site.	Roll forward Local Plan 2004 Policy Fulbourn 1.
5241 (Land at 90 High Street, Meldreth) 5242 (Land at 90 High Street, Meldreth)	Object	Land behind 90 High Street, Meldreth and west of the Mel should be included in the village framework as it is previously developed land.	Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The inclusion of the land within the village framework would lead to an intensification of development, contrary to the character of this area, adjacent to the Conservation Area and Protected Village Amenity Area. Land adjoining this site has previously been considered for inclusion within the village framework by the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector and rejected.	
5247 (Rolph Land at Toft Lane, Great Wilbraham) 5248 (Rolph Land at Toft Lane, Great Wilbraham) 4813 (Barraclough land at Toft Lane, Great Wilbraham)	Object	Site at Toft Lane, Great Wilbraham should be included in the Village Framework.	Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The inclusion of the land within the village framework would lead to an intensification of development, contrary to the open character of this area.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4892 (Land East of Frogge Street, Ickleton)	Object	<p>The owners proposal is to create a wildlife sanctuary on the majority of the site, with suitable residential development serviced via service road with two access points to the Frogge Street highway along the roadside frontage.</p> <p>Overs are a family trust with strong local connections, and wish to safeguard the wildlife aspect to this property, but appropriate residential development along the frontage suitably screened by retaining the existing roadside hedge is considered appropriate in the circumstances.</p>	<p>The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre or lower order village. Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The inclusion of the land within the village framework would lead to an intensification of development, contrary to the character of this area.</p>	
5253 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd (Land at 23 Fen End, Over)	Object	Amend the village framework at Fen End, Over.	<p>Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. However, in this instance the village framework currently cuts through middle of a building and should be amended to include the whole building. The rest of the site is open and better reflects the open countryside and should remain outside the village framework.</p>	Amend the village framework to include the whole building, but do not include the remainder of the site.
4898 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Land West of Butts Lane, Fowlmere)	Object	Within Group Villages such as Fowlmere there should be scope to review Village Frameworks, such as at this site.	<p>This site has previously been considered for inclusion within the village framework by the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector and rejected.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6548 6544 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 6552 6550 6577 6573 6555 6570 - Munro Group Ltd 6569 - Munro Group Ltd 6584 6586 6578 6559 - Humo Holdings 6563 6561 - Lighthouse Developments	Object	Village frameworks should be reviewed, rather than just carried forward.	Village frameworks in South Cambridgeshire have been defined in the local plan, and refined in the recent local plan review. A full review of frameworks at this stage is unnecessary.	
6554	Object	Object to the policy as drafted, which will allow few opportunities for the limited growth of appropriate settlements which are not identified as Rural Centres. Suggest that a thorough review of all village frameworks be made to allow for limited alterations for residential development.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beneath Rural Centres, the Structure Plan P5/5 allows for small-scale housing development in villages taking into account the need for affordable housing, village character and the level of jobs and services etc. The smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. Therefore the non Rural Centre villages have been subdivided into two groups, to reflect the level of infill development that should be permissible compatible with its location, to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. This is an approach that was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6565	Object	The restrictive policy on village framework extensions will result in continual and progressive decline of local facilities.	Small amounts of infilling are permitted, appropriate to their location, in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a very limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

<p>1597 - Weston Colville Parish Council 1024 (Land at The Close, Meldreth Road, Whaddon) 5377 (Land East of 32 Streetly End, Streetly End) 5380 (Land East of 32 Streetly End, Streetly End) 6622 (Village Framework alteration in West Caxton) 5779 (Village Framework alteration in South Caxton) 2961 4873 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Land North of Meldreth Road, Shepreth) 5777 - Cambs County Council Property &amp; Procurement Department (Pickering Farm, Church Street, Whaddon) 4812 - Cambs County Council Property &amp; Procurement Department (Land South of Recreation Ground, Litlington) 5812 - P B Moore &amp; Sons (Land at Manor Farm, Graveley) 4280 - Tebbit &amp; Son 6522 - Henry H Bletsoe &amp; Son (Land between Caxton Depot and Caxton, Ermine Street, Caxton) 6624 (Land north of Church Farm, Church Lane, Arrington) 6061 (Land at Church Farm, Church Lane, Arrington) 6064 (Land at Church Farm, Church Lane, Arrington) 6625 (Land north of Church Farm, Church Lane, Arrington)</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Framework should be amended and utilised for housing development in proposed infill village.</p>	<p>Allocating sites for residential development adjoining infill villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The rural settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. In particular within infill villages, development is limited to upto 2 dwellings, due to the very limited level of services and facilities available. It would be unsustainable to allocate sites due to the disproportionate number of additional journeys this would create.</p> <p>The suitability of smaller villages for development was explored and dismissed by the Inspector who considered objections to Local Plan No. 2. Planning policy is now less permissive of development in small villages and therefore no change would be appropriate.</p>	
---	---------------	---	---	--

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4903 - Cambridgeshire Recycling 6185 - Executors of the Late John Sheldrick 5761 6180 4556 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Does not address where brownfield sites do not fall neatly into frameworks.	The search sequence detailed in Structure Plan Policy P1/1 provides for a limited proportion of the overall development to take place in identified Rural Centres. In identifying sites, P1/1 requires first to look for brownfield sites within settlements, then other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites. Development of large sites outside smaller villages, even brownfield sites, would result in disproportionate numbers of journeys, and result in unsustainable development.  Frameworks have been drawn tightly to reflect the built up area of the villages, and protect the countryside.	
5784 - Stamford Homes Ltd (Land at New Road, Over)	Object	It is considered that small-scale reviews and alterations to the village framework boundaries should be made. Village Framework should be reviewed at Over.	Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The village framework currently defines a clear edge to the settlement. The inclusion of the land within the village framework would lead to development detrimental to the open character of this area.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5776 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Caxton Depot, Ermine Street, Caxton)	Object	Object to the policy as drafted, which will allow few opportunities for the limited growth of appropriate other settlements. Suggest that a thorough review of all village frameworks be made to allow for limited alterations for residential development. A potential extension to the village framework of Caxton is identified which if partly developed for housing purposes could provide an enhancement to the edge of the village at its interface with the open countryside and provide an element of affordable housing for the village.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre or lower order village. Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The land is removed from the village in a rural setting. The inclusion of the land within the village framework would lead to an intensification of development, contrary to the character of this area.	
5919 (80a High Street, Meldreth) 5924 (80a High Street, Meldreth)	Object	Amend the village framework at Meldreth to include 80a High Street.	Agree, the property should be included within the village framework.	Amend the village framework at Meldreth to include 80a High Street.
1238 (60 The Moor, Melbourn, Nr Royston, Herts) 5980 (Land behind 46 - 56 The Moor, Melbourn) 6009 - The Fairey Family (Land at The Grip, Hadstock Road Linton) 6008 - The Fairey Family (Land at Orbells, Horseheath Road, Linton) 6007 - The Fairey Family (Land at Chalklands, Kynes Meadow, Linton) 6010 - The Fairey Family (Land at Long Lane, Linton) 6006 - The Fairey Family (Land at Webbs, Balsham Road, Linton)	Object	Propose that sites adjoining village frameworks, in Linton and Meldreth, should be included within village framework as they are suitable for housing development.	Allocating sites for residential development adjoining group villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The rural settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. In particular within group villages, a slightly larger scale of development is permitted than infill villages, due to the services available. It would be unsustainable to allocate large sites due to the disproportionate number of additional journeys this would create.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5885 - D H Barford & Co	Object	In relation to village frameworks the text states, 'buildings associated with countryside uses (e.g.farm buildings) are not normally included in the framework.' Bearing in mind the stated function of the village framework is to define 'the present extent of the built up area' it is invidious to exclude farm buildings from the village framework just because they happen to be (or have been) farm buildings.	Farm buildings are not classified as previously developed land in the definition contained in PPG3. They are directly associated with countryside uses, so should be governed by policies that relate to the countryside. Only in cases where they are directly related to the built up area of the village have they been included within the framework.	
6116 (Land off Church Road, Stow-cum-Quy)	Object	Our client's land, as shown on the attached plan should be included within the Village Framework. The site does not project into the open countryside, nor would it be very visible owing to the fact there is residential development on two sides of the site. The site has good cycling links to Cambridge and is near to the park and ride. Also refer to representations to CS1 and CS19.	This site is at an infill village, and is currently in the green belt. PPG2 states that the Green Belt, once approved, should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The land continues to meet the purposes of the greenbelt, and should remain outside the village framework.	
5850 (Land South of 77-91 Station Road, Willingham)	Object	Object to the policy as drafted, which will allow few opportunities for the limited growth of appropriate "other" settlements which are not identified as rural centres. Suggest that thorough review of all village frameworks be made for limited alterations for residential development. A potential site to be included within the village framework is identified at Station Road, Willingham.	Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. The village framework currently defines a clear edge to the settlement. The inclusion of the land within the village framework would lead to an intensification of development, contrary to the open character of this area.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

4895 (Land West of Station Road, Fulbourn) 4690 (Land West of Station Road, Fulbourn) 5386 (Land behind 3-7 Dogget Lane, Fulbourn) 5396 (Land behind 3-7 Dogget Lane, Fulbourn) 5404 (Land behind 3-7 Dogget Lane, Fulbourn) 5412 (Land behind 3-7 Dogget Lane, Fulbourn) 5363 (9 Dogget Lane, Fulbourn) 5856 (Land North of Court Meadows House, Balsham Road, Fulbourn) 5863 (Land North of Court Meadows House, Balsham Road, Fulbourn) 3484 (Land West of Station Road, Fulbourn) 4911 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Land South of Manor Park, Histon) 6412 (Land West of Station Road, Fulbourn) 5698 - Freshwater Estates Ltd. (Land at 41 Mill Lane, Sawston)	Object	Sites listed should be allocated for housing development in rural centres, and village framework changed.	The search sequence detailed in Structure Plan Policy P1/1 provides for a limited proportion of the overall development to take place in identified rural centres. In identifying sites, it requires first to look for brownfield sites within settlements, then other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites.  Land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village framework through the urban capacity study, demonstrates that allocation of additional land outside rural centres is not required. This includes Cambourne, where additional housing can be accommodated within existing settlement boundaries.  The urban capacity study demonstrates that a significant number of dwellings will come forward during the plan period from windfall development. This will provide development of a scale appropriate to the location, and contribute to meeting the needs of those communities.	
5957 - D H Barford & Co	Object	Overlooks general presumption in favour of: replacement living accommodation in the countryside; extensions to existing residential properties and development associated with existing businesses in the countryside. The third criteria 'the village has the necessary infrastructure capacity to support the development' is vague. For example what if the village does not have a school?	Housing policies on development in the countryside will be included in the LDF, providing further detail on what constitutes appropriate countryside uses. The third criteria is necessary to ensure sustainable development, and considerations will include the scale and nature of the development in relation to the infrastructure available.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5689 (Land South of Clay Close Lane, Impington) 5790 (Land at Gog Magog Way, Stapleford) 5789 (Land at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Great Shelford) 5813 (Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Great Shelford) 5900 (Land East of Hinton Way, Great Shelford) 5816 (Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Great Shelford) 5940 (Land at Home End, Fulbourn) 5007 (Land North of Clay Close Lane, Impington) 5986 (Dean Grove, Sawston)	Object	Site should be allocated for housing development in proposed rural centres, and village framework changed. Sites proposed are also currently in the Green Belt.	<p>The search sequence detailed in Structure Plan Policy P1/1 provides for a limited proportion of the overall development to take place in identified rural centres. In identifying sites, it requires first to look for brownfield sites within settlements, then other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites. Land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village framework through the urban capacity study, demonstrates that allocation of additional land outside rural centres is not required. This includes Cambourne, where additional housing can be accommodated within existing settlement boundaries. The urban capacity study demonstrates that a significant number of dwellings will come forward during the plan period from windfall development. This will provide development of a scale appropriate to the location, and contribute to meeting the needs of those communities.</p> <p>The Green Belt is an additional consideration. Preferred Option CS10 is to retain the boundaries as shown in Local Plan 2004 other than required in Area Action Plans.</p>	
6549 6545 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 6553 6560 6574 6566 6557 6558 6551 6581 6575	Object	Criteria 1 is too subjective, and could be unreasonably restrictive.	<p>This principle has been part of settlement policy in both South Cambridgeshire Local Plans. It is crucial for the consideration of development proposals and the protection of village environments.</p>	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

<p>5054 - Whittlesford Parish Council (Land North of Church Lane, Whittlesford) 21 (Land between 108 &amp; 122 Histon Road, Cottenham) 4335 (South along Histon Road, Cottenham) 4381 (South along Histon Road, Cottenham) 5423 (Land at Town End, Duck End, Girton) 5432 (Land at Town End, Duck End, Girton) 5518 (Land East of 198 Barton Road, Comberton) 5519 (Land East of 198 Barton Road, Comberton) 5668 (Land North of Whittlesford Bridge) 6614 (Land South of Cottenham, Histon Road, Cottenham) 5841 (Land North of Histon Road, Cottenham) 5968 (Land North of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton) 6615 (Land South of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton) 2053 - The Royal Eastern Counties Schools Limited (Land West of the High Street, Girton) 4516 - Christ's College (Land between Oakington Road and Histon Road, Cottenham) 4522 - Chancellor, Masters &amp; Scholars of the University of Cambridge (Land North of Woodlands Park and West of High Street, Girton) 4816 - Cambs County Council</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Framework should be amended and site allocated for housing development in proposed group village. Sites are currently in the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Allocating sites for residential development adjoining group villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The rural settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. In particular within group villages, a slightly larger scale of development is permitted than infill villages, due to the services available. It would be unsustainable to allocate large sites due to the disproportionate number of additional journeys this would create.</p> <p>In addition, preferred option CS10 proposes that green belt boundaries remain the same as Local Plan 2004, unless altered by an area action plan.</p>	
--	---------------	---	--	--

---

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD**

---

Property & Procurement  
Department (Land next to  
Oakington Primary School,  
Oakington)  
5010 (Land behind 38 Histon Road  
Cottenham)  
6146 - The W Scambler Trust  
(Land North of Warrington Farm,  
Dry Drayton)  
6074 - Munro Group Ltd (Land  
North of Cambridge Road,  
Waterbeach)  
6347 - Munro Group Ltd (Land  
between Bannold Road/Burgess  
Road, Waterbeach)  
6629 - The English Courtyard  
Association (2nd Village  
Framework change proposed by  
English Courtyard Assoc.  
Whittlesford)  
5745 - The English Courtyard  
Association (Village Framework  
change proposed by English  
Courtyard Assoc. Whittlesford)  
6186 (Land North of Girton Farm,  
Oakington Road, Girton)  
6617 (Land South of Girton Farm,  
Oakington Road, Girton)

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5733 - Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council 1580 (Land at 52 North Road, Great Abington) 1859 (Land East of Hay Street, Steeple Morden) 1898 - Sawston Parish Council 2863 - CLIFF WALSHINGHAM & COMPANY (Land North of Duxford Primary School, St Johns Street Duxford) 1700 (Land West of A1198, Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth) 1022 (Land at Morden Farm, Church Lane, Guilden Morden) 1377 - Rooke, Wood & Miller 1424 1570 3354 6005 (Land bordered by Mill Road, Newington and Rampton Road, Willingham) 5220 (Land off Randalls Lane, Over) 5998 (Land at 14 West Drive, Caldecote) 4327 (Land at 14 West Drive, Caldecote) 4703 (Land at 70 West Drive, Caldecote) 5040 (Front half of land at 72 West Drive, Caldecote) 5028 (Land at 72 West Drive, Caldecote) 5300 (Chas Day Nurseries, Fen End, Over) 5325 (Land at 31 Blackhorse Lane, Swavesey) 4713 (Land at rear of Manor Farm	Object	Framework should be amended and utilised for housing development in proposed group village	Allocating sites for residential development adjoining group villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. The Urban Capacity Study demonstrates sufficient land available further up the search sequence for sites. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The rural settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. In particular within group villages, a slightly larger scale of development is permitted than infill villages, due to the services available. It would be unsustainable to allocate large sites due to the disproportionate number of additional journeys this would create.	
--	--------	--	--	--

***Representations******Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD***

Close, Oakington)  
 5371 (Sandpit Pond, Longstanton Road, Over)  
 5683 - Banner Homes  
 5717 (Land at 17 Whitcroft Road, Meldreth)  
 5741 (Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford)  
 5742 (Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford)  
 5781 (Land off Lacey's Way, Duxford)  
 5782 (Land off Lacey's Way, Duxford)  
 5849 (Site at Whitecroft Road, Meldreth)  
 5875 (Land North of Brook Road, West of North End, Bassingbourn)  
 5952 (Beech Tree Farm, Shepreth Road, Foxton)  
 3850 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)  
 3834 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)  
 4818 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Land South of Willingham Road, Over)  
 6360 (Land at 31 Blackhorse Lane, Swavesey)  
 5763 - Amblecroft Ltd (Land East of 82 Caxton Road, Eltisley)  
 6083 - Ashdale Land & Property Consultants (Land North of Poorsfield Road, Waterbeach)  
 6039 - C & A Locke (Land at Granta Cottage, Mill Lane,

***Representations******Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD***

Whitesford)  
 5768 - Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd  
 5920 - The Davison Group (Land behind Elsworth Primary School)  
 6520 - Henry H Bletsoe & Son (Land NE of Cottenham)  
 6038 (Land South of the cemetery, The Causeway, Bassingbourn)  
 6065 - Humo Holdings (Land at Strawberry Farm, Great Abington)  
 6601 (Land at Water Lane/Kettles Close, Oakington)  
 6604 (Land South of Mill Way, Swavesey)  
 6066 (Land adjacent to Pieces Lane Waterbeach)  
 6068 (Land at Rosalind Franklin House, Bannold Road, Waterbeach)  
 6100 (Land East of Fox Street, Balsham)  
 6634 (Land North of High Street, Balsham)  
 6188 (Land at Maarnford Farm, Hunts Road, Duxford)  
 5930 - Lighthouse Developments (Land North of Bogs Gap Lane, Steeple Morden)  
 6593 (Land south of Over Road, Willingham)  
 6598 - J W Burgess & Son (Land east of Boxworth Way, Swavesey)  
 5802 - Westbury Homes Ltd (Land r/o Searle's Meadow, Dry Drayton)

---



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1040 - Brown & Co. (Land behind Ridgley's Farm, High Street, Fen Drayton) 5233 (Highgate Farm, Over Road, Willingham) 5897 (Rectory Farm, Pampisford) 4525 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge (Burnt Farm, High Street, Madingley) 6041 (Land adjoining College Farm, Horseheath) 6042 (Land adjoining College Farm, Horseheath) 5662 - Bourn Farming Partnership (Gills Hill Farm Yard, Bourn) 5649 - Gallagher Waterbeach Limited (Land East of Bannold Drove, Waterbeach)	Object	Include farm within the village framework.	It is not considered appropriate to amend the village framework to include farm buildings as farms are a countryside use and do not constitute previously developed land according to the definition in PPG3.	
6062 (Land at 44 East Drive, Caldecote)	Object	It is noted that there is to be no change in the definition of village frameworks as "defined and refined in two Local Plans". The application of this policy should be consistent both throughout the district and within the villages. Within Caldecote to the north of East Drive there is significant variation in the amount of residential curtilage included within the framework. In the interest of consistency, it is recommended that the anomalies be rectified. In particular, it is requested that the framework be adjusted to incorporate the outbuildings and garden land directly related to no. 49 East Drive, Caldecote.	Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. However, in this instance the boundary has been drawn across a dwelling and should be amended slightly to include the whole building. However, the associated land is better related to the countryside and should not be included.	Amend the village framework to the rear of 44 East Drive, Highfields Caldecote to include the whole of the dwelling but not the associated land.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6367 - RDA (Land above Woodpecker Way, Waterbeach)	Object	Please include this land within the village framework.	Village frameworks have been drawn consistently tightly to the established built up area of the village. However, in this instance the boundary has been drawn tightly adjacent to the rear of the houses and does not include their curtilages. Agree, there is scope to move the village framework to the end of gardens, where there is a clear boundary.	Amend village framework to include the curtilage of the three properties at Woodpecker Way, Waterbeach.
3639 - House Builders Federation 2575 - FPDSavills 6546 - Cambridgeshire Recycling 6590 6589 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 6580 6567 - McCann Homes Limited 2866 - Steeple Morden Parish Council 4008 - Bidwells Property Consultants 5160 - Laing Homes North Thames 5709 - Dixon International Group Ltd	Object	Protecting sites for employment, service or facilities, unless there is no alternative available, is too inflexible.	Rural employment and services are vital to support sustainable communities, bringing homes, essential services and workplaces closer together, and sites are a scarce resource that should be retained where ever possible. Redevelopment is still possible in circumstances detailed in options CS43 and CS45. These options provide detail on how this criteria should be implemented.	Cross refer to policies on protecting employment and services in village frameworks policy.
2029 - Boxworth Parish Meeting	Support	Item 2 "The development would be sensitive to the character of the village, local features of landscape or ecological importance, or the amenities of neighbours." We agree wholeheartedly. We have recently set out our opposition to a very large, very close wind farm exactly because it fails on this vital requirement.	Support noted.	
4099 - Guilden Morden Parish Council	Support	Support the Guilden Morden Village Framework as shown on the SCDC UCS Map 20.	Noted.	
3649 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 5547 3143 - CPRE Cambridgeshire	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*District Council's Assessment*

*Approach to Draft DPD*

---

**Decision on CS3 Village Frameworks - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified. Make changes to village frameworks as detailed.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS4 Qualification as a Rural Centre - Preferred Approach*

1594	Object	<p>The criteri by which the Rural Centres are to be identified are far too stringent. Only 5 settlements have been identified in the District and not even these meet all the 4 criteria. The current 12 settlements defined as Rural Growth Centres in the Local Plan including Willingham have passed the test of sustainability and should be retained as Rural Centres. This will enable a wider distribution of growth and maintain local services and enable the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs.</p>	<p>The Key Criteria used to designate Rural Centres are based on those set out at paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure Plan. The 12 settlements designated as Rural Growth Settlements in the Local Plan 2004 were identified by reseach carried out in 1998 on the basis of the policies of the previous Structure Plan. It does not follow that these same settlements are suitable for designation as Rural Centres.</p>	
2264 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Object	<p>Gamlingay Parish Council (GPC) supports the four key criteria identified on page 18. GPC suggests the rural selection criteria based on population be increased from 3,000 to 4,000 population, with the exception of Fulbourn (due to its obvious proximity to Cambridge City and in the interests of developing in a sustainable way). This proposed amendment would not have any adverse affect on the results of the study, and clarifies that development should be channelled to the main population centres identified, with associated key criteria.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure states that "Rural Centres will generally have a population of at least 3,000..." It is therefore not appropriate to impose a threshold population of 4,000, as this would contradict the intention of Structure Plan with regard to what the minimum population of a Rural Centre might be.</p>	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3130	Object	The criteria listed could be used by developers to justify unsustainable development. (ie) One or two places at a Secondary School which may already be at capacity on the basis of say 50 dwellings provided. The policy should be re-drafted to avoid open ended provision in villages approaching or at sustainable limit.	The capacity of existing infrastructure and facilities in the village would be considering in assessing development proposals against CS5. CS5 states "The preferred approach to development within Rural Centres is to allow development and redevelopment for housing estates, housing groups and infilling where sites are identified where development or redevelopment can be accommodated without causing harm to amenity or the local environment and services, facilities and infrastructure are available or can be made available or can be made available as part of the development". Applying CS5 would lead to development of the type described in the representation being refused planning permission.	
2580 - FPDSavills	Object	We do not accept that the starting point for the selection of Rural Growth Settlements is the threshold of 3,000 population. The Council take the view that population is a more important determinant than services and facilities. We strongly disagree.	Noted. Paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure Plan states that "Rural Centres will generally have a population of at least 3,000". It is considered that a population of 3,000 is required to support the level of services and facilities that is associated with a Rural Centre. If a lower threshold than this were adopted it might result in the designation of villages where the viability of the services and facilities necessary to be designated as a Rural Centre was more at risk.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2138 - DLP Consultants Ltd	Object	The designation of Rural Centres should serve a wider planning purpose than simply that of determining land allocations. Conversely, land allocation can support communities and their social and economic viability. Cottenham is an important centre north of Cambridge. Planned new development would reinforce its role and would be sustainable. The Local Plan should look to allocate or reallocate land to sustainable settlements such as Cottenham and should have regard to the needs of the post 2016 strategy arising from Regional Spatial Strategy which cannot simply be ignored in the preparation of the LDF.	<p>The Structure Plan strategy is aiming to turn around a development strategy from one which spreads development across the villages of South Cambridgeshire to one which focusses development in and on the edge of Cambridge and at a new town at Northstowe. The Structure Plan carries with it a residue of development allocations from the former strategy and allows for some continued small scale development in villages. Cottenham would be included as a Minor Rural Centre to take into account the role it plays in providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland.</p> <p>It is considered that it would be premature to provide for growth after 2016. This is because Draft RSS14 rolls forward the Structure Plan to 2016, with an additional requirement to 2021. The Structure Plan requires 20,000 houses in 17 years (1999 to 2016), giving an annual average of 1176.5 dwellings. Draft RSS14 requires 23,500 2001 to 2021, giving an average annual amount of 1175. Therefore the LDF is already planning for the rate of development required. The strategy for development reflects RPG14, Draft RSS14, and the Structure Plan.</p>	Include Cottenham as a proposed Minor Rural Centre.
6599 - J W Burgess & Son	Object	There should be a greater number of service villages in the district, or the establishment of a lower order service village.	Minor Rural Centres will be designated in order to take into account the role that villages can play in providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland.	Designate Minor Rural Centres as described in Recommendations section.
3204	Object	The Objection relates to the failure to provide for the enlargement of Cambourne beyond the limits of the Master Plan to achieve a more sustainable development.	Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of Cambourne, or any other Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2368 - RAVE	Object	The policy is too prescriptive and ignores the the role of Rural Centres as foci in their own hinterland. It also takes no account of the guidance to be found in the Panel Report discounting this role for larger villages near to Cambridge.	The criteria to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure Plan. However, agree that policy may in some respects have been applied in an over-prescriptive way and agree that more weight needs to be given to role of Rural Centres in providing services. It is proposed that an additional category of settlement, that of Minor Rural Centres, should be identified. Minor Rural Centres would be those villages that, whilst failing to meet the criteria set out in the Structure Plan, nevertheless perform a role in terms providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. With regard to larger villages close to Cambridge, the Structure Plan Panel Report states as follows: "The precise proportion of development provision allocated to Rural Centres will be a matter to be determined by Local Plans and will obviously be greater in some areas than others. 2.31 It should be emphasised, however, that we do not intend this as a signal that larger villages around Cambridge should continue to play a significant role in meeting wider development needs once the existing commitments are used up. Throughout the EIP we heard reference to the need to 'turn the supertanker' of development provision in the Cambridge Sub-Region around to a more sustainable direction." (paras 2.30 and 2.31 of the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan EIP Panel Report) Whilst some of the larger villages around Cambridge have been designated as Rural Centres, it is not proposed that any additional housing allocations should be made in these villages. These villages will not play a significant role in accommodating growth beyond existing commitments. The only village where significant growth is proposed is in Cambourne.	Amend Rural Centres methodology and designate Minor Rural Centres as set out in Recommendations section.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6595	Object	There should be a greater number of service villages in the district, or the establishment of a lower order service village.	Minor Rural Centres will be designated to take account more fully of the role that villages play in providing services and facilities for their rural hinterland.	Designate Minor Rural Centres as described in the Recommendation section.

---



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3509 3511	Object	Support Fulbourn Parish Council's and RAVE's objections to the proposals that Fulbourn village becomes a Rural Centre. Such proposals would result in unrestricted development leading to the coalescence of the village with the city. The amenities and facilities for education, travel, youth schemes and the sewerage system are inadequate to accept any proposed expansion.	<p>It is proposed that Fulbourn should be removed from the list of Rural Centres and designated as a Minor Rural Centre, because representations indicate that the level of services and facilities generally fall below the level of those in other Rural Centres, in particularly in that the doctor's surgery in Fulbourn is a branch surgery with limited opening hours, the library facility is very limited and that the village is not well related to a secondary school. If these considerations are taken into account, Fulbourn cannot be considered to meet the Village Facilities Key Criterion. Fulbourn would therefore only meet two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities) set out in the Preferred Options Report. In spite of these considerations, Fulbourn nevertheless can be said to have a reasonable range of shops in the village and there is evidence to suggest that it does perform a role in serving the needs of the quite remote rural area to the east and south-east of Cambridge. It is therefore proposed for inclusion as a Minor Rural Centre.</p> <p>In Minor Rural Centres, it is proposed that developments up to small estate level (25 dwellings) will be permitted within the village framework, although the acceptability of any developments of a scale above group level (8 dwellings) will be dependent on existing facilities being improved. Issues of infrastructure capacity and the availability of services for new development are addressed by CS5, which states: "The preferred approach to development within Rural Centres is to allow development and redevelopment for housing estates, housing groups and infilling where sites are identified or redevelopment can be accommodated without causing harm to amenity or the local environment and services, facilities and infrastructure are</p>	Remove Fulbourn from list of proposed Rural Centres and add to list of proposed Minor Rural Centres, as detailed in the Recommendation section.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

			available or can be made available as part of the development." Applying CS5 would lead to new development being refused planning permission where services, facilities and infrastructure are not available and cannot be made available.	
3160 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	<p>1. a category of rural centres of less than 3,000 should be included to allow for some development in smaller settlements to encourage and support local communities.</p> <p>2. a minimum density of new housing development at 30 dph should not be specified for all occasions, this should be governed by local circumstance.</p>	<p>Minor Rural Centres will be designated to take account of the role that some villages play in providing services and facilities for a local hinterland, however these villages will, like Rural Centres, be generally expected to have a population of above 3,000.</p> <p>It is considered that Group level developments of 8 dwellings (or exceptionally up to 15 dwellings if the development would make best use of a redundant brownfield site) is the maximum size of scheme that can be sustainably accommodated in villages of below 3,000 population.</p> <p>In view of this, CS22 of the Core Strategy makes provision for densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare in all cases, unless "there are very special local circumstances that require a different treatment." A more liberal approach would contradict the Structure Plan, Policy 5/3 of which states "Densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare will not be acceptable", and PPG3.</p>	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4006 - Bidwells Property Consultants	Object	<p>On Policy CS4 we remark at this juncture on the Council's later failure to observe its own criteria; given that there is flexibility, therefore, we propose additional Rural Centres.</p> <p>We say additionally, depending on what Rural Centre status is meant to convey, that both PENs should be categorised as Rural Centres.</p>	<p>The Villages that were identified were those villages which passed three of the Key Criteria that were identified, and Cambourne, which during the LDF period will develop into the second largest settlement in the district and will have a range of services and facilities to reflect its scale. The approach to the designation of Rural Centres would be changed to reflect the role that villages play in providing services and facilities for their rural hinterlands and Minor Centres would be designated. The close proximity of Bar Hill to Northstowe, a new town which will serve a rural hinterland, means that it would not be advisable to designate Bar Hill as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre Northstowe is the more logical location for additional service provision.</p>	
3651 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 4906 - Cambridgeshire Recycling 5234 5310 2857 - Januarys	Object	<p>Arbitrary and unjustified criteria used to define Rural Centres, an unreasonable basis on which to establish a settlement hierarchy.</p>	<p>The criteria used to assess Rural Centres are set out in the Structure Plan at paragraph 1.17.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4275 - Westbury Homes	Object	The qualification criteria for Rural Centres needs to be reconsidered. The application of the criteria means that the selection of Rural Centres is restricted to 5 settlements close to Cambridge City. Other large settlements will have a lower status for development.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure Plan. However, agree that policy may in some respects have been applied in an over-prescriptive way and agree that more weight needs to be given to role of Rural Centres in providing services. It is proposed that an additional category of settlement, that of Minor Rural Centres, should be identified. Minor Rural Centres would be those villages that, whilst failing to meet the criteria set out in the Structure Plan, nevertheless perform a role in terms providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. The proposed list of Minor Rural Centres is set out in the Recommendations section.	
4345 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Although within the spirit of paragraph 1.17 of the Structure Plan which sets criteria for the selection of rural centres, the way the criteria have been used has led to a preponderance of rural centres close to Cambridge, and the exclusion of some candidates that would more truly act as rural centres and have a surrounding rural area - also referred to in Paragraph 1.17. Other candidates are principally Linton, Melbourn and possibly Gamlingay. There is spare school capacity at Melbourn and Gamlingay, although capacity is more of a problem at Linton. The criterion on employment is unnecessarily stringent and will be difficult to monitor. Selection of any village as a rural centre should be linked to the provision of High Quality Public Transport links.	The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure Plan. However, agree that policy may in some respects have been applied in an over-prescriptive way and agree that more weight needs to be given to role of Rural Centres in providing services. It is proposed that an additional category of settlement, that of Minor Rural Centres, should be identified. Minor Rural Centres would be those villages that, whilst failing to meet the criteria set out in the Structure Plan, nevertheless perform a role in terms providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. The proposed list of Minor Rural Centres is set out in the Recommendations section.	Include Gamlingay, Linton and Melbourn as proposed Minor Rural Centres as detailed in the Recommendation section.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4557 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Whilst a classification of villages is desirable to identify suitable growth locations, the criteria should not be applied too rigidly to exclude otherwise beneficial development, especially of problematic brownfield sites. Some villages such as Hauxton work as a group in a sustainable manner.	Hauxton would be identified as a Group Village. In Group Villages residential development or redevelopment up to a maximum scheme size of 16 dwellings would be permitted if this would make the best use of a brownfield site.	
4797 4795 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd	Object	Bar Hill qualifies in meeting the stated criteria.	In terms of the Rural Centres Key Criteria, Bar Hill fails to meet those relating to both public transport and to the accessibility of secondary education. It is also considered that it would be inappropriate to designate Bar Hill as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre as the settlement will have close proximity to the new town of Northstowe.	
5181	Object	Melbourn should be designated a Rural Centre with peripheral growth. The Rural Centres report did not take into account the close proximity of Melbourn to the Tesco foodstore in Royston and the capability available at this supermarket for home deliveries of food shopping. The floorspace total for Melbourn also does not take into account "Bury Lane Fruit Farm" or "Fieldgate Nurseries". In addition, the reference to the need for availability of good public transport to Cambridge (para 1.17 Structure Plan 2003) makes no allowance for either the distance from Cambridge or Melbourn's proximity to the County border.	Acknowledge that Melbourn, despite not being well served in public transport terms, has a reasonable range of services and facilities and performs a role in serving a local hinterland and it is therefore proposed as a Minor Rural Centre.	Include Melbourn in the list of proposed Minor Rural Centres as detailed in the Recommendations section.
4677 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	The Council should have considered whether or not general tightening of policy in the Rural Centres and larger villages could lead to reduced levels of intensification, infill and village expansion, thereby more effectively reducing the adverse effects of sporadic rural development.  Alternative Option for CS4: Increasing the specification for Rural Centres to further reduce the number of such settlements in the District.	Guidelines for designating Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the Structure Plan. It is considered that these guidelines were applied over-prescriptively in the initial assessment detailed in the Rural Centres Preferred Options Report, resulting in a number of villages which play a role in providing facilities for their local hinterland not being designated as Rural Centres. It has therefore been decided to It is therefore not considered appropriate	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5163 - Laing Homes North Thames	Object	The criterion for "population of at least 3,000" has been applied too rigidly. Para 1.17 of the Structure Plan states "Rural Centres will generally have a population of at least 3,000". Other settlements should be assessed even if they have less than 3,000 population as not to miss those villages which can meet the other criteria and which may be equally sustainable.	Noted. Paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure Plan states that "Rural Centres will generally have a population of at least 3,000". It is considered that a population of 3,000 is required to support the level of services and facilities that is associated with a Rural Centre. If a lower threshold than this were adopted it might result in the designation of villages where the viability of the services and facilities necessary to be designated as a Rural Centre was more at risk.	
6101 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6104 - Centex Strategic Land 6141 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	Rural centres should provide for more than limited growth in helping to meet overall land requirement both to 2016 and beyond to 2021. New allocations and planned delivery of additional services and general infrastructure can help make a location more sustainable, ensuring it would accord with the criteria in CS4 in the near future.	<p>It is considered that it would be premature to provide for growth after 2016. This is because Draft RSS14 rolls forward the Structure Plan to 2016, with an additional requirement to 2021. The Structure Plan requires 20,000 houses in 17 years (1999 to 2016), giving an annual average of 1176.5 dwellings. Draft RSS14 requires 23,500 2001 to 2021, giving an average annual amount of 1175. Therefore the LDF is already planning for the rate of development required. The strategy for development reflects RPG14, Draft RSS14, and the Structure Plan.</p> <p>Structure Plan Policy P1/1 identifies Rural Centres as being the least sustainable and least preferred stage in the sequence of locations for housing development up to 2016. To provide more homes than is necessary in villages which are still less sustainable locations than Rural Centres in order that those villages may attain Rural Centre status would be contrary to the principles of sustainability and to the policies of the Structure Plan.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6158 (Land at Beach Road, Cottenham)	Object	Our client's land (edged red) is attached on the accompanying plan. The qualifying criteria for Rural Centres are too stringent. In particular, the plan should reflect the existence of major employment centres such as Cambridge Research Park. The representation should be read in association with January's general representation relating to CS6.	Cottenham would be designated as a Minor Rural Centre under the revised approach to Rural Centres. No new housing allocations will be proposed in the village and the preferred location for new development will be on brownfield land within the existing boundary of the village, reflecting the guidance given in Structure Plan policy P1/1. The least preferred location for new development in Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres will be greenfield land on the periphery of settlements. The site identified adjacent to Dunstal Field lies in the Green Belt some way from the existing village framework boundary. It is therefore not an appropriate location for new development.	
6626 (Land at Beech Tree Farm, South of Shepreth Road, Foxton)	Object	Qualifying criteria for Rural Centres are too prescriptive and that, as a consequence, too few centres in which growth will be permitted have been identified. A further classification of villages is needed to enable moderate growth in the reasonably sized villages. Foxton has a range of facilities, together with a station on the Cambridge-Royston-London line. It is therefore, a very sustainable location capable of accommodating additional development. Two sites would provide suitable locations for additional growth in Foxton.	Foxton is not an appropriate for consideration as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre. The settlement has a very limited range of facilities, with only one shop/post office and it is considered that the village does not serve a local hinterland beyond the village itself. In mid-2002 the population of the village was 1,210. It would be contrary to the guidance given in Policy 1/1 and paragraph 1.17 of the Structure Plan to designate a settlement of this size as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6161 - Munro Group Ltd (Land between Bannold Road/Burgess Road, Waterbeach) 6179 - Munro Group Ltd (Land North of Cambridge Road, Waterbeach) 6160	Object	Representations argue for the inclusion of Waterbeach as a Rural Centre, citing the presence of the rail link to Cambridge. It is also argued that the qualifying criteria for Rural Centres have been applied too stringently.	The WAGN rail service to Cambridge was taken into account in the assessment of Public Transport, and it was found that Waterbeach narrowly failed to meet the criteria. Waterbeach does not have good access to a secondary school and, relative to other villages of a similar size, has only limited convenience shopping provision. It is therefore considered that it would be inappropriate to designate Waterbeach as a proposed Rural Centre. However, it is acknowledged that Waterbeach provides services and facilities for a rural hinterland which includes smaller villages and hamlets such as Landbeach, Chittering and Clayhithe. It is therefore proposed that Waterbeach should be included as a Minor Rural Centre.	Include Waterbeach on the list of proposed Minor Rural Centres, as detailed in the Recommendations section.
5710 - The Masters and Fellows of Pembroke College	Object	Linton should be included in the list of Rural Centres.	Noted. Linton will be proposed for designation as a Minor Rural Centre to take into account the role it plays in providing for its local hinterland. The maximum size of development permitted will be up to 25 dwellings on sites within the Village Framework of the village. See Recommendations section.	Include Linton on the list of proposed Minor Rural Centres, as detailed in the Recommendations section.
5912 (Berrycroft Stores, Berrycroft, Willingham)	Object	The selection criteria for the identification of Rural Centres is flawed. Facilities within Willingham, and the ease of access to other large centres, should justify the identification of the village as a Rural Centre. No account appears to have been made of the impact of the proposed rapid transit system along the former St Ives to Cambridge railway line.	It is proposed that an additional category of settlement, that of Minor Rural Centres, should be identified. Minor Rural Centres would be those villages that, whilst failing to meet the criteria set out in the Structure Plan, nevertheless perform a role in terms providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. Agree that proposed improvements to the transport network, such as the guided bus, should be taken into consideration. However, Willingham would not be included as a Minor Rural Centre because of its proximity to the new town of Northstowe, which will effectively provide services and facilities for a rural hinterland.	



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5918 - The Davison Group (Land North East of Papworth Everard)	Object	Object to the omission of Papworth Everard from the designation of Rural Centres. This will result in it being classified as a Group Village in which only groups of 8 houses will be permitted. Papworth Everard should be reclassified as a Rural Centre, or further classification of villages in which a moderate rate of growth will be permitted. The village has a wide range of facilities and services. It is in close proximity to the Rural Centre of Cambourne which has a range of services which should widen over the Plan period. In particular, it is recommended that consideration be given to Papworth expanding on the land to the east.	Whilst Papworth Everard will attain a population level of more than 3,000 during the LDF period, it is not considered that it would be appropriate to designate the village as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre. Public Transport links to Cambridge and the market towns from the village are not sufficiently frequent. The village is also not within a safe cycling distance of a secondary school. As the Local Plan 2004 states, "for its size, the village has few facilities", with one general shop operated by Nisa and one further shop. The close proximity of Papworth Everard to Cambourne, a village which is proposed as a Rural Centre and which will reach a population of around 7,000 during the plan period, entails that it would not be advisable to designate Papworth Everard as a Rural Centre. Cambourne is at present better served by public transport and has a wider range of facilities than Papworth Everard. As the LDF period progresses, it is likely that the differential between the settlements in terms of the range of facilities available will increase. Of the two villages Cambourne is, and will continue to be, the more sustainable location for facilities associated with a Rural Centre and it is therefore considered that Papworth Everard should not be designated as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre.	
--	--------	---	--	--

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6105 - Humo Holdings (Land at Strawberry Farm, Great Abington)	Object	The qualifying criteria in Rural Centres are too stringent. The emerging Local Plan should take a more holistic approach to developing sustainable communities. In particular, the plan should reflect the existence of major employment centres such as Granta Park. The designation of Great Abington as a Group Village is illogical given that Granta Park employing 2,300 people to within walking/cycling distance. Our client's land at Great Abington (edged red on the accompanying plan) represents an ideal location for sustainable residential development. Consideration should be given to representations submitted by January's on CS7, CS8 and CS19.	Agree that qualifying criteria may have been applied in too stringent a way. A revised approach to Rural Centres policy is proposed as set out in the Recommendations section. However, consider that the designation of Great Abington as a Group Village is appropriate. In mid-2002 Great Abington had a population of 840, and one shop. Although there is local employment available, the almost complete lack of village facilities means that it would be inappropriate to allow for development of a scale above that permitted in a Group Village.	
5842 5852 4432 - Hallam Land Management Ltd 5814 - P B Moore & Sons 5769 - Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd 5803 - Westbury Homes Ltd	Object	Object to interpretation of criteria for selection of rural centres detailed in the Structure Plan. In particular, Public Transport services (doesnt take account of planned improvements) and Village Facilities (takes no account of multiple smaller stores).	Agree that greater consideration needs to be given to future improvements in public transport provision in designating which villages should be Rural Centres. The test that was applied with regard to convenience shopping was as to whether it was possible for a resident of the village to undertake his or her full weekly shop in the village. A large number of specialist foodstores does not necessarily mean that the village would have the facilities to fulfil this role. However, agree that more explicit consideration needs to be given to the role of smaller stores in underpinning village shopping provision.	Include in Rural Centres DPD consideration of the impact of the Guided Bus and of improvements to public transport corridors in determining which villages should be designated as Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres. Include in Rural Centres DPD analysis of smaller stores in assessment of the adequacy of food shopping provision of the villages.

---

<i><b>Representations</b></i>		<i><b>Nature Representation Summary</b></i>	<i><b>District Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Approach to Draft DPD</b></i>
-------------------------------	--	---	---	-------------------------------------

---

5883	Object	<p>Appropriate scale of growth, commensurate with the Rural Centres categorisation can only be provided by designating land outside the existing village framework boundaries. Amend village framework to include land at London Road, Great Shelford is considered ideal for further growth, which could be achieved with detriment to village amenity and which would relate well to that proposed in Cambridge City.</p>	<p>Rural Centres are the least favoured option in the sequence of locations for development set out in Structure Plan Policy P1/1. The villages of South Cambridgeshire are not the most sustainable locations for growth. Policy P1/1 states that "local plans may provide for a limited proportion of the overall development provision to take place at identified Rural Centres on a scale appropriate to the size, location and function of such centres, especially where it can make a contribution to the specified social and economic needs of those communities or groups of communities." It is considered that to allocate land for growth at Great Shelford would be not be a sustainable approach to providing for development at Rural Centres. Policy P1/1 identifies a sequential approach to development within Rural Centres, with previously developed land within the Village Framework being afforded the highest priority, followed by other land within the existing settlement, followed by brownfield land on the periphery of the settlement, and finally greenfield land on the periphery. The land at London Road is greenfield land outside the existing village framework boundary. If Great Shelford were considered as an appropriate village for there to be further housing allocations, the site proposed would not, by virtue of applying the sequential approach set out in Policy P1/1, be selected as being appropriate.</p>	
------	--------	---	---	--

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5954 - D H Barford & Co 5881 5882	Object	Population of at least 3000 people should not be decisive. Employment criteria is unnecessarily restrictive and not necessarily a good indicator of sustainability. Criteria of having a post office is not necessarily a reflection of sustainability. At least 30 dwellings per hectare does take account of the need to be compatible with character of surrounding area. Doesnt take account of geographical importance of some large villages. No consideration of the distribution of rural centres.	Paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure Plan states that "Rural Centres will generally have a population of at least 3,000". It is clear from this that a population of 3,000 should be a general requirement rather than a strict threshold intended to exclude villages with a population of less than 3,000 from consideration. It is therefore proposed that those villages that are expected to reach a population of 3,000 during the LDF period, and those villages which currently have a population of above 2,500, should be assessed against the Rural Centres criteria and considered for inclusion as Rural Centres. Structure Plan paragraph 1.17 states that villages to be designated as Rural Centres should contain a post office. The presence of a post office in a village means that fewer trips are made by private car than would otherwise be the case, therefore consider that the presence/asbence of a post office does provide an indication of how sustainable the village is. Structure Plan paragraph 1.17 states that Rural Centres will "generally have a population of at least 3,000 and have good access to a secondary school and to employment opportunities..." The approach adopted to identifying local employment opportunities, which was used in determining settlement categorisation in the course of preparing the Adopted Local Plan, was endorsed by the Inspector in his Local Plan Inquiry report of 2002 as being valid. CS22 of the Core Strategy makes provision for densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare in all cases, unless "there are very special local circumstances that require a different treatment." A more liberal approach towards the minimum acceotable housing density would contradict the Structure Plan, Policy 5/3 of which states "Densities of less than 30 dwellings per hectare will not be acceptable", and PPG3. Agree that the Rural Centres methodology did not	Adopt revised approach to designation of Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres as described in Recommendations section.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

				originally place sufficient importance on issues of the distribution of Rural Centres and the role of some larger villages in serving their local area. The approach to the designation of Rural Centres is to be revised to take greater account of these factors.
5955 (Land at Beech Tree Farm, North of Shepreth Road, Foxton)	Object	Qualifying criteria for Rural Centres are too prescriptive and that, as a consequence, too few centres in which growth will be permitted have been identified. A further classification of villages is needed to enable moderate growth in the reasonably sized villages. Foxton has a range of facilities, together with a station on the Cambridge-Royston-London line. It is therefore, a very sustainable location capable of accommodating additional development. Two sites would provide suitable locations for additional growth in Foxton.		Agree that guidance contained in Structure Plan paragraph 1.17 may have been applied in an over prescriptive way in arriving at the original list of Rural Centres. A revised approach to Rural Centres policy is proposed as set out in the Recommendations section. It is considered that Foxton is not an appropriate village for consideration as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre. The settlement has a very limited range of facilities, with only one shop/post office and it is considered that the village does not serve a local hinterland beyond the village itself. In mid-2002 the population of the village was 1,210. It would be contrary to the guidance given in Policy 1/1 and paragraph 1.17 of the Structure Plan to designate a settlement of this size as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre.
5888	Object	Appropriate scale of growth, commensurate with the Rural Centres categorisation can only be provided by designating land outside the existing village framework boundaries. Amend village framework to include land at London Road, Great Shelford is considered ideal for further growth, which could be achieved with detriment to village amenity and which would relate well to that proposed in Cambridge City.		The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5901 (Land North of Pampisford Road, Great Abington)	Object	Qualifying criteria for Rural Centres are too stringent. Emerging Plan should take a more proactive role in future growth rather than seeking to maintain the status quo. Plan should reflect the existence of major employment centres such as Granta Park. Designation of Great Abington as a Group village is illogical given Granta Park employing 2,300 people is within walking/cycling distance. Our client's land represents an ideal location for sustainable residential development.	Agree that guidance contained in Structure Plan paragraph 1.17 may have been applied in an over prescriptive way in arriving at the original list of Rural Centres. A revised approach to Rural Centres policy is proposed as set out in the Recommendations section. It is considered that Great Abington is not an appropriate village for consideration as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre. The settlement has a very limited range of facilities, with only one shop/post office and it is considered that the village does not serve a local hinterland beyond the village itself. In mid-2002 the population of the village was 840. It would be contrary to the guidance given in Policy 1/1 and paragraph 1.17 of the Structure Plan to designate a settlement of this size as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre.	
5978	Object	It is noted that Swavesey has an open space provision less than the minimum standard proposed. This shortfall could be addressed by means of developer contributions in the event of planning permission being granted for further development.	Noted. As detailed in the Recreation Study Annex (p179) Swavesey has a shortfall in relation to National Playing Fields Association standards in respect of Outdoor sport and Children's Playspace provision. CS52 states that "All new dwellings (excluding sheltered dwellings and residential homes) should contribute towards the provision or improvement of existing provision of playspace and informal open space to serve the needs of the new development". A Supplementary Planning Document will be produced to provide guidance on the way in which developer funding may be utilised to improve existing recreation provision in villages.	During the course of the preparation of the SPD, examine the potential of developer contributions being utilised to bring recreation provision in villages up to the National Playing Fields Standards requirements.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6001 - H C Moss (Builders) Ltd (Land at East Farm, Melbourn)	Object	When designating Rural Centres, the emphasis should have been the potential of settlements to reach the required criteria, rather than the criteria being met at this point in time. It is noted such flexibility was introduced in the case of Cambourne. Omission of Melbourn is an anomaly. The size, facilities and services justify designation, especially bearing in mind its location close to Royston and in close proximity to rail transport in addition to good road communications.	Agree that more consideration should have been given to the potential of settlements to meet the Rural Centres criteria, particularly in terms of public transport improvements that will occur during the LDF period. However, do not consider that circumstances in Melbourn are likely to change significantly during the LDF period. Acknowledge that Melbourn, despite not being well served in public transport terms, has a reasonable range of services and facilities and performs a role in serving a local rural hinterland. It is therefore proposed that Melbourn should be designated as a Minor Rural Centre.	Include Melbourn in the list of proposed Minor Rural Centres as detailed in the Recommendations section.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5979 - The W Scambler Trust (Land between Whitton Close/Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey) 5984 (Land North of Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey) 5973 5972 (Land between Whitton Close/Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey) 5977 (Land between Whitton Close/Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey) 6056 (Land North of Taylors Lane, Swavesey)	Object	Representations state that the qualifying criteria for Rural Centres are too prescriptive and that in some cases villages with a population of less than 3,000 should be considered for possible inclusion as Rural Centres. Swavesey is ideally suited to accommodate further growth, being in reasonable proximity to Cambridge, the A14 and the proposed transport system along the former St Ives-Cambridge railway line. Good facilities already exist, and there is a Business Park adjacent to the A14 intersection. A number of sites are identified to accommodate this proposed further growth.	<p>The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure Plan. However, agree that policy may in some respects have been applied in an over-prescriptive way and agree that more weight needs to be given to role of Rural Centres in providing services. It is proposed that an additional category of settlement, that of Minor Rural Centres, should be identified as detailed in the Recommendations section.</p> <p>Swavesey was not included in the original Rural Centres assessment which informed the Preferred Options Report because, as of mid-2001, it had a population of 2,480. However, it is considered that a population of 3,000 is required to support the level of services and facilities that is associated with a Rural Centre. If a lower threshold than this were adopted it might result in the designation of villages where the viability of the services and facilities necessary to be designated as a Rural Centre was more at risk. Swavesey, which had a population of 2,530 as of mid-2002, would therefore not be assessed.</p> <p>Despite the reasonably good range of facilities in Swavesey, the close proximity of Swavesey to Northstowe, and also to the existing town of St Ives, is likely to mean that the role of the settlement in providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland is likely to be limited. It is therefore considered unlikely that it would be appropriate for the village to be designated as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre even if it had a population of more than 3,000.</p>	
--	--------	---	--	--

---



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6011 (Land East of Recreation Ground, Over) 6014 (Land East of Recreation Ground, Over)	Object	Qualifying criteria for Rural Centres are too prescriptive and resultantly too few villages are identified as being capable of moderate growth. Over is a village capable of accommodating more than 8-15 dwellings.	<p>The criteria used to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure Plan. However, agree that policy may in some respects have been applied in an over-prescriptive way and agree that more weight needs to be given to role of Rural Centres in providing services. It is proposed that an additional category of settlement, that of Minor Rural Centres, should be identified. Minor Rural Centres would be those villages that, whilst failing to meet the criteria set out in the Structure Plan, nevertheless perform a role in terms providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. The proposed list of Minor Rural Centres is set out in the Recommendations section.</p> <p>The population of Over as of mid-2002 was 2,780. It was not therefore considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres. It is possible that Over has a range of services and facilities to merit its inclusion as a Minor Rural Centre. The proximity of Over to the new settlement of Northstowe would, however, mean that the role Over plays in serving a rural hinterland would be limited. It is questionable as to whether the village should be designated as a Minor Rural Centre, and thus identified as a priority location for improved services and facilities, given the probable availability of these services and facilities in Northstowe.</p>	Consider Over for possible designation as a Minor Rural Centre, following a more detailed assessment of the village in terms of its performance against the criteria set out in para 1.17 of the Structure Plan and of the village's role in serving a rural hinterland.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5963 (Land North of Kneesworth) 6099 (Land North of Brook Road, West of North End, Bassingbourn) 6069 (Land South of the cemetery, The Causeway, Bassingbourn)	Object	Representations state that the qualifying criteria for Rural Centres are too prescriptive and that greater flexibility should be applied to facilitate a greater number of villages to qualify for this designation. Representations states that a Group Village designation for Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth is inappropriate and that given the range of services and facilities available in the village it should be designated as a Rural Centre.	Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth was not considered in the original assessment of the villages considered for designation as Rural Centres as its population, excluding the population resident at Bassingbourn Barracks, was around 2,600. It is possible that Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth has a range of services and facilities which might merit its inclusion as a Minor Rural Centre, particularly given that there is a village college in the village. However, it is considered that the proximity of Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth to Royston means that the village plays a limited role in serving a rural hinterland.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

6053 - Balsham (Building) Ltd (7 High Street, Balsham) 6036 (Land North of Glebe Road, Barrington) 6031 6058 (Land off Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton) 6081 (Land between Cambridge Road & Thriplow Road, Fowlmere) 6606 5664 - Gallagher Waterbeach Limited	Object	The proposed categories of settlements does not permit sufficient flexibility. A further category should be introduced between Rural Centres and Group Villages. Will restrict sustainable development in other villages.	<p>The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre, or in the lower order villages.</p> <p>It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in the lower order villages, appropriate to their location, in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a very limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. Villages not classified as Rural Centres are less sustainable in terms of location and level of services and facilities, which makes them unsuitable for larger than Group level infill. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.</p>	
---	--------	---	---	--

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6079 (Land rear of 104 West Drive, Caldecote) 6620 (Land rear of 10 West Drive, Caldecote) 6080 (Land rear of 104 West Drive, Caldecote) 6621 (Land rear of 10 West Drive, Caldecote)	Object	Representations state that the qualifying criteria for Rural Centres are too prescriptive and that greater flexibility should be applied to facilitate a greater number of villages to qualify for this designation. Representations states that a Group Village designation for Highfields Caldecote is inappropriate given the range of services and facilities available in the village.	<p>The criteria to take into account in determining which settlements should be designated as Rural Centres are set out at paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure Plan. However, agree that policy may in some respects have been applied in an over-prescriptive way and agree that more weight needs to be given to role of Rural Centres in providing services. It is proposed that an additional category of settlement, that of Minor Rural Centres, should be identified. Minor Rural Centres would be those villages that, whilst failing to meet the criteria set out in the Structure Plan, nevertheless perform a role in terms providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. The proposed list of Minor Rural Centres is set out in the Recommendations section.</p> <p>Highfields Caldecote does not contain an appropriate range of facilities for it to be classified as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre. The village was categorised as a Rural Growth Settlement in the Local Plan Deposit 1999 because of the need to sustain the village's primary school. The village was subsequently demoted to a Group Village in the Local Plan 2004 as it was considered that the population of the village had reached a level sufficient to sustain the school. At present there is only one shop in the village, and in mid-2002 the population of the village was estimated to be 1,020. The village does not represent a sustainable location or have adequate facilities for development of a scale above that permitted in a Group Village.</p>	
2261 - Gamlingay Parish Council 1394 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	Gamlingay Parish Council (GPC) supports the methodology put forward in paragraph 2.14 in principle and recognises the deficiencies in infrastructure Gamlingay has, as identified in the rural centres preferred options paper para.5.1 on page 21.	Noted. Although Gamlingay plays a limited role in providing services and facilities for the smaller villages in its local hinterland, it does not perform well against the criteria set out in paragraph 1.17 of the Structure Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2927 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Support	There should be a limit on the maximum density of dwellings too. Papworth Everard is likely to attain a population of 3000 before 2016 and needs time to develop as a community. In recognition of its exceptional rate of growth (approx 350% in 20 years) and the contribution it has made, and continues to make, towards the housing needs of South Cambridgeshire, Papworth Everard should be specifically excluded from being considered as a Rural Centre in the lifetime of this LDF.	In a rural area, high density development can be undesirable in design terms and in terms of generating additional car use. It would not be appropriate, however, to apply a maximum density figure across the district because the maximum acceptable housing density should be determined on a site-by-site basis. Any negative impact arising from proposals for high density development would be addressed by applying the policies in the Development Principles section of the Core Strategy.  Whilst the high growth rates in housing and population, and the need for the village to develop as a community, are acknowledged, consider that it would not be appropriate to exclude Papworth Everard from consideration as a Rural Centre for the duration of the LDF period. However, Papworth Everard is not proposed as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre in the Rural Centres DPD. It is considered that Papworth Everard is too close to Cambourne, which will be proposed as a Rural Centre, for designation as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre to be appropriate.	
3457	Support	As Cambourne will never comply to this it should be removed from trying to become a Rural Centre	The policies in the LDF are intended to provide a framework for development in the district up to 2016. It is therefore necessary to consider commitments that will come forward between now and 2016. Cambourne will be one of the largest villages in the district and the range of facilities available will reflect this. For this reason Cambourne was included in the Preferred Options Report as a proposed Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2909 3491	Support	Support the designation of Fulbourn as a Rural Centre.	It is proposed that Fulbourn should be removed from the list of Rural Centres and designated as a Minor Rural Centre, as representations indicate that the level of services and facilities generally fall below the level of those in other Rural Centres, particularly the fact that the branch surgery is only part time, that the library facility is very limited and that the village is not well-related to a secondary school. If these considerations are taken into account, Fulbourn cannot be considered to meet the Village Facilities Key Criterion. Fulbourn would therefore only meet two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities) set out in the Preferred Options Report. In spite of these considerations, Fulbourn nevertheless can be said to have a reasonable range of shops in the village and there is evidence to suggest that it does perform a role in serving the needs of the quite remote rural area to the east and south-east of Cambridge.	Designate Fulbourn as a Minor Rural Centre as proposed in Recommendation section.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3373	Support	<p>Support Fulbourn's designation as a Rural centre with peripheral development.</p> <p>I cannot see that the eight sites identified in the Urban Capacity study will provide the housing required. neither will their size enable the village to provide necessary community services and facilities.</p> <p>The Lacey family have a suitable piece of land situated on the edge but within the ambit of Fulbourn village that is unsuitable for modern agriculture but could provide the space for a range of house sizes and types.</p>	<p>It is proposed that Fulbourn should be removed from the list of Rural Centres and designated as a Minor Rural Centre, Fulbourn would therefore only meet two of the Key Criteria (Public Transport Accessibility and Local Employment Opportunities) set out in the Preferred Options Report. In spite of these considerations, Fulbourn nevertheless can be said to have a reasonable range of shops in the village and there is evidence to suggest that it does perform a role in serving the needs of the quite remote rural area to the east and south-east of Cambridge. As a Minor Rural Centre, housing development would be limited to windfall developments of to 25 dwellings within the existing Village Framework. The acceptability of any new development above Group level (8 dwellings) will be dependent on existing facilities being improved. No housing allocations will be made in Fulbourn, as the District's requirement for additional housing development can be met by means of increased densities on residual land areas at Cambourne.</p>	
3145 - CPRE Cambridgeshire	Support	We would support this option	Support noted.	
5548	Support	Support, though it has to be recognised that some Rural Centres will be situated in the Green Belt and there may, therefore, be limited opportunities for development.	Support noted. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5994 (Land NW of 11 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford)	Support	Identification of Great Shelford / Stapleford as a Rural Centre is supported on account of its sustainable location, close to Cambridge, the ease and frequency of bus and rail services and the range of services available. However, the appropriate scale of growth, commensurate with this categorisation can only be provided by designating land outside the existing framework boundaries. In particular, our client's land off Shelford Road is considered to be an ideal, central location for future growth, which could be delivered without significant loss to the village amenity.	Support noted. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre.	
5941 6411	Support	Support the identification of Fulbourn as a Rural Centre.	Support noted.	



**Decision on CS4 Qualification as a Rural Centre - Preferred Approach**

Identify an additional category of settlement, that of Minor Rural Centres. Minor Rural Centres would be between Rural Centres and Group Villages in the settlement hierarchy. Minor Rural Centres would be those villages that, whilst failing to meet the criteria set out in the Structure Plan, nevertheless perform a role in terms providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. In Minor Rural Centres, the acceptability of all developments of a scale above Group level would be dependent on existing facilities being improved. The maximum size of development permitted would be small estate level, i.e. up to an upper limit of 25 dwellings. No peripheral housing allocations would be made in Minor Rural Centres.

Revise approach to selection criteria. The Village Facilities criterion will look more fully at the range of provision of shops and services in the village, with the importance of the total floorspace of convenience foodstores in the villages being reduced. A less stringent approach will be taken to the application of the Public Transport Key Criterion. The role of settlements in providing for their hinterland, and the geographical spread of Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres through the District will be considered. In addition, the effect of Northstowe on the function of individual settlements and proposed improvements to public transport provision will also be taken into account.

## Rural Centres:

- 7  Cambourne
- 7  Sawston
- 7  Histon & Impington
- 7  Great Shelford & Stapleford

## Minor Rural Centres:

- 7  Fulbourn
- 7  Melbourn
- 7  Linton
- 7  Gamlingay
- 7  Cottenham

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS5 Development within Rural Centres - Preferred Approach</i>				
3163 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	This policy should include allowance for windfall sites that have not yet been identified.	Redevelopment is permitted within village frameworks at a scale in accordance with its location. An Urban Capacity Study has been undertaken to take account of potential windfall sites in the larger villages. This has been considered as part of the detailed examination of housing land supply.	
3653 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	The Urban Capacity Study may have identified scope in all candidate Rural Centres for a limited proportion of the overall development provision. However, it has not identified the specific means whereby local facilities can be enhanced, or recreation space provided commensurate with the possible levels of development.	The Urban Capacity Study identified potential sites for development / redevelopment in the larger villages, including those identified as Rural Centres. It does not set out the development strategy for the redevelopment of such sites. This is set out in the Core Strategy DPD, through the Strategy, and Services and Facilities Chapters.	
3654 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Development should be constrained to be "within the village framework".	Redevelopment is permitted within village frameworks at a scale in accordance with its location. The wording of CS5 should be made clarified, consistent with CS7 and CS8 to make it clear that development should be within the village frameworks.	Amend wording to make it clear that development will only be permitted within the village frameworks.
5311	Object	The LDF is being produced in the strategic context of the Structure Plan 2003. This does not place any specific limits on the size of individual housing schemes that would be permitted in the Rural Centres. It is therefore unnecessary to refer to different types and hence sizes of housing schemes.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre. However, this does not preclude unlimited infill within the Rural Centres, compatible with its location.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4678 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	<p>The Council should have considered whether or not general tightening of policy in the Rural Centres and larger villages could lead to reduced levels of intensification, infill and village expansion, thereby more effectively reducing the adverse effects of sporadic rural development.</p> <p>Alternative Option for CS5: Introduce more stringent criteria to CS5 to further limit the scale of infill development in Rural Centres.</p>	<p>It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.</p>	
5066	Object	<p>(1) Rural Centres Key Criteria are not appropriate when considering food shop area in respect of Melbourn; (2) Melbourn should be considered a Rural Centre with peripheral development; (3) Village Framework of Melbourn too restrictive; (4) Local bus services should be improved in relation to Royston; (5) Possible Infill sites are not identified in the LDF report; (6) Other greenfield sites should be considered; (7) All Rural Centres identified so far appear to be satellites of Cambridge City; (8) Not consideration in report in relation to across border towns and villages; (9) Possible creation of energy centres using satellite villages of both market towns and Cambridge; (10) As with (9) should Royston become part of Cambridgeshire? (11) Study of the town of Woking as an example of how an energy centre should work.</p>	<p>Melbourn would be proposed for inclusion as a Minor Rural Centres, where proposed development of up to 25 dwellings may be permitted subject to the development leading to the improvement of services and facilities. Paragraph 1.1 of the Structure Plan sets out that the preferred location for development in Rural Centres will be on brownfield sites within the existing Village Framework boundary, with greenfield sites on the periphery of the village being the least preferred option. The site identified is therefore not considerate appropriate at this stage.</p>	
5235 (Highgate Farm, Over Road, Willingham)	Object	<p>The LDF is being produced in the strategic context of the Structure Plan 2003, which provides for local plans to facilitate small-scale employment development in Rural Centres to help support the vitality of rural communities. Meeting social and economic needs can only be satisfied with limited additional development - opportunity at Highgate Farm, Over Road, Willingham.</p>	<p>It is not considered appropriate to amend the village framework to include farm buildings as farms are a countryside use and do not constitute previously developed land according to the definition in PPG3.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4909 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	CS5 and Paras 2.17 and 2.18 - The LDF is being prepared in the strategic context of the adopted Structure Plan 2003 which does not place any specific limits on the size of individual housing schemes that would be permitted in Rural Centres. It is therefore unnecessary to refer to different types and hence sizes of housing schemes. With regard to meeting the social or economic needs of communities which could only be satisfied as a result of limited additional development, we consider there is the opportunity at Gamlingay to rationalise and considerably improve currently unattractive uses and industrial processes on the edge of the village and provide housing, including affordable housing, improved facilities and services etc, as part of a sustainable and well designed village extension.	It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.	
5712 - Dixon International Group Ltd	Object	Support the general thrust of the policy but object to the inherent inconsistencies contained within the LDF regarding the location of new development.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5995 (Land NW of 11 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford)	Object	Identification of Great Shelford / Stapleford as a Rural Centre is supported on account of its sustainable location, close to Cambridge, the ease and frequency of bus and rail services and the range of services available. However, the appropriate scale of growth, commensurate with this categorisation can only be provided by designating land outside the existing framework boundaries. In particular, our client's land off Shelford Road is considered to be an ideal, central location for future growth, which could be delivered without significant loss to the village amenity.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre.	
5953 - D H Barford & Co	Object	Wording does not make sense. This could be interpreted to mean that development will only be allowed 'where sites are identified'.	Noted. The wording could be clearer.	Reword CS6 to make it explicit that the redevelopment of brownfield sites within Rural Centres will be permitted.
1595	Support	This policy will allow for the larger settlements to achieve a degree of development that will sustain their service and infrastructure provision. The Village Frameworks should be amended to accommodate future growth on sites identified as being appropriate and not causing harm to amenity and local environment	Support noted. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that there is scope to more than meet the housing numbers without the need to amend village frameworks and/or allocate sites.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2323	Support	I have one point to make concerning developments in the Sawston area where we already have 3 industrial areas around the village, causing considerable heavy traffic to traverse the village streets. Sawston was provided with an excellent bypass some 20 years ago and I strongly believe that all such industrial areas should be located adjacent to it to preserve the character of the village and improve road safety. Two of the industrial areas already abutt the bypass but the Babraham Road site, which has several units and open areas vacant, does not. It would seem sensible, therefore, that if further housing development apart from that already proposed at Portobello Road is considered for Sawston the area currently occupied by the Babraham Road Industrial area should be re-developed for housing. There is already good road access to the site and there is a school and green recreation space nearby. The remaining industrial units should be relocated for direct access from the bypass.	Noted. The designation of a settlement as a Rural Centre does not necessarily mean that any housing growth, other than □windfall□ development, occurs. RC3 in the Rural Centres DPD outlines the proposed approach to development in the Rural Centres, which does not include further development at Sawston. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate sites in any other Rural Centre.	
4346 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Protection of greenspace with biodiversity value in Rural Centres is suggested. This might be covered in the definition of amenity value.	Support noted. Redevelopment will not be permitted on sites designated in the LDF for another purpose, such as sites with amenity or wildlife value - for example, Protected Village Amenity Areas (PVAAs).	
5549	Support	Support, though it has to be recognised that some Rural Centres will be situated in the Green Belt and there may, therefore, be limited opportunities for development.	Support noted. RC3 in the Rural Centres DPD outlines the proposed approach to development in the Rural Centres. at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate sites in, or on the edge of, any other Rural Centre	

---

*Representations**Nature Representation Summary**District Council's Assessment**Approach to Draft DPD*

---

**Decision on CS5 Development within Rural Centres - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

Identify an additional category of settlement, that of Minor Rural Centres. Minor Rural Centres would be between Rural Centres and Group Villages in the settlement hierarchy. Minor Rural Centres would be those villages that, whilst failing to meet the criteria set out in the Structure Plan, nevertheless perform a role in terms providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. In Minor Rural Centres, the acceptability of all developments of a scale above Group level would be dependent on existing facilities being improved. The maximum size of development permitted would be small estate level, i.e. up to an upper limit of 25 dwellings. No peripheral housing allocations would be made in Minor Rural Centres.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS6 Peripheral Development at Rural Centres - Preferred Approach*

1596	Object	Rather than enable the spread of identified settlements around their peripheries, it is more appropriate to identify a greater number of settlements which can accommodate new development without resorting to the potential for urban sprawl. Such villages and their boundaries should be defined through the LDF process	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. Account has also been made for brownfield sites within the larger villages in the Urban Capacity Study. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre, or elsewhere.
4014 - Bidwells Property Consultants	Object	CS6 states that Rural Centres will be classified as with or without peripheral development. If this exercise has been carried out it is not evident or explained. Apart from anything else, why designate Rural Centres with no growth provision.	This detailed background was outlined in the Rural Centres DPD. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more sites at the other Rural Centres, therefore they will be Rural Centres without development. However, this does not preclude the redevelopment of brownfield sites within Rural Centres, and to a larger scale than that permitted in Group villages.

---



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

3854 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)	Object	The preferred approach refers to provision for development on the edge of Rural Centres, where there is insufficient capacity within the built up area for development or redevelopment. Our site provides sufficient capacity for redevelopment. It is a previously developed brownfield site, and its redevelopment accords with national planning policy. It would also reduce the need to develop on existing greenfield sites.	Allocating sites for residential development adjoining group villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. The Urban Capacity Study demonstrates sufficient land available further up the search sequence for sites. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The rural settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. In particular within group villages, a slightly larger scale of development is permitted than infill villages, due to the services available. It would be unsustainable to allocate large sites due to the disproportionate number of additional journeys this would create.	
5312	Object	Support the approach in principle but do not support the effect of this approach in practice - once applied it effectively restricts peripheral development to only one settlement, at Cambourne.	Support noted. The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. At the Rural Centres, there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. However, the strategy does not preclude 'windfall' development within other Rural Centres or other lower order villages, which could allow the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more sites in any other Rural Centre.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4680 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	<p>The Council should have considered whether or not general tightening of policy in the Rural Centres and larger villages could lead to reduced levels of intensification, infill and village expansion, thereby more effectively reducing the adverse effects of sporadic rural development.</p> <p>Alternative Option for CS6: Delete CS6 on the basis that further expansion, even at Rural Centres, is undesirable in the context of both of the overall pattern of development and the potential for housing at more sustainable locations elsewhere.</p>	<p>It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.</p>	
5236 (Highgate Farm, Over Road, Willingham)	Object	<p>Support the approach in principle but do not support the effect of this approach in practice - once applied it effectively restricts peripheral development to only one settlement, at Cambourne. We consider Willingham should be identified a Rural Centre and that some peripheral development should be provided at Highgate Farm, Over Road, Willingham in the form of a planned "business park" form of development.</p>	<p>It is not considered appropriate to amend the village framework to include farm buildings as farms are a countryside use and do not constitute previously developed land according to the definition in PPG3.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5069	Object	(1) Rural Centres Key Criteria are not appropriate when considering food shop area in respect of Melbourn; (2) Melbourn should be considered a Rural Centre with peripheral development; (3) Village Framework of Melbourn too restrictive; (4) Local bus services should be improved in relation to Royston; (5) Possible Infill sites are not identified in the LDF report; (6) Other greenfield sites should be considered; (7) All Rural Centres identified so far appear to be satellites of Cambridge City; (8) Not enough consideration in report in relation to across border towns and villages; (9) Possible creation of energy centres using satellite villages of both market towns and Cambridge; (10) As with (9) should Royston become part of Cambridgeshire? (11) Study of the town of Woking as an example of how an energy centre should work.	Melbourn would be proposed for inclusion as a Minor Rural Centres, where proposed development of up to 25 dwellings may be permitted subject to the development leading to the improvement of services and facilities. Paragraph 1.1 of the Structure Plan sets out that the preferred location for development in Rural Centres will be on brownfield sites within the existing Village Framework boundary, with greenfield sites on the periphery of the village being the least preferred option. The site identified is therefore not considerate appropriate at this stage.	
4912 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	Support in principle but do not support the effect of this approach in practice once CS4 is applied, as it effectively restricts peripheral development to only one settlement, at Cambourne. We consider Gamlingay should be identified as a Rural Centre and that some peripheral development should be provided for to help meet housing and social needs and to enable considerable environmental enhancement of the area on the southern edge of the village.	Support noted. The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. The Rural Centres were identified in accordance with the Structure Plan criteria and those that did not meet the criteria were categorised into Group and Infill villages. At the Rural Centres, there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. However, the strategy does not preclude 'windfall' development within other Rural Centres or other lower order villages, which could allow the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more sites in any other Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6107 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6108 - Centex Strategic Land 6159 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	Object to the imposition of a further constraint to development at rural centres. Would restrict expansion of otherwise sustainable locations contrary to advice contained in PPG3.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beyond this, there is no need to make any further housing allocations and development in lower order villages is limited to infill only, of a scale compatible with its location. Villages not classified as Rural Centres are less sustainable in terms of location and level of services and facilities, which makes them unsuitable for larger than Group level infill.	
5951 - D H Barford & Co 3148 - CPRE Cambridgeshire	Object	Brownfield options should be exhausted first. Allowing greenfield development on edge of Rural Centres in preference to the reuse of previously developed land within smaller well served villages is not logical in terms of sustainability or the general sequential approach promoted in PPG3. Having regard to PPS7 it would be better in some situations to encourage growth within smaller settlements that will support existing infrastructure and services, in preference to greenfield development in Rural Centres.	Support noted. The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. Account has also been made for brownfield sites within the larger villages in the Urban Capacity Study. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2907 3485	Support	Fulbourn should be identified as a Rural Centre with peripheral development, to meet the identified local social needs of the village, including the provision of a community centre. The urban capacity study will not provide the amount of housing the Council says it needs.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Account has also been made for brownfield sites within the larger villages in the Urban Capacity Study, and the development strategy does not preclude 'windfall' development within Rural Centres, which could allow the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre, or elsewhere.	
4794 5550 4425 - Hallam Land Management Ltd 4793 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd 5667 - Gallagher Waterbeach Limited 4558 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	This policy is appropriate, reasonable and complies with the Structure Plan objectives. Support CS6 in that it creates circumstances in which Rural Centres can be expanded to enhance the overall sustainability of the settlement, though it has to be recognised that some Rural Centres will be situated in the Green Belt and there may, therefore, be limited opportunities for development.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS6 Peripheral Development at Rural Centres - Preferred Approach**

This option is rejected. There are no Rural Centres that will be classified at Rural Centres with peripheral development.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS7 Group Villages - Preferred Approach*

1591 - Weston Colville Parish Council	Object	<p>We completely agree with your statement under CS7 para 2.19 'Modest levels of development which are of a scale appropriate to the size and availability of services in smaller villages will help to sustain local services and facilities without adding unduly to the need to travel.' We very strongly feel that this policy should apply to all villages and in particular Weston Colville. We submit that modest levels of development in our village are required over the next 10/15 years in order to sustain the facilities which we currently have. If these are lost more journeys will be generated than those created by limited development.</p> <p>Also as demonstrated by your own surveys we have quite a demand for low cost housing. It is unrealistic to think this can be provided without supporting free market housing.</p>	<p>Support noted. It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.</p>	
1598	Object	<p>The 8 dwelling limit to housing provision in Group villages is considered to represent too great a distinction between the limited number of Rural Centres and other settlements that may be almost as sustainable. It is at odds with the Councils option for Affordable Housing thresholds which is for 10 dwellings in the larger settlements this is anomolous. A greater level of housing provision should therefore be considered acceptable in Group Villages</p>	<p>Minor Rural Centres would be designated to acknowledge the role that some villages play in providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. CS30 concerning affordable housing states that for settlements of less than 3,000 population, the threshold for requiring affordable housing should be a minimum development size of two dwellings.</p>	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3165 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the list of Group villages should include Guilden Morden</li> <li>2. the village framework should be defined to allow for future growth within the plan period.</li> <li>3. the maximum size of development should be increased in group villages to 15 dwellings to allow for flexibility in design and provision of housing.</li> <li>4. the density of 30 dph should be included as a guide only,</li> <li>5. the best use definition should include previously used land as well as brownfield land.</li> <li>6. the policy should allow for affordable housing sites exceptions sites</li> </ol>	<p>Guilden Morden is a Group Village and the village framework will remain as defined in Local Plan 2004. It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004. PPG3 requires densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) in order to make best use of land, however, CS22 allows flexibility in very special local circumstances. Brownfield land and previously developed land are synonymous. The LDF will allow for exceptions sites for affordable housing, in accordance with PPG3.</p>	<p>Roll forward Local Plan 2004 Policy HG8 Exceptions Policy for Affordable Housing.</p>
6594	Object	<p>Willingham has a full range of services and a good bus route, Willingham should not be restricted to a group village, but should be a lower order service village.</p>	<p>The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beyond this, there is no need to make any further housing allocations and development in lower order villages is limited to infill only, of a scale compatible with its location. Villages not classified as Rural Centres are less sustainable in terms of location and level of services and facilities, which makes them unsuitable for larger than Group level infill.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3503	Object	Fulbourn should be a Group Village. It is unable to cope with a big increase in housing numbers because of problems with the sewers. Already traffic volumes into Cambridge at rush hour are too high & there is no viable alternative for communities. It needs to remain separate from the urban sprawl of Cambridge.	In accordance with the Structure Plan criteria, Fulbourn has the facilities to merit inclusion as a Rural Centre. However, the designation of a settlement as a Rural Centre does not necessarily entail that any housing growth occurs. RC3 in the Rural Centres DPD outlines the proposed approach to development in the Rural Centres, which does not include further development at Fulbourn.	
3642 - House Builders Federation	Object	The HBF strongly questions how developments of up to 8 dwellings could be capable of providing an appropriate mix of dwelling size, type and affordability to secure a sustainable housing balance in each community. Circular (6/98) (paragraph 10 i)) sets a minimum site size threshold of 25 dwellings. Thus the policy should either be amended by deleting the site size thresholds and target percentages. Or the site size threshold should be one which will actually achieve the desired objective and should be set in accordance with Government advice in Circular 6/98.	The Market Housing Mix and Affordable Housing Target Policies take account of the district-wide assessment of housing needs, undertaken in accordance with PPG3. Both policies, whilst suggesting a mix of house types and level of affordable housing required to meet the identified needs, will provide a degree of flexibility where it can be demonstrated that local circumstances, whether relating to a particular settlement or site, indicate that a different mix or level of affordable housing would be better suited. The local circumstances justify a departure from Circular 6/98, which has been tested through the Local Plan 2004 Inquiry.	
4005 - Bidwells Property Consultants 4151 - Westbury Homes	Object	Policy CS7 is unnecessary. By restricting development in Group Villages, the District Council's preferred approach to development outside Rural Centres may result in the inefficient use of land within the built-up areas of settlements. This could result in developments which fail to meet the requirements of PPG3 (paragraph 58) which emphasises the importance of making efficient and effective use of land.	It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4560 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	This Option or the suite of Options needs to be adjusted to permit exceptions in appropriate circumstances such as windfall brownfield opportunities.	Agreed. It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities and CS7 (and CS8 for Infill villages) permits this on sites within village frameworks.	
4681 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	<p>The Council should have considered whether or not general tightening of policy in the Rural Centres and larger villages could lead to reduced levels of intensification, infill and village expansion, thereby more effectively reducing the adverse effects of sporadic rural development.</p> <p>Alternative Option for CS7: The introduction to this section further reinforces the notion that the Council has not critically examined existing commitments, but moreover the option would exist to consider more stringent criteria for Group Villages and a lower development threshold.</p>	It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.	
4792 4791 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd	Object	Allowing up to 8 dwellings on individual schemes is fundamentally flawed as the UCS identifies many sites in villages which at a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare would result in a development of more than 8 dwellings. The option also makes reference to allowing development which falls below the 30 dwelling per hectare which will not be allowed by ODPM as advised by Government guidance. Also Policy P5/3 of the Structure Plan does not allow development less than 30 dph.	CS7 allows for the redevelopment of sites within village frameworks at a minimum density of 30dph, in accordance with PPG3. Normally development will not exceed 8 dwellings, but in exceptional circumstances development of up to 15 dwellings will be permitted, in order to make best use of a previously developed site. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages, with a limited range of facilities and services, as it would generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004. CS22 specifies a minimum density of 30dph, but allows, in exceptional circumstances, lower densities where very exceptional local circumstances exist.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5070	Object	(1) Rural Centres Key Criteria are not appropriate when considering food shop area in respect of Melbourn; (2) Melbourn should be considered a Rural Centre with peripheral development; (3) Village Framework of Melbourn too restrictive; (4) Local bus services should be improved in relation to Royston; (5) Possible Infill sites are not identified in the LDF report; (6) Other greenfield sites should be considered; (7) All Rural Centres identified so far appear to be satellites of Cambridge City; (8) Not enough consideration in report in relation to across border towns and villages; (9) Possible creation of energy centres using satellite villages of both market towns and Cambridge; (10) As with (9) should Royston become part of Cambridgeshire? (11) Study of the town of Woking as an example of how an energy centre should work.	Melbourn would be proposed for inclusion as a Minor Rural Centres, where proposed development of up to 25 dwellings may be permitted subject to the development leading to the improvement of services and facilities. Paragraph 1.1 of the Structure Plan sets out that the preferred location for development in Rural Centres will be on brownfield sites within the existing Village Framework boundary, with greenfield sites on the periphery of the village being the least preferred option. The site identified is therefore not considerate appropriate at this stage.	
4893 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Littleton House School, Oakington Road, Girton)	Object	Littleton School Girton is due to close in 2006. The site would be available for redevelopment and the development should not be constrained to 15 dwellings, in this accessible location to Cambridge.	The part of the site within the Village Framework would be suitable for redevelopment in accordance with CS7, which allows for the redevelopment of sites within village frameworks at a minimum density of 30dph, in accordance with PPG3. Normally development will not exceed 8 dwellings, but in exceptional circumstances development of up to 15 dwellings will be permitted, in order to make best use of a previously developed site. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages, with a limited range of facilities and services, as it would generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. This part of Girton is over 5km (3 miles) from the centre of Cambridge, a distance further than most people would walk and at the edge of the accepted distance for people to cycle. Therefore, due to the poor bus service, this will result in unsustainable, motorised trips, which the development strategy seeks to avoid.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5221 5256 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 5280 5281 5301 5326 5387 5397 5405 5413 5424 5433 5364 5372 6361	Object	Support the approach in principle as it provides for small scale residential development within the village framework, particularly where it makes best use of redundant brownfield sites. However, we do not support the final paragraph regarding providing a particular mix of housing and affordable housing on all developments. (see comments on CS23 and CS27-33)	Support noted. CS7 cannot be treated in isolation and all planning applications for development will be required to comply with all the relevant policies in the LDF, which cover a range of issues. On the issue of housing, there are policies on Housing Mix and Affordable Housing, in accordance with PPG3, to try to meet the needs of the whole community and provide wider housing opportunity, choice and a better mix of size and type. Whilst the infill sites will be relatively limited in extent, it is important that these contribute to the overall housing objectives.	
3138 - CLIFF WALSHINGHAM & COMPANY 5746 - The English Courtyard Association	Object	Infill villages should be allowed the capacity to expand so that they attract new services and jobs and become less rather than more dependent upon Rural Centres. Too prescriptive and needs to be more flexible to allow sites to be developed above 8 dwellings where suitable in PPG3 terms.	It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5760 - Amblecroft Ltd	Object	Support as it allows for residential group development in identified Group villages. Support the identification of Eltisley as a Group village. Support para 2.19 which confirms modest levels of development in smaller villages will help to sustain local services and facilities without adding unduly to the need to travel. However, consider a full review of all villages should be undertaken to assess their individual needs as required by PPS7 para 8.	Allocating sites for residential development adjoining group villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. The Urban Capacity Study demonstrates sufficient land available further up the search sequence for sites. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The rural settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. In particular within group villages, a slightly larger scale of development is permitted than infill villages, due to the services available. It would be unsustainable to allocate large sites due to the disproportionate number of additional journeys this would create.	
5902 (Land North of Pampisford Road, Great Abington) 6106 - Humo Holdings (Land at Strawberry Farm, Great Abington)	Object	The qualifying criteria in Rural Centres are too stringent. The emerging Local Plan should take a more holistic approach to developing sustainable communities. In particular, the plan should reflect the existence of major employment centres such as Granta Park. The designation of Great Abington as a Group Village is illogical given that Granta Park employing 2,300 people to within walking/cycling distance.	Agree that guidance contained in Structure Plan paragraph 1.17 may have been applied in an over prescriptive way in arriving at the original list of Rural Centres. A revised approach to Rural Centres policy is proposed as set out in the Recommendations section. It is considered that Great Abington is not an appropriate village for consideration as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre. The settlement has a very limited range of facilities, with only one shop/post office and it is considered that the village does not serve a local hinterland beyond the village itself. In mid-2002 the population of the village was 840. It would be contrary to the guidance given in Policy 1/1 and paragraph 1.17 of the Structure Plan to designate a settlement of this size as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

6037 (Land North of Glebe Road, Barrington) 6059 (Land off Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton) 6082 (Land between Cambridge Road & Thriplow Road, Fowlmere)	Object	The proposed categories of settlements does not permit sufficient flexibility. A further category should be introduced between Rural Centres and Group Villages. This would facilitate growth in those settlements with a reasonable level of services and accessibility, but which do not qualify as a Rural Centre.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beyond this, there is no need to make any further housing allocations and development in lower order villages is limited to infill only, of a scale compatible with its location. Villages not classified as Rural Centres are less sustainable in terms of location and level of services and facilities, which makes them unsuitable for larger than Group level infill.	
--	--------	---	---	--

3837 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford) 3836 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford) 5921 - The Davison Group (Land behind Elsworth Primary School)	Object	Fails to make any provision for larger sites coming forward, where a balanced redevelopment scheme could contribute to and improve the existing sustainability. We therefore consider our site should be included as a residential-led allocation.	Allocating sites for residential development adjoining group villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. The Urban Capacity Study demonstrates sufficient land available further up the search sequence for sites. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The rural settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. In particular within group villages, a slightly larger scale of development is permitted than infill villages, due to the services available. It would be unsustainable to allocate large sites due to the disproportionate number of additional journeys this would create.	
--	--------	--	--	--

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5934 - Lighthouse Developments (Land North of Bogs Gap Lane, Steeple Morden)	Object	The definition of Group and Infill villages is too prescriptive. There are sites in smaller villages which could accommodate limited residential development to the benefit of village am amenity. The land at Bogs Gap Lane, Steeple Morden relates more properly to the built-up village than the countryside.	Allocating sites for residential development adjoining group villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. The Urban Capacity Study demonstrates sufficient land available further up the search sequence for sites. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The rural settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. In particular within group villages, a slightly larger scale of development is permitted than infill villages, due to the services available. It would be unsustainable to allocate large sites due to the disproportionate number of additional journeys this would create.	
5956 (Land at Frog End, Shepreth)	Object	Shepreth should be designated as a Group village on account of its range of services and facilities. The presence of the railway station substantially increases its sustainability. Consideration should be given to including some, or all of the land at Frog End, Shepreth to facilitate additional development to meet local needs.	Shepreth was classified as an Infill village in Local Plan 2004 and failed to meet the criteria in CS7 for inclusion as a Group village. Whilst there is access to more sustainable travel through the railway station, it would not be sustainable to allow larger amounts of housing development in a location where residents will need to travel outside the village to access even the more basic facilities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5894 (Land North of Warrington Farm, Dry Drayton)	Object	Given the proposed reduction in village categories the maximum of 8 dwellings, or exceptionally 15 dwellings in Group villages is too restrictive. It is considered that there are sites within Group villages which could accommodate in excess of 15 dwellings, and in the interests of achieving Government aims for housing density, additional numbers should be facilitated. Greater flexibility is needed to facilitate the maximum use of sites such as our client's at Warrington Farm, Dry Drayton.	Allocating sites for residential development adjoining group villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The rural settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. In particular within group villages, a slightly larger scale of development is permitted than infill villages, due to the services available. It would be unsustainable to allocate large sites due to the disproportionate number of additional journeys this would create. In addition, preferred option CS10 proposes that green belt boundaries remain the same as Local Plan 2004, unless altered by an area action plan.	
6032	Object	The proposed categorisation of villages into 3 groups does not provide sufficient flexibility for the distribution of future growth. An additional category should be identified between the suggested Rural Centres and Group Villages.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beneath Rural Centres, the Structure Plan P5/5 allows for small-scale housing development in villages taking into account the need for affordable housing, village character and the level of jobs and services etc. The smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. Therefore the non Rural Centre villages have been subdivided into two groups, to reflect the level of infill development that should be permissible compatible with its location, an approach that was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5896 (Land North of Pettitt's Close, Dry Drayton) 6054 - Balsham (Building) Ltd (7 High Street, Balsham) 2840 - Thriplow Farms Ltd (The Granary, Lodge Road, Thriplow) 6003 - H C Moss (Builders) Ltd (Land at East Farm, Melbourn)	Object	It is considered that there are sites within Group villages which could accommodate in excess of 15 dwellings.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beyond this, there is no need to make any further housing allocations and development in lower order villages is limited to infill only, of a scale compatible with its location. Villages not classified as Rural Centres are less sustainable in terms of location and level of services and facilities, which makes them unsuitable for larger than Group level infill.	
2585 - FPDSavills 5945 - D H Barford & Co 5167 - Laing Homes North Thames	Object	Object to the word "redundant". Redundancy is not an issue in the current version of PPG3 relating to the definition of previously developed land. The maximum of 15 dwellings could preclude sustainable development schemes.	The reference to "redundant" brownfield sites is necessary to avoid conflict with other policies in the LDF. For example, policies resisting the change of use from employment to residential, and resisting the loss of facilities and services in villages. These policies are necessary to maintain balanced communities. Therefore, not all brownfield sites should be deemed suitable for housing redevelopment in the first instance. For example, an employment site should be reused for employment in first instance and only if it becomes redundant from that use will it be considered for housing.  A threshold for a maximum of 15 dwellings is needed to ensure that the scale of development is compatible with its location, in a less sustainable village, in terms of its location and facilities and services.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5851 (Site at Whitecroft Road, Meldreth) 2860 - Januarys 6087 6091 5714 - Dixon International Group Ltd	Object	Object to the continued classification of villages below Rural Centre status as Group or Infill villages. There is no need to continue the Local Plan 2004 hierarchy, which is inconsistent with the Structure Plan Strategy. Beneath Rural Centres the policy should remain flexible and allow each case to be judged on its merits. There is no need for a numerical constraint on development or redevelopment for housing within village frameworks. The settlement categories are too prescriptive, in determining the ability of a village to accommodate future growth, greater emphasis should be given to its location with regard to other major settlements.	Beneath Rural Centres, the Structure Plan P5/5 allows for small-scale housing development in villages taking into account the need for affordable housing, village character and the level of jobs and services etc. The smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. Therefore the non Rural Centre villages have been subdivided into two groups, to reflect the level of infill development that should be permissible compatible with its location, an approach that was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.	
6605 6597 - J W Burgess & Son	Object	Swavesey should not be restricted to a Group village and should be a lower order service village where more housing is allowed.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beyond this, there is no need to make any further housing allocations and development in lower order villages is limited to infill only, of a scale compatible with its location. Villages not classified as Rural Centres are less sustainable in terms of location and level of services and facilities, which makes them unsuitable for larger than Group level infill.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6013 (Land East of Recreation Ground, Over) 6015 (Land East of Recreation Ground, Over)	Object	Qualifying criteria for Rural Centres are too prescriptive and that, as a consequence, too few villages are identified as being capable of moderate growth. The concentration of growth in 5 Rural Centres is thought undesirable. Over is a village capable of accommodating more than 8-15 dwellings, which is all that would be facilitated in a Group village. The sustainability of the settlement will be further enhanced by the proposed transportation system on the St Ives to Cambridge railway line. Within Over, our client's land adjacent to the Doles/New Road is considered ideal for further residential development.	Paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure Plan states that "Rural Centres will generally have a population of at least 3,000". It is considered that a population of 3,000 is required to support the level of services and facilities that is associated with a Rural Centre. If a lower threshold than this were adopted it might result in the designation of villages where the viability of the services and facilities necessary to be designated as a Rural Centre was more at risk. Agree that guidance contained in Structure Plan para 1.17 with regard to selection of rural centres may have been applied in an over-prescriptive way. Minor Rural Centres will be designated in order to take account of the way in which some villages serve a rural hinterland. Over does not have a population of above 3,000, and therefore would not be proposed for inclusion as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre.	
6025 - Dossett Brothers (Land North of Kings Close, Barton)	Object	Criteria for defining settlement category is too prescriptive. In determining the ability of a village to accommodate further growth, greater emphasis should be given to its location with regard to other major settlements and facilities. Barton is an ideal sustainable location close to Cambridge which could accommodate further significant growth. Our client's land off King's Grove, Barton is promoted for residential development.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beyond this, there is no need to make any further housing allocations and development in lower order villages is limited to infill only, of a scale compatible with its location. Villages not classified as Rural Centres are less sustainable in terms of location and level of services and facilities, which makes them unsuitable for larger than Group level infill.	
6044 (Land adjoining College Farm, Horseheath) 6047 (Land adjoining College Farm, Horseheath)	Object	Definition of permitted development in Group villages is considered too limiting. There are sites in smaller villages which could accommodate limited residential development to the benefit of village amenity. Our client's land at Horseheath should be included within the village framework.	It is not considered appropriate to amend the village framework to include farm buildings as farms are a countryside use and do not constitute previously developed land according to the definition in PPG3.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3407	Support	Support the designation of Swavesey as a Group Village but that the designation to be widened to include the ability to grant suitable peripheral development.	Support noted. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that the 20,000 dwellings for the period 1999-2016 can be met in the higher order locations; edge of Cambridge, Northstowe and in the Rural Centres, in accordance with the Structure Plan. Therefore, there is no need to allocate further sites.	
2265 - Gamlingay Parish Council 1396 - Gamlingay Parish Council 5551 5950 - D H Barford & Co 2869 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Support	Intention to retain Group Village classification is supported. This will maintain the established settlement hierarchy with scope for development that will support infrastructure and services within the medium sized villages.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS7 Group Villages - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

Identify an additional category of settlement, that of Minor Rural Centres. Minor Rural Centres would be between Rural Centres and Group Villages in the settlement hierarchy. Minor Rural Centres would be those villages that, whilst failing to meet the criteria set out in the Structure Plan, nevertheless perform a role in terms providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland. In Minor Rural Centres, the acceptability of all developments of a scale above Group level would be dependent on existing facilities being improved. The maximum size of development permitted would be small estate level, i.e. up to an upper limit of 25 dwellings. No peripheral housing allocations would be made in Minor Rural Centres.

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD***CS8 Infill Villages - Preferred Approach*

1464	Object	<p>Infilling promotes seamless ribbon development within village frameworks.</p> <p>Traditional rural villages are characterized by a mix of buildings interspersed with the softening effects of vegetation, much of which is being lost.</p> <p>There is also a significant loss of amenity to the whole community when family recreational space is built on.</p>	<p>Regardless of where housing allocations are made, it has been the approach to allow limited infill development in the smaller villages, appropriate to their location, to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. CS8 is designed to protect the character of the village, by restricting infill to 2 dwellings on sites that do not form an essential part of village character and ensuring development is sympathetic to its surroundings. Other policies in the LDF will also ensure development is in keeping with its surroundings and that any open space of importance to the character of the village is protected, in order to preserve the character of these villages from unsuitable development.</p>
1590 - Weston Colville Parish Council	Object	<p>Weston Colville is no doubt classified as an 'Infill Village' under CS8. However at the moment we do have a food shop, a permanent post office, a good village hall, an arts centre and an excellent cricket pitch, although we lack a primary school there is one close by at Balsham.</p>	<p>Infill villages have been classified as those without a primary school, as this is a critical indicator for the level of facilities and services within villages. Whilst Weston Colville has access to Balsham primary school, it is 5km (3 miles) away and not within close enough walking and cycling distance. The smaller villages tend to have a very limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow larger amounts of developments in the village, as would be allowed in CS7 Group Villages, and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5715 - Dixon International Group Ltd	Object	Object to the continued classification of villages below Rural Centre status as Group or Infill villages. There is no need to continue the Local Plan 2004 hierarchy, which is inconsistent with the Structure Plan Strategy. Beneath Rural Centres the policy should remain flexible and allow each case to be judged on its merits. Therefore there is no need for a numerical constraint on development or redevelopment for housing within village frameworks. This option contradicts CS1 & CS2. CS3 & CS4 will provide suitable control on development.	Regardless of where housing allocations are made to meet the housing strategy, it has always been the approach to allow limited infill development in the smaller villages, appropriate to their location, to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. Whilst there will be no housing allocations in these villages (consistent with the Structure Plan) there is a need to further classify these villages into Group and Infill Villages in order to provide a guide to the suitable level of infill development having general regard to their location and level of services and facilities.	
4004 - Bidwells Property Consultants	Object	Policy CS8 is also unnecessary.	It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3299 - Hinxton Parish Council	Object	<p>At a strategic level we do not accept the need to locate another 18,000 homes in the area and believe this assertion is based on unrealistic projections of demand.</p> <p>The proposed new settlement of 8,000 homes at 'Hanley Grange' is a speculative move by a developer to exploit the LDF and create housing not for local people, but principally to serve commuters and proposed expansion at Stanstead. Local road and rail infrastructure is woefully inadequate to support even current usage.</p> <p>We wish to support the rural environment around Cambridge, preserving a halo of small villages and protecting the green belt.</p>	<p>The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. The LDF must be in conformity with this strategy, and is planning for 20,000 dwellings in the period 1999-2016. There has been some discussion at the regional level surrounding a potential additional 18,000 dwellings, which relates to RSS14, covering the period to 2021, which is beyond the remit of the LDF.</p>	
4682 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	<p>The Council should have considered whether or not general tightening of policy in the Rural Centres and larger villages could lead to reduced levels of intensification, infill and village expansion, thereby more effectively reducing the adverse effects of sporadic rural development.</p> <p>Alternative Option for CS8: Deletion of this policy or reduction in the dwelling threshold to one.</p>	<p>It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.</p>	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

3261 - West Wratting Park Estate (Land North of the Causeway, West Wratting)	Object	The proposal is to alter the village framework at The Causeway, as shown on the attached plan. Essentially, the proposal would rationalise the position of the village framework, better to coincide with the obvious distinction between village and countryside. As suggested, it follows an obvious boundary on the ground, whereas as currently approved, it is illogical, running through the middle of a plot of land, following no obvious boundary.	Allocating sites for residential development adjoining infill villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The rural settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. In particular within infill villages, development is limited to upto 2 dwellings, due to the very limited level of services and facilities available. It would be unsustainable to allocate sites due to the disproportionate number of additional journeys this would create.	
5935 - Lighthouse Developments (Land North of Bogs Gap Lane, Steeple Morden)	Object	The definition of Group and Infill villages is too prescriptive. There are sites in smaller villages which could accommodate limited residential development to the benefit of village am amenity. The land at Bogs Gap Lane, Steeple Morden relates more properly to the built-up village than the countryside.	Allocating sites for residential development adjoining group villages on sites currently outside the village framework would be contrary to the search sequence detailed in Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan. The Urban Capacity Study demonstrates sufficient land available further up the search sequence for sites. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The rural settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. In particular within group villages, a slightly larger scale of development is permitted than infill villages, due to the services available. It would be unsustainable to allocate large sites due to the disproportionate number of additional journeys this would create.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6033	Object	The proposed categorisation of villages into 3 groups does not provide sufficient flexibility for the distribution of future growth. An additional category should be identified between the suggested Rural Centres and Group Villages.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beyond this, there is no need to make any further housing allocations and development in lower order villages is limited to infill only, of a scale compatible with its location. Villages not classified as Rural Centres are less sustainable in terms of location and level of services and facilities, which makes them unsuitable for larger than Group level infill.	
6060 (Land off Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton)	Object	The proposed categorisation of villages into 3 groups does not provide sufficient flexibility. There is a need for an intermediate category between a Rural Centre and Group Village. The capacity of a village to accommodate further growth is dependent on a range of factors, and size is not the most significant factor. It is considered that the sustainability of a settlement to other facilities is of over-riding importance. In this regard the relationship, and proximity, of Fen Ditton to the development proposed within Cambridge City is very significant as it means that the area is able to benefit from nearby facilities. As a consequence it is considered that our client's land at Fen Ditton is very suitable for development.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beyond this, there is no need to make any further housing allocations and development in lower order villages is limited to infill only, of a scale compatible with its location. Villages not classified as Rural Centres are less sustainable in terms of location and level of services and facilities, which makes them unsuitable for larger than Group level infill.	



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

6075 - Yardline Limited (Land East of High Street, Pampisford)	Object	In determining the classification of villages, account should be taken of the fact that growth in some areas was previously restricted by the Area of Restraint designation. Pampisford was previously an infill village although the range of services and employment opportunities are thought to justify a Group village classification. Our client's land at High Street is considered to be an ideal site for residential development.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beyond this, there is no need to make any further housing allocations and development in lower order villages is limited to infill only, of a scale compatible with its location. Villages not classified as Rural Centres are less sustainable in terms of location and level of services and facilities, which makes them unsuitable for large scale infill.	
2861 - Januarys 3168 - McCann Homes Limited 6089 6630 - West Wratting Park Estate (Site at Weston Green) 2851 - West Wratting Park Estate (Site at West Wratting) 6092	Object	Policy is too restrictive with regards to the accepted level of growth in these villages. The sole criterion of whether a village has a primary school is extremely arbitrary, and thus inappropriate. In small villages or hamlets with static or declining populations, policy latitude should allow for exceptional cases, which bring advantage to these small communities.	Infill villages have been identified as those without a primary school, as this is a critical indicator for the level of facilities and services within villages. It is important that small amounts of infilling are permitted, appropriate to their location, in order to meet local needs, make best use of previously developed land and support local services and facilities. However, the smaller villages tend to have a very limited range of facilities and services, which makes it necessary for people to travel outside the village for most of their daily needs. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in these villages and generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6026 - Dossett Brothers (Land North of Kings Close, Barton)	Object	Criteria for defining settlement category is too prescriptive. In determining the ability of a village to accommodate further growth, greater emphasis should be given to its location with regard to other major settlements and facilities. Barton is an ideal sustainable location close to Cambridge which could accommodate further significant growth. Our client's land off King's Grove, Barton is promoted for residential development.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Beyond this, there is no need to make any further housing allocations and development in lower order villages is limited to infill only, of a scale compatible with its location. Villages not classified as Rural Centres are less sustainable in terms of location and level of services and facilities, which makes them unsuitable for larger than Group level infill.	
6045 (Land adjoining College Farm, Horseheath) 6049 (Land adjoining College Farm, Horseheath)	Object	Definition of permitted development in Group villages is considered too limiting. There are sites in smaller villages which could accommodate limited residential development to the benefit of village amenity. Our client's land at Horseheath should be included within the village framework.	It is not considered appropriate to amend the village framework to include farm buildings as farms are a countryside use and do not constitute previously developed land according to the definition in PPG3.	
5552 5942 - D H Barford & Co 3149 - CPRE Cambridgeshire 4561 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support the approach that was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004. This will facilitate growth to meet local needs and support services in villages, consistent with advice in PPS7.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS8 Infill Villages - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD****Chapter 3. The Cambridge Green Belt***CS9 Green Belt Objectives - Preferred Approach*

2424 - RAVE

Object

The fourth bullet point should be deleted. A potential breach of the policy should not be included as one of its objectives. If a release of land on the periphery of a Rural Centre is to be considered it should have to be considered as a departure and evaluated on that basis.

The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. The designation of a settlement as a Rural Centre does not necessarily mean that any housing growth, other than 'windfall' development, occurs. RC3 in the Rural Centres DPD outlines the proposed approach to development in the Rural Centres. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate sites at any other Rural Centre.

6602 (Land at Water Lane/Kettles Close, Oakington)

Object

There should be a review of the green belt to exclude anomalies that exist in it, such as our site in Oakington.

The Cambridge Green Belt was refined, removing any anomalies in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4003 - Bidwells Property Consultants	Object	<p>Policy CS9 is introduced by paragraph 3.6 which prays in aid PPG2. In this process, however, paragraph 3.6 corrupts what PPG2 (Revised) of January 1995 actually says.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.9 of PPG2 refers to readily recognisable features such as roads, streams, belts of trees or woodland edges. Paragraph 3.6 of the POR does not reflect that guidance in that it adds in far less substantial features and could imply minds already made up in certain locations.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.8 of PPG2 (Revised) also counsels against drawing (or re-drawing) boundaries excessively tightly.</p> <p>Both aspects of Central Government advice need to be properly reflected in CS9.</p>	Para. 3.6 accords with the guidance in PPG2 (para.2.9).	
2862 - Januarys 3959 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The preferred objective should allow for the limited growth of not only Rural Centres but other villages also where appropriate. There should be flexibility in defining the Green Belt to allow for smaller scale non-strategic but sustainable development on the edge of Cambridge.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. In some instances this requires the removal of limited amounts of land from the Cambridge Green Belt. As such the Green Belt boundary needs to be reviewed. However, the only revisions to the Green Belt boundary should take place in these growth locations, to avoid being in conflict with PPG2. Where revisions to the boundary will be necessary, these should be dealt with in detail through the relevant AAP.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3644 - House Builders Federation	Object	<p>The text is considered to be potentially misleading as on the one hand it talks about the boundaries of the Cambridge Green Belt remaining as currently set out in the South Cambridgeshire local plan, and on the other hand referring to changes to the Green Belt that will be necessary via the Area Action Plans.</p> <p>It is essential that adequate long-term housing provision is provided for in a Green Belt review.</p>	CS10 clearly states the Green Belt will remain unchanged except at the growth locations on the edge of Cambridge and at Northstowe, which will be dealt with through the Area Action Plans.	
4562 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	<p>Generally support subject to comments made in respect of Option CS7 above.</p> <p>This Option or the suite of Options needs to be adjusted to permit exceptions in appropriate circumstances such as windfall brownfield opportunities.</p>	Noted. CS11 and PPG2 provide clear guidance on the sorts of development permitted in the Green Belt, including exceptions. In addition, CS12 permits redevelopment of Major Developed Sites within the Green Belt.	
3655 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 5218 - Holywell-cum-Needingworth Parish Council	Object	"To allow for the limited growth of Rural Centres where appropriate" is too qualified to be an adequate policy and is in direct conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt. Green belt boundaries should be strengthened. It appears to easy to move them to build housing.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. In some instances this requires the removal of limited amounts of land from the Cambridge Green Belt. As such the Green Belt boundary needs to be reviewed. However, the only revisions to the Green Belt boundary should take place in these growth locations, to avoid being in conflict with PPG2. Where revisions to the boundary will be necessary, these should be dealt with in detail through the relevant AAP.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6169 5981 - The W Scambler Trust (Land North of Warrington Farm, Dry Drayton) 5966 - Capital & Counties Properties UK Ltd (Land West of Ida Darwin Hospital, Fulbourn) 6165 (Land adjacent to Pieces Lane Waterbeach) 6027 - Dossett Brothers (Land North of Kings Close, Barton)	Object	Our client's land should be removed from the Green Belt. Failure to re-assess the Green Belt boundary will lead to less sustainable development being preferred in some cases. The Green Belt in locations close to Cambridge must be released and re-drawn to facilitate a more even distribution of growth in sustainable locations.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. In some instances this requires the removal of limited amounts of land from the Cambridge Green Belt. As such the Green Belt boundary needs to be reviewed. However, the only revisions to the Green Belt boundary should take place in these growth locations, to avoid being in conflict with PPG2. Where revisions to the boundary will be necessary, these should be dealt with in detail through the relevant AAP.	
3159 - CPRE Cambridgeshire 6228 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	It is unclear protecting the setting and character of all settlements falls within the purposes of including land in the Green Belt as set out in PPG2 or in terms of the specific purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.	The wording should reflect and be consistent with the guidance in PPG2.	Revisit wording of Bullet 3 in light of PPG2.
5747 - The English Courtyard Association	Object	CS9 and para 3.7 Green Belt boundaries must be drawn consistent with PPG2. Where this is not the case the boundary should be altered. Minor changes can be allowed in the LDF. CS9 needs to be revisited to accord fully with PPG2.	The Cambridge Green Belt was refined, removing any anomalies, in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004. CS10 clearly states the Green Belt will remain unchanged except at the growth locations on the edge of Cambridge and at Northstowe, which will be dealt with through the Area Action Plans.	
1288 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	Para 3.6  Please either replace the word "footpath" with "public rights of way" or keep the word "footpath" and add after it "and bridleways"	Agree. Change references to 'footpaths' to 'Rights of Way' as this includes bridleways etc., with a wider range of permissible users.	Change references to 'footpaths' to 'Rights of Way'.
2750	Support	Support increased provision in public rights of way, but this should include bridleways not just footpaths; footpath should be upgraded to bridleway wherever at all possible.	Support noted. Bullet 5 refers to public access in a wider sense.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4225 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The approach is supported, although reference could also be made to ensuring the protection of green corridors running from the countryside into the urban area, as indicated in the Structure Plan	Support noted. Bullet 5 refers to public access in a wider sense.	
5539 - Thriplow Parish Council 1932 1289 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire) 2588 - FPDSavills 3775 - English Heritage 4787 5320 5532 5553 3135 3487 4786 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd 5450 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company (TMLC proposed Monsanto Site) 5526 - The Fairfield Partnership	Support	Support the Green Belt objectives. The Green Belt will ensure that the character of the settlements around the edge of Cambridge will be preserved and that development pressures should be directed more appropriately to the selected settlements beyond the outer boundary of the Green Belt.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS9 Green Belt Objectives - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS10 Green Belt Boundary - Preferred Approach*

2589 - East of England Development Agency	Object	EEDA requests that a more explicit reference is required within the policy to ensure a consistent and comprehensive review of Green Belt boundaries through joint working with Cambridge City Council. By doing so, this will ensure that sufficient and suitable land comes forward through a co-ordinated and transparent process to fulfill the Sustainable Communities Plan and the objectives of the Cambridge Sub region strategy.	There will be joint working with Cambridge City Council on the production of the Cambridge East AAP, therefore, it goes without saying that the Green Belt boundary will be reviewed jointly.	
3830 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)	Object	The Council should be looking to minimise the extent of land to be released from the green belt, by maximising housing supply on more appropriate sites, particularly previously developed brownfield sites. Hence our site should included as a residential led allocation. This is also mentioned in paragraphs: 1.13, 1.14, 2.4 & 2.8	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Detailed examination of housing land supply information, including windfall development on brownfield sites, shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more sites.	
3645 - House Builders Federation 4347 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2864 - Januarys 4011 - Bidwells Property Consultants	Object	Review is not in accordance with the Structure Plan's requirements. It is essential that adequate long-term housing provision is provided for in a Green Belt review. The approach of restricting changes to those in Area Action Plans conflicts with proposals to allocate sites on the periphery of rural centres without sufficient internal capacity.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. In some instances this requires the removal of limited amounts of land from the Cambridge Green Belt. As such the Green Belt boundary needs to be reviewed. However, the only revisions to the Green Belt boundary should take place in these growth locations, to avoid being in conflict with PPG2. Where revisions to the boundary will be necessary, these should be dealt with in detail through the relevant AAP.	

---



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4584 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	LDF should make reference to preparation of Area Action Plan for North West Cambridge as a vehicle for redrafting the green belt boundary. CS10 should make specific reference to North West Cambridge urban extension.	Noted. CS10 refers to the urban extensions of Cambridge collectively and North West Cambridge is one of them, although it will be part of the second round of AAPs.	
4725 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The plan should allow for a sub-regional multi-sports facility and playing fields and the edge of Cambridge would be an ideal location for this. This should be allowed for in a review of the Green Belt boundary.	The location of such a facility within the Green Belt would be contrary to PPG2. The Green Belt is only being reviewed at the locations necessary to accommodate the development as set out in the development strategy.	
5133 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 1474	Object	We remain concerned at the potential for erosion of the Cambridge Green Belt by piece-meal development. If exceptions are to be allowed these will proliferate over time. The Green Belt must remain sacrosanct.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. In some instances this requires the removal of limited amounts of land from the Cambridge Green Belt. As such the Green Belt boundary needs to be reviewed. However, the only revisions to the Green Belt boundary should take place in these growth locations, to avoid being in conflict with PPG2. Where revisions to the boundary will be necessary, these should be dealt with in detail through the relevant AAP.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1933 5556 5554 5810 - The Felix Hotel (The Felix Hotel, Huntingdon Road, Girton) 2819 (Proposed Green Belt boundary change north of Teversham) 4470 - LDA Design 6040 - C & A Locke (Land at Granta Cottage, Mill Lane, Whitesford) 6085 - Capital & Counties Properties UK Ltd (Land West of Ida Darwin Hospital, Fulbourn) 6167 - NIAB (NIAB land, Girton) 5748 - The English Courtyard Association 3277 - Grantchester Townlands Charity	Object	Rather than leave all green belt boundaries as they are, the opportunity should be taken to modify the boundary where obvious changes, including where development has been built as a result of planning approval, reinforcing what is an obvious anomaly.	The Cambridge Green Belt was refined, removing any anomalies, in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004. The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. In some instances this requires the removal of limited amounts of land from the Cambridge Green Belt. As such the Green Belt boundary needs to be reviewed. However, the only revisions to the Green Belt boundary should take place in these growth locations, to avoid being in conflict with PPG2. Where revisions to the boundary will be necessary, these should be dealt with in detail through the relevant AAP.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

<p>1196 - Willers Brothers (Land at Haslingfield Road, Harston)</p> <p>1195 - Willers Brothers (Centenary Works, Button End, Harston)</p> <p>4785</p> <p>5831 (Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Great Shelford)</p> <p>5796 (Land at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Great Shelford)</p> <p>5797 (Land at Gog Magog Way, Stapleford)</p> <p>5832 (Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Great Shelford)</p> <p>5904 (Land East of Hinton Way, Great Shelford)</p> <p>5843</p> <p>5857</p> <p>5864</p> <p>5886</p> <p>5944 (Land either side of Hinds Loder (Track), Fulbourn)</p> <p>5969</p> <p>3544 - Stannifer</p> <p>4727 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited</p> <p>4825 - Cambs County Council Property &amp; Procurement Department (Land South East of Babraham Road Park and Ride)</p> <p>4784 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd</p> <p>6170</p> <p>5982 - The W Scambler Trust (Land North of Warrington Farm, Dry Drayton)</p> <p>5948 - Munro Group Ltd (Land North of Cambridge Road, Waterbeach)</p> <p>5985 (Dean Grove, Sawston)</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The Preferred Options have not identified sufficient land which will be available for development to meet the housing target and therefore further changes to the Green Belt boundary may need to be made. To accommodate a significant number of new dwellings in sustainable locations close to Cambridge, the Green Belt needs to be re-appraised. Client's land should be removed from the Green Belt.</p>	<p>The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. In some instances this requires the removal of limited amounts of land from the Cambridge Green Belt. As such the Green Belt boundary needs to be reviewed. However, the only revisions to the Green Belt boundary should take place in these growth locations, to avoid being in conflict with PPG2. Where revisions to the boundary will be necessary, these should be dealt with in detail through the relevant AAP.</p>	
--	---------------	---	---	--

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5996 (Land NW of 11 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford)  
 6110 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd  
 6148 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd  
 6111 - Centex Strategic Land  
 6166 (Land adjacent to Pieces Lane Waterbeach)  
 6028 - Dossett Brothers (Land North of Kings Close, Barton)  
 4749 - Engineering and Design Plastics Ltd (Land South of Yarrow Road, Cherry Hinton)  
 4564 - Bayer CropScience Ltd  
 6147 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.

3136	Support	A provision could be added concerning the need to preserve visual quality in the flat landscape areas.	Support noted. This issue will be covered by policies in the Development Principles and Natural Environment Chapters.
3489	Support	Support, with the following additional clause:  "and to allow for the limited growth of Rural Centres where appropriate."	Noted. Covered in CS9, at Bullet 4.
3660 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 5540 - Thriplow Parish Council 5321 5533 4449 - RLW Estates 5451 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company (TMLC proposed Monsanto Site) 5524 - The Fairfield Partnership	Support	We fully support the policies outlined in paragraphs 3.1-3.21, and the retention of the boundary as currently set other than changes required in connection with the AAPs for Northstowe and urban extensions to Cambridge.	Support noted.

---

**Decision on CS10 Green Belt Boundary - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS11 Development in the Green Belt - Preferred Approach</i>				
1485	Object	There should be no exception for 'affordable housing'. With the proposed level of new development in the area it must be feasible to fit this in outside the Green Belt, and every 'nibble' at the belt reduces its efficacy.	PPG3 Annex B allows exceptions sites for affordable housing in Green Belts. Given the present shortfalls in affordable housing, this approach should continue in the LDF.	
3137	Object	The wording is insufficiently robust to discourage illegal use by travellers or undisclosed changes of use by other landowners. destruction of existing quality housing stock to allow development up to the edge of the Green Belt should be resisted. Landscaping conditions should be applied to all permitted developments in or adjoining Green belt boundaries.	Travellers are subject to the same regulations as anyone else. All development will need to accord with Development Principles policies, which include consideration of landscaping.	
2591 - East of England Development Agency	Object	Major Existing Developed Sites: EEDA objects to the wording "redevelopment would be limited to that which would not result in a greater floorspace than the existing built form unless there are significant environmental improvements". The text should define "major development sites". A policy for smaller development sites may also be appropriate.	The wording at para 3.21, restricting redevelopment to that would not result in a greater floorspace, reflects guidance in PPG2. Agree, there should be a definition of Major Developed Sites.	Include a definition of Major Developed Sites in the Glossary.
3506 - Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Object	The list of acceptable Green Belt developments should include the relocation of the Cambridge wastewater treatment works.	CS11 reflects general guidance in PPG2. It is not feasible to cover every development eventuality in policy if it is to be flexible. PPG2 provides sufficient guidance for exceptional developments such as for infrastructure.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3876 - Network Rail (Town Planning Team)	Object	<p>Whilst Network Rail appreciate the intentions of this policy, there are concerns over potential conflict with the general maintenance, renewal and improvement of the operational railway. Network Rail make every effort to locate its development appropriately but there are sometimes circumstances when, in the interest of a safe and efficient rail network, it will be necessary to site development in sensitive locations.</p> <p>Network Rail requests that the rail corridors are removed from the designation or the policy should acknowledge that development in these locations for essential infrastructure can be appropriate if it is shown that there are no alternative locations and the development has a wider benefit that outweighs the impact on the immediate area.</p>	PPG2 para 3.13 allows for exceptional large-scale development (such as roads), provided it contributes to the objectives at para 1.6. Therefore, there is no justification for the removal of the Green Belt designation from rail corridors.	
2594 - FPDSavills	Object	The Council needs policies permitting residential conversions of rural buildings in any new LDF.	PPS7 allows for reuse of some existing buildings in the countryside where it would meet sustainable development objectives. However, reuse for economic development purposes will usually be preferable, but residential conversions may be appropriate in some locations. Housing in the countryside/Green Belt is an issue addressed in the housing chapter.	
4723 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	<p>Para 3.9</p> <p>Objection is raised to the reference to small scale in the penultimate line. The site at Barton Road South can show significant but essential facilities within a building to support open land sports use for a sub-regional facility. The reference to small scale is therefore inappropriate.</p>	Any development other than "small-scale" development is likely to conflict with the objectives for Green Belts as set out in PPG2 para 1.6.	
4565 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The redevelopment of existing brownfield sites in the Green Belt should be included as an additional category.	CS11 accords with PPG2 and existing Major Developed Sites are already included.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5805 - The Felix Hotel 2865 - Januarys	Object	In addition to permitting extensions and alterations to dwellings, criterion 3 should also refer to other appropriate buildings in the Green Belt. For example, there may be existing buildings in commercial use (including hotels) which could benefit from some additional extensions and/or alterations, which could be carried out without materially effecting the openness of the Green Belt	PPG2 para 3.4 clearly refers to "limited extension, alterations, replacement of existing dwellings" and not to other buildings.	
5949 - Munro Group Ltd (Land between Bannold Road/Burgess Road, Waterbeach)	Object	Failure to review the Green Belt will lead to less sustainable development being preferred in some cases. Allocation of our client's land at Cambridge Road, Waterbeach for low-density residential development would not be determined to the character of the area or the character of the Green Belt. Removal of this land from the Green Belt would not compromise the purpose of that designation as it is considered that the open countryside effectively starts to the east of the nearby railway line.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. In some instances this requires the removal of limited amounts of land from the Cambridge Green Belt. As such the Green Belt boundary needs to be reviewed. However, the only revisions to the Green Belt boundary should take place in these growth locations, to avoid being in conflict with PPG2. Where revisions to the boundary will be necessary, these should be dealt with in detail through the relevant AAP.	
5541 - Thriplow Parish Council 1701 - Cambridgeshire ACRE 1934 5322 5534 5555 6191 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	We fully support the policies outlined in paragraphs 3.1-3.21 and the provision of affordable housing as an exception on green belt land is supported where this can meet a recognised local need.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS11 Development in the Green Belt - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS12 Major Developed Sites - Preferred Approach</i>				
2421 - Hauxton Parish Council	Object	The Bayer land is 3 distinct areas: 1. Major developed factory site East of the A10. Future use should not significantly impact on local traffic (A10) 2. Residential houses on Church Road Hauxton, and the Mill House and Hauxton Mill (Listed Building) East of the A10 owned by Bayer. Development in excess of 15 dwellings for Group Village brown field sites could be suggested. 3. West of the A10. No development should be allowed which impinges on the CSF 10 Separation of Communities - Preferred Approach. Industrial, commercial or housing development should not be allowed.	Noted. The full extent of each MDS site will be identified on maps in the LDF and the potential uses for the sites is guided by PPG2.	Ensure the full extent of each MDS site is identified on maps
2434 - RAVE	Object	The list of sites in the Strategy is incomplete since it should include Cambridge Airport. The LDF is already presuming that major development will occur on this site if it is vacated by Marshalls Aerospace. The extent of the release of land for development from the Green Belt on this site should be subject to the procedure set out in PPG 2 Annex C.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. In some instances this requires the removal of limited amounts of land from the Cambridge Green Belt. As such the Green Belt boundary needs to be reviewed. However, the only revisions to the Green Belt boundary should take place in these growth locations, to avoid being in conflict with PPG2. Where revisions to the boundary will be necessary, these should be dealt with in detail through the relevant AAP.	
4226 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Two other locations are the Hexcel Composites site at Whittlesford and the Krupp's site at Bourn airfield. They may become available for re-development in the next 12 years.	Bourn Airfield and Hexcel Composites are sites that are not in the Green Belt, therefore MDS status under CS12 would not be applicable.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4227 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	It should be noted that a large proportion of the currently undeveloped land in the Spicers at Sawston site benefits from statutory protection under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act, 1979 (Scheduled Monument Number 24407).	Noted.	
3776 - English Heritage	Object	Consideration of these sites has not been possible without a proposals map defining them.	Noted.	
4576 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	The site at 307 Huntingdon Road should be added to the list of major developed sites within the green belt.	This is not an existing MDS, as the site has yet to be developed and should not be included in CS12.	
4566 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The Bayer CropScience Ltd main industrial site is intensively developed and is not within the Green Belt and there is no case for including it now even as a MDS.	The Preferred Approach proposes to bring the land into the Green Belt (instead of it being an island within the Green Belt) in accordance with PPG2, and therefore it will be a MDS within the Green Belt. The full extent of each MDS will be identified on maps in the LDF.	
6171 - Spicers Ltd	Object	Spicers note from CS12, the intention of designating their site at Sawston as a Major Developed Site within the Green Belt. They regret that the Core Strategy does not explain how or when this might happen. They seek the Council's assurance that they will be fully consulted and involved in whatever process the Council has in mind.	Noted. The preferred approach is to bring the Spicers land into the Green Belt (instead of being an island within the Green Belt) in accordance with PPG2, and therefore it will be a MDS within the Green Belt.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5965 - Capital & Counties Properties UK Ltd (Land West of Ida Darwin Hospital, Fulbourn)	Object	Paras 3.18-3.21 It is considered that our client's land would be suitable for an employment use, but may also prove suitable for a laundry facility on the existing Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospital site. The land is located within the 'Major Development Site' (MDS), within walking distance of the settlement boundary of Fulbourn (Rural Centre) and Cherry Hinton; a sustainable location. To artificially limit the floor space of the MDS (provided there is no adverse impact on the amenity of the Green Belt) is contrary to the objectives of the Core Strategy. This would enable more efficient use of the site, and allow them to be adapted for the needs of future users.	Limiting the floorspace of MDS is in accordance with the objectives of the Green Belt and PPG2.	
2867 - Januarys	Support	We support this policy, but consider that the Council must ensure it does not adhere too slavishly to floorspace limitations based on the quantum of existing buildings on these sites. Often, they will represent sustainable options for further development and could be expanded without impacting materially on the openness of the Green Belt.	Support noted. Limiting the floorspace of MDS is in accordance with the objectives of the Green Belt and PPG2.	
5542 - Thriplow Parish Council 5324 5535 5558	Support	We fully support the policies outlined in paragraphs 3.1-3.21. It is important that any development of these sites is contained within the existing development boundary, does not encroach on open land and has no significant visual impact.	Support noted.	
6086 - Capital & Counties Properties UK Ltd (Land West of Ida Darwin Hospital, Fulbourn)	Support	Review of green belt boundaries around major developed areas is welcomed.	It is not proposed to review the Green Belt boundary around MDS, only at the major locations for development on the edge of Cambridge and at Northstowe, in accordance with the development strategy.	

#### **Decision on CS12 Major Developed Sites - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD****Chapter 4. Development Principles****CS13 Development Principles Objectives - Preferred Approach**

4233 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>The core strategy has omitted options on:</p> <p>Site Accesses          Develop a policy in the Core Strategy which could say 'The preferred approach for the location of the site accesses for construction vehicles is to avoid residential areas and ensure that any haul roads are located, designed and landscaped in such a way as to avoid any noise, smell, dust, visual or other adverse impacts on existing residents and businesses, as well as on the surrounding environment. Appropriate construction traffic haul roads will need to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Also, at the point where any on-site temporary haul routes for construction traffic enter the public highway, provision should be made for the cleaning of vehicle tyres to avoid deposition of mud/debris on the public highway and the generation of dust.'</p>	<p>Agree. Although this matter has been addressed in the Area Action Plans, it is more appropriate for inclusion within the Core Strategy. The objectives set out the overarching principles for development and the details will be dealt with in the Sustainable Development Policy.</p>	<p>Ensure the issue of site access and haul roads is addressed in the Sustainable Development Policy.</p>
4234 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>The core strategy has omitted options on:</p> <p>Storage Compounds, Plant and Machinery          Develop a policy in the Core Strategy which could say 'The preferred approach to any storage compounds, plant and machinery is for them to be located, designed and used to avoid any noise, smell, dust, visual or other adverse impact on existing residents and businesses. Adequate provision will need to be made for the storage of fuel and vehicles in a way that minimises risk of pollution to the surface water or to aquifers.'</p>	<p>Agree. Although this matter has been addressed in the Area Action Plans, it is more appropriate for inclusion within the Core Strategy. The objectives set out the overarching principles for development and the details will be dealt with in the Sustainable Development Policy.</p>	<p>Ensure the issue of storage compounds is addressed in the Sustainable Development Policy.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4236 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>The core strategy has omitted options on:</p> <p>Construction Activities Develop a policy in the Core Strategy that could say "The preferred approach to construction activities is that contractors will be required to be bound by the requirements of the 'Considerate Contractors Scheme'."</p>	<p>Agree. Although this matter has been addressed in the Area Action Plans, it is more appropriate for inclusion within the Core Strategy. The objectives set out the overarching principles for development and the details will be dealt with in the Sustainable Development Policy.</p>	<p>Ensure there is a requirement in the Sustainable Development policy for developers to be bound by the requirements of the Considerate Contractors Scheme.</p>
4237 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>The core strategy has omitted options on:</p> <p>Construction Spoil The term 'Construction Spoil' has been used in the Cambridge East and Northstowe AAPs. We think that the term is ill defined and could be argued to include all builders' waste. Deposit of builders waste for land raising would amount to a waste disposal operation which is not intended or supported. The County Council does recommend development of a policy in the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies that addresses the management of waste arising from construction activities in South Cambridgeshire.</p>	<p>Agree. Although this matter has been addressed in the Area Action Plans, it is more appropriate for inclusion within the Core Strategy. The objectives set out the overarching principles for development and the details will be dealt with in the Sustainable Development Policy.</p>	<p>Ensure the management of waste arising from construction activities is addressed in the Sustainable Development policy.</p>
4238 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>The core strategy has omitted options on:</p> <p>Resource Re-use and Recycling Strategy It is recommended that consideration also be given to a requirement for developers to produce a Resource Re-Use and Recycling Strategy to cover waste arisings during the construction of new developments. Such a strategy would seek to categorise the nature and type of waste/surplus material arising, its volumes and proposals for the dealing (re-use, recycle, recovery or disposal) of each identified component of the surplus materials identified.</p>	<p>The principle of reuse and recycling of construction waste is agreed. Although this matter has been addressed in the Area Action Plans, it is more appropriate for inclusion within the Core Strategy. The objectives set out the overarching principles for development and the details will be dealt with in the Sustainable Development Policy.</p>	<p>Ensure the recycling of redundant building and infrastructure materials is addressed in the Sustainable Development policy.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4240 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The policy should state that the preferred approach is that any redundant buildings and other infrastructure are recycled to provide a local source of hardcore or other building materials. The policy should state that the District Council would encourage the recycling of existing building materials and in-situ mineral resources by supporting the granting of planning permission [as it is the likely to be a County Matter] for plant to process such materials into hardcore and aggregates.	Agree. Although this matter has been addressed in the Area Action Plans, it is more appropriate for inclusion within the Core Strategy. The objectives set out the overarching principles for development and the details will be dealt with in the Sustainable Development Policy proposed in CS14.	Ensure the recycling of redundant building and infrastructure materials is addressed in the Sustainable Development policy (CS14).
3171 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	Development should be designed with a full range of house types and densities within the overall to allow for the needs of the community and the economy and not just limited to a minimum of 30 dph on all sites.	The objectives set out the overarching principles for development and the details should be dealt with in the Housing Chapter and Area Action Plans.	Ensure this is addressed in the Housing Chapter and through the Area Action Plans.
3507 - Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Object	The development principles can only be regarded as consistent with the housing allocations if the Chesterton Sidings site follows the relocation of the Cambridge wastewater treatment works.	900 houses can be accommodated on Chesterton Sidings. This is an allocation in Local Plan 2004 and subject to a separate Masterplan. A Plan monitor and manage approach will be utilised, and the strategy adapted if necessary if problems develop with the site.	
4352 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The list of development principles should be expanded to include the following: "To allow development only where the local authorities are satisfied that appropriate arrangements have been made to ensure that adequate services are available. Planning obligations and contributions will be expected to secure any required provision of capacity in the following services: Education (Nursery, Primary and Secondary), Transport, (including contributions to schemes in area and sub-regional plans), Libraries and One Stop Shops, Social Services, Primary Health Care, Waste Management, Police & Fire Service, Community & Youth Facilities, Indoor Sports Centres, Outdoor Recreational and Play Facilities, Countryside Amenities and Access."	The objectives set out the overarching principles for development and the last bullet seeks to ensure development provides the necessary services and infrastructure to meet its needs. The details as how this will be achieved through S106 etc (including the range of services, facilities and infrastructure which will be required), would be dealt with in other policies, particularly CS18 'Development Criteria' as an overarching policy with individual issue based policies e.g. CS81 for transport and in the section of the Core Strategy covering Planning Obligations.	Ensure adequate policies to secure S46 (previously known as S106) contributions for a range of infrastructure, facilities and services are incorporated into CS18 'Development Criteria', the Planning Obligations chapter and any specific issue based policies.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3349 - English Partnerships	Support	<p>English Partnerships supports the policy objectives set out in the principle objectives. The critical objective in this context is 'place making'. The policy should emphasise the principles of connectivity, local context and legibility as key features in developing a sense of place and identity.</p> <p>The policy should recognise the need to achieve a critical scale and balance of development, which will ensure balanced communities that can then contribute to the long-term viability of public and social infrastructure such as schools and local centres.</p>	Noted. The objectives set out the overarching principles for development and the details should be dealt with in the Sustainable Development Policy.	Ensure that 'place making' and creating a 'sense of place' is addressed in the Sustainable Development policy.
6496 - The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards 5559 5453 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 6192 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 4567 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support the development principles objectives, in particular to the need to ensure that major developments are planned according to the principles of sustainable development, and the need for adequate provision of services and infrastructure.	Support noted.	
3778 - English Heritage	Support	This policy might include a reference to integration with existing built form.	Agree. Amend bullet 2 to include reference to integration with the existing built form.	Amend bullet 2 to read "To ensure high quality new development that protects and enhances the character of the district and local distinctiveness through careful integration with the existing built form."

#### **Decision on CS13 Development Principles Objectives - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS14 Sustainable Development - Preferred Approach</i>				
3345 - Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority	Object	The Strategic Health Authority would expect to see agreed Health objectives incorporated within the key sustainability themes.	Noted. This should be included in the Sustainable Development Policy.	Ensure that the health objectives are addressed in the Sustainable Development policy.
3220 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Object	The PCT supports this approach but would expect to see agreed Public health and Health Service objectives incorporated within the key sustainability themes.	Support noted. Public health and health service objectives which can be addressed through planning would be included in the Sustainable Development Policy.	Ensure that relevant health objectives are addressed in the Sustainable Development policy.
3172 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	The policy on sustainability should also include reference to the need to support, enhance and improve local services and facilities in rural areas. This will include allowing development in rural areas.	The retention and enhancement of rural services and facilities will be addressed in the Sustainable Development Policy, and the Services and Facilities Chapter. The recommendation for a new category of village - Minor Rural Centres - where development would be contingent on contributions will guarantee the retention or enhancement of local services and facilities addresses this concern.	Ensure that the retention and enhancement of rural facilities and services is addressed in the Sustainable Development policy and the policies for Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres.
3477 - Royal Mail Group 3599 - GO-East	Object	Agree with promotion of sustainable development principles, and support requirement for sustainability appraisal of development proposals. Should be a criteria based approach, with scope within the policy to provide for justification for development where there is an overriding need or requirement.	Support noted. The Sustainable Development Policy will be a criteria-based policy.	
3938 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature supports CS14, the preferred approach to Sustainable Development, as it agrees with the Council that a key policy is needed to draw together all sustainability issues to ensure that the fundamental principles of sustainable development underpin all development proposals. This policy should ensure that biodiversity is conserved and enhanced as an integral part of economic, social and environmental development, so that policies and decisions about the development and use of land integrate biodiversity with other considerations.	Support noted. Biodiversity issues should be included in the Sustainable Development Policy.	Ensure that biodiversity conservation and enhancement is addressed in the Sustainable Development policy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3780 - English Heritage	Support	The cultural heritage spans both social and environmental dimensions of sustainability, and we hope the proposed policy will refer to this, as well as the natural environment.	Support noted. These issues should be included in the Sustainable Development Policy.	Ensure that social and environmental dimensions are addressed in the Sustainable Development Policy.
4242 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5560 2631 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 5454 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 4569 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support the development of an over-arching policy on sustainability.	Support noted.	
6454 - The Countryside Agency	Support	We support the preferred requirement that development should only be permitted when consistent with sustainable development principles and the intention to develop an overarching policy on sustainability. We suggest that Policies P1/2 and P1/3 of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 provide an excellent basis for this overarching policy. We also suggest that the LDD should advocate the preparation of concept statements for each allocated site as a means of securing more sustainable development. We have published guidance providing an easy to follow model for preparing a concept statement - Concept Statements and Local Development Documents - Practical guidance for local planning authorities (CA149).	Support noted. The LDF should be in conformity with the Structure Plan and account will be had to Policies P1/2 and P1/3. The Sustainable Development Policy will be criteria-based and should provide a basis for ensuring that development is sustainable. The role of concept statements will be considered in the preparation of the plan.	Ensure that the issues arising from Policies P1/2 and P1/3 of the Structure Plan are addressed in the Sustainable Development policy. Additionally consider whether specific concept statement should be prepared for allocated sites.

#### **Decision on CS14 Sustainable Development - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS15 Sustainability Appraisal of Development Proposals - Preferred Approach*

3340 - Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority	Object	The Strategic Health Authority agrees with South Cambridgeshire PCT that Health Impact Assessment and other methods where appropriate, should be used to understand the potential positive and negative impacts of new developments. This has not been effectively incorporated in the Development Principles chapter nor the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report.	The intention was that health issues would be incorporated into the Sustainability Assessment Scoping Report and would therefore be incorporated into any future sustainability appraisals for the LDF. As the Strategic health Authority advises that the Sustainability Scoping Report does not fully address health issues, a separate Health Impact Assessment is appropriate. It is understood that the Strategic Health Authority is developing a Health Impact Assessment protocol with Cambridgeshire Horizons. Consultation with the health authorities will be undertaken in preparing the Core Strategy to address how this can be most included in policy.	Draft policy to ensure that health issues are addressed by requiring a Health Impact Assessment to accompany relevant planning applications.
3234 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Object	Health Impact Assessment and other methods where appropriate, should be used to understand the potential positive and negative impacts of new developments. This has not been effectively incorporated in the Development Principles chapter nor the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping report.	The intention was that health issues would be incorporated into the Sustainability Assessment Scoping Report and would therefore be incorporated into any future sustainability appraisals for the LDF. As the Strategic health Authority advises that the Sustainability Scoping Report does not fully address health issues, a separate Health Impact Assessment is appropriate. It is understood that the Strategic Health Authority is developing a Health Impact Assessment protocol with Cambridgeshire Horizons. Consultation with the health authorities will be undertaken in preparing the Core Strategy to address how this can be most included in policy.	Draft policy to ensure that health issues are addressed by requiring a Health Impact Assessment to accompany relevant planning applications.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3582 - GO-East	Object	<p>The same comments made in respect of CS14 apply here, ie applicants will need to be clear what is required of them and requirements will need to be reasonable. Also, it is unclear how the Sustainable Communities Toolkit will be used in practice. Will this be a Supplementary Planning Document, for example?</p> <p>The submission DPD will need to include a policy approach that is clear and reasonable and clarity over the role and purpose of the Sustainable Communities Toolkit.</p>	<p>The Sustainable Development Policy will be a criteria-based policy. The Sustainable Communities Checklist being developed in partnership with Cambridgeshire Horizons (as part of a Sustainable Communities Toolkit) will be adaptable to individual districts, and make clear the particular requirements in each district. There will be flexibility in the use of the checklist, for example, the level of detail should reflect the nature of the development proposal. The exact status of the toolkit, and its potential adoption as SPD, is still being investigated by officers.</p>	
3647 - House Builders Federation	Object	<p>Concerned by the explanatory text to the policy, in particular by paragraph 4.7. It is considered that the specifications of labour and energy sources are not valid material planning considerations. Nor would it be reasonable for the Local Authority to seek to dictate particular forms of sustainable provision without any regard to the costs that would arise as a result.</p>	<p>PPS22 outlines the Government target to generate 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010 and aspiration to double this to 20% by 2020. Similar proposals are included in draft RSS14. It is therefore a material planning consideration and legitimate to require the minimisation of energy use and energy generation from renewable sources. The principles of sustainable development and minimizing the need to travel should also apply to the construction of development, which should seek to use locally sourced materials and labour wherever possible. The costs of meeting these sustainability requirements will also be a material planning consideration and will need to be balanced against the other demands being made on individual developments.</p>	<p>Change references to using local labour sources to include a requirement for travel plans to address the travel needs of the labour force.</p>
4570 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	<p>Whilst the sentiment is good that this option introduces a new requirement that is not supported by central government advice and imposes an undue, and, as drafted indistinct, burden on applicants that can only lead to delay and confusion in the planning process.</p>	<p>Government strives to achieve sustainable development. The toolkit will provide a checklist for applicants to follow in order to demonstrate the development proposal strives to be sustainable. Inclusion of a Sustainability Appraisal should speed up the decision-making process for planning applications.</p>	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

6230 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Para 4.7</p> <p>Gallagher objects to the suggestion that additional cost may not amount to impracticality. A sustainable development needs to address economic as well as social and environmental considerations. Key decisions should be informed by a proper evaluation recognising the technical, capital cost, operating cost and social issues.</p>	<p>Government strives to achieve sustainable development, particularly in the Growth Areas which are covered by its Sustainable Communities Plan. Development proposals need to be sustainable to be acceptable in planning terms. Development viability is a relevant factor provided that it does not undermine the development strategy (focussing development close to Cambridge to meet the development needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region in a way that minimises travel). In addition, minimising costs at the expense of creating successful sustainable development is not an acceptable approach.</p>	
6231 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Para 4.8</p> <p>Generalised toolkits need to be handled with care in their application on a site by site basis. The text should recognise the need to apply sensitively.</p>	<p>Although the sustainable communities toolkit is being developed for the Cambridge Sub-Region, the checklist will reflect requirements in individual districts. This will create a high degree of cross boundary consistency, while allowing for local issues and considerations. There will be flexibility in the use of the checklist, for example, the level of detail should reflect the nature of the development proposal.</p>	
<p>3935 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 5561 2635 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire &amp; Peterborough 4646 - Grantchester Parish Council</p>	Support	<p>Supports the approach, provided policy is developed in detail and adequately monitored, as it will ensure that planning applications that the Council determines will perform well against key sustainability tests.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	

---

**Decision on CS15 Sustainability Appraisal of Development Proposals - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS16 Design of New Development - Preferred Approach</i>				
4241 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 4.10  In the third sentence, insert "public", to read: "quality landscaping and public open space". Further mention could also be made of open space which meets the needs of all sectors of the community.	The term 'public open space' can apply to urban spaces such as town squares or village greens, as well as other green spaces. The design and location of 'public open space' will therefore also be included in the Design of New Development Policy.	Ensure that provision of public open space is addressed in the Design of New Development policy
4524 - Cambridge Police	Object	Principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design should be incorporated in the developments, otherwise subsequent "Secured by Design" applications are likely to experience great difficulties. It is important to ensure that layouts, particularly in residential areas, do not compromise safety or security. Too many routes, particularly of a pedestrian/cycle nature, can create additional access/escape routes for offenders while affording the anonymity they seek. In curtilage parking provision would be preferred, but where this is not possible parking courts should be small, serving a maximum of six dwellings close to and within the natural surveillance of the dwellings served.	Agree. This should be included in the Design of New Development Policy and Development Criteria Policy.	Ensure that 'secured by design' principles are addressed in the Design of New Development policy and Development Criteria Policy.
4349 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 4.12  Design themes should include provision of greenspace with biodiversity quality, which would include enhancing existing landscape and landscape features with high biodiversity value.	Agree. This should be included in the Design of New Development Policy.	Ensure that provision of green space with biodiversity value is addressed in the Design of New Development policy

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4350 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Para 4.12</p> <p>Permeability should include not only links to existing roads but also to footways, cycleways, public rights of way and greenspaces. Developments should not be designed with priority for motorised travel. Additionally, developments should be designed for all users, including the elderly/retired, children and 'primary child carers'.</p>	Agree. This should be included in the Sustainable Development Policy.	Ensure permeability for non-car modes and needs of all users are addressed in the Sustainable Development policy.
4353 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>The core strategy and development control documents should refer to the need for the design of new buildings to include space for the storage of recyclables. (In the case of dwellings, space will be required for storage under cover for the equivalent of 3 wheeled bins.) The supplementary planning documents should also include matters such as disabled access - see later comment on Para 4.17.</p>	Agree. This should be included in the Development Criteria Policy.	Ensure provision for the storage of recyclables is addressed in the Development Criteria policy
3358 - English Partnerships	Support	<p>English Partnerships welcomes and supports statements contained in paragraphs 4.9-4.13 and Policy Statement CS 16 Design of New Development and would support the Local Planning Authority and Community in establishing a series of flexible and responsive design statements.</p> <p>English Partnerships requests that the policy recognises the need for design criteria to be flexible and adaptive in response to changing circumstances and requirements over time. For example; future technological advances that may improve design, affordability, socio/economic circumstances, building construction methods and materials.</p>	Support noted. The Design of New Development Policy will be a criteria-based policy, which will allow for flexibility on a site-by-site basis and will be reviewed as necessary to ensure it remains up to date.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2270 - Gamlingay Parish Council 1397 - Gamlingay Parish Council 5562 3020 - Great Shelford Parish Council 2873 - Steeple Morden Parish Council 5455 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company (TMLC proposed Monsanto Site) 6455 - The Countryside Agency 4571 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Strongly supports the use of Village Design Statements and Parish Plans as Supplementary Planning documents. We strongly support the comprehensive approach to high quality design, which is a cornerstone of government planning policy.	Support noted.	
3595 - GO-East	Support	We strongly support the approach to high quality design, which is a cornerstone of government planning policy. We also acknowledge the important part design guidance in SPD for particular locations, such as Village Design Statements, can play. However, we would caution about the wholesale adoption of Parish Plans as SPD where, in many cases, the majority content of these Plans covers matters outside the scope of the planning system.  The approach taken in the submission DPD will need to ensure that only those Parish Plans, or parts of Plans, that address planning matters are adopted as SPD.	Support noted. Agree that only planning related parts of Parish Plans would be eligible for adoption as SPD. There are procedures in place that must be gone through before such documents can be adopted as SPD. The documents will need to be in conformity with the policies in the LDF and have undertaken the necessary public consultation. This should made clear in the LDF.	Make clear that Village Design Statements and Parish Plans in whole or in part will only be eligible for adoption as Supplementary Planning Documents where they are consistent with the LDF and have been through the required consultation and adoption processes.
3781 - English Heritage	Support	We support a comprehensive design policy. This should refer to the importance of 'sense of place' [para 4.12], and how the attributes of a site, including historic landscape and townscape, can assist. In this context, conservation area appraisals and Historic Landscape Characterisation [HLC] will be important.	Agree. This should be included in the Design of New Development Policy.	Ensure that creating a 'sense of place' is addressed in the Design of New Development policy.

#### **Decision on CS16 Design of New Development - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS17 Design and Landscape Statement - Preferred Approach</i>				
4243 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 4.16  The statement needs to also include public transport links and biodiversity.	Agree, provision for biodiversity is clearly relevant to design considerations for open spaces, landscaping etc. Public transport links will also be relevant in terms of appropriate housing densities and pedestrian access points. These should be included in the guidance on the preparation of a design and landscape statement.	Ensure that public transport links and biodiversity are addressed in a design and landscape statement.
3581 - GO-East	Object	PPS12 (paragraphs 1.12 - 1.14) requires that DPDs address matters relating to design and access.  We suggest that consideration is given to extending this approach to cover matters related to access	This issue will be addressed in the Design of New Development Policy and Development Criteria Policy. Access is also listed in paragraph 4.16 as a factor to be taken into account in preparing a design and landscape statement.	Ensure that access is addressed in the Design of New Development Policy and Development Criteria Policy.
4572 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Whilst the sentiment is good that this option introduces a new requirement that is not supported by central government advice and imposes an undue, and, as drafted indistinct, burden on applicants that can only lead to delay and confusion in the planning process.	Inclusion of a Design and Landscape Statement should provide greater clarity with planning applications and speed up the decision-making process. The nature of the statement will be compatible with the scale and complexity of the proposal and should not impose an undue burden on applicants for planning permission. Guidance for applicants will need to be prepared.	
6456 - The Countryside Agency	Support	We support the preferred requirement that planning applications should be accompanied by an appropriate design and landscape statement.  The preparation of a concept statement for the site (see our comments on CS14) would provide a useful base from which to work.	Support noted.	Consider whether developers should also be required to provide a concept statement for allocated sites.
5563 2876 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Support	Support. We look forward to seeing this initiative, which we feel will be very helpful to the planning process if conscientiously produced and followed.	Support noted.	

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*District Council's Assessment*

*Approach to Draft DPD*

---

**Decision on CS17 Design and Landscape Statement - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS18 Development Criteria - Preferred Approach</i>				
4244 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 4.17 Suggest insertion of "public open space" in developer checklist.	Agree. This should be included in the Development Criteria Policy.	Ensure that public open space is addressed in the Development Criteria Policy.
5523 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to CS18 as it would be impossible to cover all development proposals without the list of criteria becoming unreasonably lengthy and meaningless. It is also dubious whether a single policy and list of criteria would achieve a high quality of design.	CS18 will be a criteria-based policy which will set out a checklist for developers. This policy will cross-refer to other parts of the LDF which will contain the detail, therefore keeping the policy succinct. For example, CS16 the Design of New Development and the Design Guide SPD will ensure a high quality of design is achieved.	
3360 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships requests that the policy makes allowance for a flexible and responsive approach to determining planning applications; ensuring proposals contained in the development checklist are themselves flexible, adaptive and act as parameters rather than a prescriptive set of criteria. Clearly it is important that planning guidance provides contextual background but this should be considered on a site by site basis with an understanding of development opportunities as presented.	Support noted. The Development Criteria Policy will be a criteria-based policy in line with Government guidance, which allows flexibility on a site-by-site basis.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3478 - Royal Mail Group	Support	<p>Support approach of a policy setting out development criteria for development projects. Policy should be constructed to require relevant information on those matters related to the development proposal. These criteria should include:- Sustainability, Transport impact and access, design and visual impact, external appearance and materials, size scale height and massing, environmental / ecological impact, cultural heritage and archeological matters.</p> <p>Policy should also allow for change of use, subject to criteria being met: Evidence of need or demand for current / last use, requirement/justification for proposed use, details of marketing undertaken, impact of loss of facility.</p>	Noted. These issues should be included in the Development Criteria Policy. The policy will apply to all new development and changes of use. CS18 will be a criteria-based policy which will set out a checklist for developers. This policy will cross-refer to other parts of the LDF which will contain the detail.	Ensure that sustainability, transport impact and access, design and visual impact, external appearance and materials, size, scale, height and massing, environmental / ecological impact, cultural heritage and archaeological matters are addressed in the Development Criteria Policy.
4354 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Para 4.17</p> <p>CCC supports the principle of including disabled access as part of the development criteria for development proposals. Suggest that in addition a policy is required to ensure "inclusive access" as defined in Planning and Access for Disabled People: a Good Practice Guide (ODPM). Including encouragement for developers to provide an access statement as part of their planning application. This could form part of the comprehensive policy on design (Para 5.13) and more detailed guidance could be provided in the suggested supplementary planning document on design (CS16).</p>	Noted. This should be included in the Development Criteria Policy. Consider adding a cross-reference to the ODPM Good Practice Guide.	Ensure that disabled access, and the requirement for an Access Statement, is addressed in the Design of New Development Policy and Development Criteria Policy. Add a reference to the ODPM's Good Practice Guide.
3783 - English Heritage 5564 3596 - GO-East 3239 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust 4574 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	We strongly support the suggested approach to criteria based policy or policies that are spatial in nature, and so are applicable to a range of developments, rather than being based on single land uses or very narrow criteria. It would have been helpful if the Preferred Options Report had indicated some of the appropriate criteria.	Support noted.	

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*District Council's Assessment*

*Approach to Draft DPD*

---

**Decision on CS18 Development Criteria - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

## *Chapter 5. Housing*

### *CS19 Housing Objectives - Preferred Approach*

3173 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	The plan should allow for the review of housing provision throughout the district area and the plan periods to ensure that development land is always available to meet local and regional needs.	CS21 phases development to ensure a continuous supply throughout the plan period. "Plan, Monitor, Manage" will keep track of progress and any adjustments can be made to ensure a continuous supply of housing throughout the plan period.	
2049 - W A Fairhurst & Partners	Object	<p>It is recommended that the following paragraph be added to 5.2:-</p> <p>"The land at Waterbeach Barracks is safeguarded to meet housing need for additional homes, or to ensure that the current Structure Plan requirement is met."</p> <p>Alternatively:-</p> <p>"The land north of Waterbeach should be allocated to meet a large proportion of the 9,600 units in rural areas and the 2,000 currently proposed on land adjacent to Cambridge to be released from the Green Belt."</p>	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. There is no need to allocate more sites or safeguard land for housing. In particular, there is no strategic context or need to allocate land for major development beyond those identified in the Structure Plan, including at Waterbeach.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3841 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)	Object	Para 5.2 limits housing development within Rural Centres and other villages. This does not make any provision for larger sites coming forward, such as our site, where a balanced redevelopment scheme contribute to the sustainability of Duxford. Hence our site should included as a residential-led allocation.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. Development can be met higher up the hierarchy such that no further development is needed in the villages ranked below Rural Centres. At the Rural Centres, there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers committed to higher order locations. For example, at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. However, the strategy does not preclude "windfall" development within villages, which could allow the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more sites.	
3843 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford) 3842 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)	Object	Greater flexibility should be provided to allow previously developed brownfield sites in or immediately adjacent to villages, such as our site to be included as potential windfall sites.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. Development can be met higher up the hierarchy such that no further development is needed in the villages ranked below Rural Centres. At the Rural Centres, there is scope to more than meet the housing numbers required at this stage in the sequence. Primarily this is at Cambourne through increased densities on the existing residential land parcels in the masterplan. Therefore, there is no need to allocate more sites. However, the strategy does not preclude "windfall" development within villages, which could allow the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks. However, redevelopment of brownfield sites outside village frameworks have not been recognised in policy terms as forming an integrated part of the village and development for housing would be contrary to planning policy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4245 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Chapter 5 It should be possible before the next phase of the LDF to provide more detailed information on recent migration to South Cambs, based on the Census and NHS records. It would be useful to show the origins of people moving in - but the Council is still awaiting the data from the Office for National Statistics. A 'context' section could usefully review current tenures, showing the small % of social rented housing in the district, and the % of this which is specifically for elderly people. This underpins the requirement for affordable housing - i.e. very few re-lets per annum which are not for elderly people.	Noted. This level of detail is not directly relevant to the LDF process.	
3997 - Bidwells Property Consultants	Object	The Plan does not address the Structure Plan's brownfield target of 37%.	The brownfield targets in the Structure Plan have been set on the basis of the development strategy. In South Cambs, developments at Cambridge East, Cambridge Southern Fringe and Northstowe will reuse brownfield sites. In addition, "windfall" sites within village frameworks also contribute. "Plan, Monitor, Manage" will keep track of progress and appropriate action can be taken as necessary to bring forward brownfield land.	
1480 - Cambridge City Council Property & Building Services (Land north of Fen Road, Cambridge) 1462 - Cambridge City Council Property & Building Services (Land north of Fen Road, Cambridge)	Object	No Area Action Plan has been proposed for Cambridge Northern Fringe East or the surrounding area in the LDS. To this end, we object to omission of such land from either the Urban Capacity Study or Area Action Plans. We would like to propose the following site for residential development.	This is an allocation in Local Plan 2004 and subject to a separate Masterplan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2517 - Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority 2513 - Addenbrooke's Hospital 3245 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Object	Key Workers should be identified as a priority in the general housing objective, particularly to serve the needs of important public service sectors such as health. New housing should be designed to provide access to all people to their own homes through all life stages including parenthood, sickness, old age and lack of mobility. We are pleased that the Council proposes to reflect this in Design guidance but we feel that it should be included in the second bullet point.	The term Affordable Housing is now used to encompass a wide variety of types and tenures of housing for a wide range of people with different personal circumstances, including housing for "Key Workers". However, for clarity, add at the end of 2nd bullet: "... INCLUDING KEY WORKERS."	Add at the end of 2nd bullet: "... INCLUDING KEY WORKERS."
3508 - Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Object	The approach assumes housing development at Chesterton Sidings. The LDF should refer to this being dependent on the relocation of the Cambridge wastewater treatment works and a comprehensive strategy for the CNF (East).	900 houses can be accommodated on Chesterton Sidings. This is an allocation in Local Plan 2004 and subject to a separate Masterplan. A Plan monitor and manage approach will be utilised, and the strategy adapted if necessary if problems develop with the site.	
3559 - Stannifer	Object	The emerging LDF does not reflect the new regional spatial strategy and, therefore, will be out of date when adopted.	The LDF is required to be in conformity with the adopted Structure Plan and the development strategy contained within it. Whilst RSS14 is not sufficiently advanced to be taken into account at this stage, the draft RSS proposes development levels in the Cambridge Sub Region to 2016 which are consistent with the Structure Plan. The new plan-making system allows greater flexibility for revisions to be made to parts of the LDF in order for it to remain up to date, for example, when RSS14 is adopted. The imperative to bring forward major development in the Sub Region puts an emphasis on the early preparation of the key LDF documents.	
4568 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	Description of key workers should include those employed in education, including higher education.	The definition in the Glossary is "typically employed in key public services, such as nurse, teachers and police". This list is not exhaustive but provides a guideline.	Include a more precise definition of Key Workers in the Glossary.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5456 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Object	Whilst broadly supportive of the housing objectives, TMLC considers that it could be strengthened by relating it more closely with the objectives of PPG3.	The housing objectives closely relate to PPG3 objectives.	
5521 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to CS19 as it will be physically impossible for the housing needs of all sectors of the community to be met. The 2nd bullet point of the policy should therefore be reworded.	The objectives set out the overarching principles for housing developments to aspire to. It is important to try to meet the identified needs of the community, delivered through specific policies in the Housing Chapter.	
6150 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6151 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	Support the objective which requires "an adequate and continuous supply of land..." Object to the basis against which the housing allocations have been assessed. Should be based on the requirements of RSS14 and not the Structure Plan. Fail to provide a robust approach in seeking to ensure sufficient choice in location of allocations. Over reliant on a small number of strategic allocations including inter alia, Northstowe, and Green Belt releases around Cambridge. Additional development could and should be provided at Cambourne to the north of the A428.	Support noted. The LDF is required to be in conformity with the adopted Structure Plan and the development strategy contained within it. Whilst RSS14 is not sufficiently advanced to be taken into account at this stage, the draft RSS proposes development levels in the Cambridge Sub Region to 2016 which are consistent with the Structure Plan. The new plan-making system allows greater flexibility for revisions to be made to parts of the LDF in order for it to remain up to date, for example, when RSS14 is adopted. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that the 20,000 dwellings for the period 1999-2016 can be met and that there is no need to allocate further sites.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2341 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee 5749 - The English Courtyard Association	Object	There is no indication of how differing requirements of individuals such as the retired or disabled (particularly as private sector customers) will be incorporated in the housing mix. Nor is there any indication of a policy to provide for members of the travelling community. Land for elderly persons housing needs to be given favorable consideration, both in urban and rural areas.	Subsidised special needs housing, including for the elderly, is included within the term affordable housing and provided through the Supporting People initiative. Private special needs housing will generally be provided by the market. The Housing Needs Survey includes assessment of special needs housing and housing for older people. This shows that the vast majority of special needs can be addressed through minor adaptations of existing homes and do not require specialist housing. Recent changes to Building Regulations also now require design of all properties to take account of potential long terms needs of occupants. The draft Local Development Scheme states that a separate DPD will be produced to address the needs of travellers once work on a Cambridge Sub Region travellers needs assessment has been completed.	
2500 - Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd 6063 - Network Rail	Object	Support the strategic objective to provide an adequate and continuous supply of housing land to meet strategic requirements but would encourage the Council to place more emphasis on optimising the use of previously developed land within urban areas in line with Government guidance set out in PPG3.	Support noted. Previously developed land (PDL) forms a significant part of each of the three major housing areas, on the edge of Cambridge and at Northstowe. In the rural area, subject to levels of development appropriate to the category of village, development is permitted on previously developed "windfall" sites within village frameworks.	
5845 5815 - P B Moore & Sons	Object	Para 5.6 The table should be revised.	Agree, the table should be revised to update the latest position at 2004.	Update Housing Land Supply table with latest figures.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6114 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6115 - Centex Strategic Land	Object	Support the objective which requires "an adequate and continuous supply of land..." Object to the basis against which the housing allocations have been assessed. Should be based on the requirements of RSS14 and not the Structure Plan. Fail to provide a robust approach in seeking to ensure sufficient choice in location of allocations. Over reliant on a small number of strategic allocations including inter alia, Northstowe, and Green Belt releases around Cambridge. Additional development could and should be provided at Histon to the north of Impington Lane.	Support noted. The LDF is required to be in conformity with the adopted Structure Plan and the development strategy contained within it. Whilst RSS14 is not sufficiently advanced to be taken into account at this stage, the draft RSS proposes development levels in the Cambridge Sub Region to 2016 which are consistent with the Structure Plan. The new plan-making system allows greater flexibility for revisions to be made to parts of the LDF in order for it to remain up to date, for example, when RSS14 is adopted. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that the 20,000 dwellings for the period 1999-2016 can be met and that there is no need to allocate further sites.	

---

<i>Representations</i>		<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

<p>1939 5939 - D H Barford &amp; Co 5792 5794 5826 5964 5827 5858 5865 5878 5879 2868 - Januarys 4720 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited 5770 - Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd 5785 - Stamford Homes Ltd 6024 - The Fairey Family 5993 5804 - Westbury Homes Ltd</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The Council's expectations regarding housing completions in the period to 2016 will not be realised. Further land allocations are essential. Unsafe assumptions are made as regards the contribution from windfall sites, and the Council has failed to justify its proposal to 'reconfirm' all historic commitments. Core Strategy downgrades a number of villages to group villages. Due to lead in times, major developments may not be completed during plan period. Therefore residue housing requirement will be higher.</p>	<p>Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that the 9,600 dwellings in the rural area for the period 1999-2016 can be met. Account has been had to the deliverability of Urban Capacity sites, through a discounting process. The windfall figure used for the Urban Capacity Study already takes a conservative view. The rate fell from the 1990s to the early 2000s and this lower rate has been used. It also takes account only of sites in village frameworks. Given high demand and land values in the Cambridge area it is considered unlikely that this rate will not be achieved. Existing Local Plan 2004 allocations have been scrutinised by an Independent Local Plan Inspector in the context of the then emerging Structure Plan, and the sites included in the adopted Local Plan 2006 were those considered suitable in the transition to the new urban focused development strategy. The majority of these have, or are, coming forward for development, and are considered reasonable to be carried forward to help meet the housing numbers for the period to 2006, when the Core Strategy will be adopted. Therefore, there is no need to allocate further sites. "Plan, Monitor, Manage" will keep track of progress and any adjustments can be made to ensure a continuous supply of housing throughout the plan period.</p>	
<p>5567 4450 - RLW Estates 4154 - Westbury Homes 4575 - Bayer CropScience Ltd</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Support the objectives to provide an adequate and continuous supply of housing land to ensure the provision of a range of housing types and sizes including affordable housing.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	

---

**Decision on CS19 Housing Objectives - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS20 Housing Allocations in the Local Plan 2004 - Preferred Approach</i>				
3134	Object	The notional allocation at Impington may need revision due to flood risk. (See representation under rural centres)	Noted. This will be reviewed as part of the preparation of the draft LDF policies, which will include seeking the views of the Environment Agency.	Review allocation.
3510 - Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Object	Specific reference should be made to all of the allocations proposed to be taken forward, not just those in the villages. These apparently include Chesterton Sidings. Its availability needs to be explained and the constraints identified.	The Strategy Chapter (paras 2.8 and 2.9) set out the development strategy, including at Arbury Camp and Chesterton Sidings. Agree, for the sake of clarity, this information should be included in the Housing chapter.	
2877 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	We would wish to see some clarification of the footnote relating to Steeple Morden.	The footnote refers to Policy Steeple Morden 1: contained in Part 2 of Local Plan 2004, which permits residential development if 3 site specific criteria are met. Clarification will be provided in the policy allocating the site, as in the Local Plan 2004.	
3650 - House Builders Federation	Object	<p>The text refers to the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan requirement for 20,000 dwellings between 1999-2016. It would seem more appropriate to now instead refer to the 23,600 dwelling requirement between 2001-2021 in the East of England Plan that will be going on public deposit very imminently.</p> <p>The HBF welcomes the Council's 10% flexibility allowance to allow for the non-implementation of outstanding planning permissions. However, it queries whether adequate discounting has been made in respect of likely urban capacity provision. In particular, the figure of 1,573 dwellings coming forward as a small windfall allowance in respect of villages seems very high.</p>	Support noted. The LDF is required to be in conformity with the adopted Structure Plan and the development strategy contained within it. Whilst RSS14 is not sufficiently advanced to be taken into account at this stage, the draft RSS proposes development levels in the Cambridge Sub Region to 2016 which are consistent with the Structure Plan. The new plan-making system allows greater flexibility for revisions to be made to parts of the LDF in order for it to remain up to date, for example, when RSS14 is adopted. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that the 20,000 dwellings for the period 1999-2016 can be met and that there is no need to allocate further sites. The windfall figure used for the Urban Capacity Study already takes a conservative view. The rate fell from the 1990s to the early 2000s and this lower rate has been used. It also takes account only of sites in village frameworks. Given high demand and land values in the Cambridge area it is considered unlikely that this rate will not be achieved.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3784 - English Heritage	Object	We are unable to consider these allocations in the absence of a proposals map defining them.	Noted. Allocations are shown in Local Plan 2004.	
5222 5257 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 5302	Object	Object to the proposal to carry forward the housing allocation in Over from the adopted Local Plan as it is a greenfield site and there is the opportunity to use a suitable brownfield site, our client's land off Randall's Lane, instead.	The allocation north of Chapman Way in Local Plan 2004 is the residue of a larger allocation, and has the benefit of planning permission. The correct approach is to retain the site as an allocation until completed, given the importance of the Local Plan 2004 allocations in providing land supply up to 2006.	Carry forward all housing allocations from Local Plan 2004, including those with planning permission, in order to be consistent with employment land allocations.
4719 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	It should not be assumed that, apart from the major strategic extensions of Cambridge, the only scope for further housing is to be in the villages. Barton Road North can provide a sustainable smaller scale and non-strategic extension of Cambridge and should be considered before further development within villages, which are likely to be less sustainable.	The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and a hierarchy for its location. The Structure Plan strategic locations for housing development are sufficient to meet housing requirements on the edge of Cambridge and through Green Belt review for the period to 2016. There is no need for further Green Belt release. Notwithstanding, this is a sensitive Green Belt location at an entrance to Cambridge where "distinctive Cambridge" is very close to its countryside setting.	

---

<i><b>Representations</b></i>	<i><b>Nature</b></i>	<i><b>Representation Summary</b></i>	<i><b>District Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Approach to Draft DPD</b></i>
-------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------

---

4783

Object

- Structure Plan Housing Distribution requirements in Policy P9/1 is indicative only.
- There has been insufficient time to review all the Councils details on commitments.
- The supply predicated from allocations does not meet the changing Policy framework and should not be carried forward in the LDF.

The Structure Plan provides the development strategy for the LDF setting the housing numbers and the sequence for development, together with the general location of strategic development in Policy P9/1. It also brackets South Cambs figures for land in the built up area of Cambridge and on the edge of Cambridge through a Green Belt review together with those for the City to set an overall requirement for these stages in the sequence. The strategy for the rural area also takes account of the Structure Plan which focuses development on the larger Rural Centres. The figure for outstanding permissions has been discounted by 10% to allow for any noon-implementation, which has historically been low in the District. Existing Local Plan allocations have been scrutinised by an independent Inspector in the context of the then emerging Structure Plan. and the sites included in the adopted Local Plan 2006 were those considered suitable in the transition to the new urban focused development strategy. The majority of these have, or are, coming forward for development, and are considered reasonable to be carried forward to help meet the housing numbers for the period to 2006, when the Core Strategy will be adopted. Therefore, there is no need to allocate further sites. "Plan, Monitor, Manage" will keep track of progress and any adjustments can be made to ensure a continuous supply of housing throughout the plan period.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5459 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Object	The Urban Capacity Study did not consider housing capacity of the previously developed land at the former Monsanto site which lies within the Cambridge urban area and which falls within South Cambridgeshire. As a result, the level of greenfield housing development identified for the villages has been overestimated and needs to be reduced.	The Monsanto Site was not included in the Urban Capacity Study which did not address capacity at strategic major development sites. This site is considered in the development strategy in the Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP. The AAP considers the appropriate extent of the site and will determine in more detail the uses for the site and the housing capacity to meet the first 2 stages in the sequence for development set out in the Structure Plan, ie in and on the edge of Cambridge either in the urban area or through Green Belt review. The housing requirement for villages is set separately. It is not considered likely that supply in the higher order locations in and on the edge of Cambridge in the period to 2016 will be significantly above the Structure Plan figures and the village figure is therefore address appropriately.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

3844 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford) 5729 - Dixon International Group Ltd	Object	Para 5.7 identifies a need to make new allocations for approx 366 dwellings in villages. Sites put forward by 3 respondents to help meet this target. The small windfall site provision seems ambitious, further land should be allocated to reduce the windfall requirement.	Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that the 9,600 dwellings in the rural area for the period 1999-2016 can be met. Account has been had to the deliverability of Urban Capacity sites, through a discounting process. The windfall figure used for the Urban Capacity Study already takes a conservative view. The rate fell from the 1990s to the early 2000s and this lower rate has been used. It also takes account only of sites in village frameworks. Given high demand and land values in the Cambridge area it is considered unlikely that this rate will not be achieved. Existing Local Plan 2004 allocations have been scrutinised by an Independent Local Plan Inspector in the context of the then emerging Structure Plan, and the sites included in the adopted Local Plan 2006 were those considered suitable in the transition to the new urban focused development strategy. The majority of these have, or are, coming forward for development, and are considered reasonable to be carried forward to help meet the housing numbers for the period to 2006, when the Core Strategy will be adopted. Therefore, there is no need to allocate further sites. "Plan, Monitor, Manage" will keep track of progress and any adjustments can be made to ensure a continuous supply of housing throughout the plan period.	
--	--------	---	---	--

---



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5734 (Land at Station Road, Linton) Object		<p>Site should be allocated for housing development. Land currently in use for B8 storage but will shortly become redundant. Complies with criteria of policy protecting rural employment as site used at normal employment density would diminish residential amenity.</p> <p>Majority of allocations in CS20 have already been completed or have planning permission. Thus very few allocations made in proposed rural centres. Site represents a windfall site and its allocation at this stage would reduce requirement in Urban Capacity Study. Connection could be made to village centre via a pedestrian / cycle bridge.</p>	<p>This site is currently in employment use, and would therefore be required to pass the policy tests protecting rural employment sites. The size of this site would result in a housing development over the scale permitted if Linton is designated as a minor rural centre. Its ability to come forward as a windfall it therefore restricted. With regard to allocating the site, there is no need to allocate further sites in minor rural centres, given the results of the urban capacity study, and the site sequence detailed in the Structure Plan.</p> <p>The area south of the A505 is also severed from the main village, limiting its suitability for residential development.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4913 - Cambridgeshire Recycling 5684 - Banner Homes 5692 (Land South of Clay Close Lane, Impington) 5722 (Land at 17 Whitcroft Road, Meldreth) 5967 5823 5824 5846 5859 5866 3735 - GO-East 3177 - McCann Homes Limited 4781 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd 5819 - P B Moore & Sons 5771 - Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd 5786 - Stamford Homes Ltd 6021 - The Fairey Family 5987 4669 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc 6112 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6113 - Centex Strategic Land 5807 - Westbury Homes Ltd 5719 - Dixon International Group Ltd 5703 - Freshwater Estates Ltd. (Land at 41 Mill Lane, Sawston) 6142 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	Given that the emerging LDF provides an entirely new framework and strategy for the allocation for housing land, and given the existing Local Plan expires in 2006, it is considered that the opportunity should be taken to reappraise all of the identified allocations. Sites should be re-allocated to sustainable Rural Centre locations. The majority of allocations listed have already been completed and no new allocations are made including in the proposed rural centres.	Existing Local Plan 2004 allocations have been scrutinised by an Independent Local Plan Inspector in the context of the then emerging Structure Plan. The majority of these have, or are, coming forward for development, and are considered reasonable to be carried forward to help meet the housing numbers for the period to 2006 when the LDF will be adopted. The proposed increase in housing numbers at Cambourne will meet the remainder of the Structure Plan requirement for 9,600 dwellings in the rural area, taking account of completions, commitments and windfalls. Therefore, there is no need to allocate further sites. "Plan, Monitor, Manage" will keep track of progress and any adjustments can be made to ensure a continuous supply of housing throughout the plan period.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1351	Support	It will be very important to earmark the great majority of future village houses as 'affordable' housing as defined elsewhere. It is the loss of younger members of the original local population which threatens most greatly the viability of our villages. Thus far village developments have consisted almost entirely of 'executive' homes because these offer the greatest profits to the developers.	Support noted. The Affordable Housing and Housing Mix policies seek to achieve an appropriate balance of house types, including affordable housing and a greater proportion of smaller homes to meet identified local needs.	
2380 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Support	As it is unclear on what basis the LP 2004 notional allocation is calculated, nor to which date it refers, the entry for Papworth Everard may be incomplete. 259 dwellings (area 3C) is correct. We do not recognise the 10/0.3ha entry, though there is a longstanding agreement for 24 dwellings in S. of area 3B, and planning has been granted for 21 dwellings there. Area 3A has outline permission for 135 dwellings, 57 of which have full permission. A 1.642ha site near the Village Centre has been granted permission for change of use from B1 Business to residential use.	Support noted. The entry for Papworth Everard of 0.3ha / notional allocation 10 dwellings is a residue of West of Ermine Street North, at Elm Way (shown on Local Plan 2004 Inset Map 78 as site 3B). This was a residue of the larger 3B site which has now been built. This residue also now has planning permission, but will be retained in the plan as an allocation until it is completed.	
4246 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5570 3458 - Guilden Morden Parish Council 5914 (Berrycroft Stores, Berrycroft, Willingham) 4577 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support carrying over of the Local Plan 2004 allocations into the LDF. It is recognised that many of the existing allocations are considered necessary to meet the sub region strategy in the short term.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS20 Housing Allocations in the Local Plan 2004 - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

Also include housing allocations from Local Plan 2004 that have the benefit of planning permission, subject to any material changes in circumstances. This will provide a context if future applications are required, and an approach consistent with the employment land allocations.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS21 Phasing of Major Developments - Preferred Approach</i>				
3512 - Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Object	Phasing of Chesterton Sidings as part of CNF (East) is dependent on a comprehensive approach to the whole of that area and relocation of the Cambridge wastewater treatment works.	Noted. This is addressed by Policy CNF2 of the adopted Local Plan 2004.	
2582 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	This paragraph does not draw attention to the need to start developments as soon as possible to meet housing needs and targets.	Noted. If the LDF is to deliver the required housing numbers over the plan period, it is crucial that development, particularly at the larger strategic sites is enabled as soon as practically possible. This is addressed by the wording of CS21, but the emphasis of this point should be made in the supporting text.	Ensure that additional wording to encourage development to start as soon as possible is included in the supporting text for the Phasing Policy.
2516 - Addenbrooke's Hospital 3133 3877 - Network Rail (Town Planning Team)	Object	This policy sets out a phasing approach for a continuous supply of housing. This seems to sit alone without reference to other factors. It would be inappropriate for housing development to occur without necessary public transport improvements being in place. If housing is provided without additional public transport capacity, unsustainable modes will be used and existing public transport facilities may be stretched to breaking point. Phasing should be dependent firstly on provision of infrastructure commensurate with occupation or completion rates. Housing completion targets must not be the sole criteria and be allowed further exacerbate the current chronic infrastructure deficit. There is no reference to the need to ensure that community and leisure facilities should be provided in phases as developments are implemented.	CS21 addresses the need for a district wide phasing policy that will set out a mechanism for ensuring phased delivery of housing and require development at the major sites to come forward in accordance with details to be drawn up in individual Area Action Plans. The AAPs will provide the detail on phasing of individual developments to ensure that the necessary infrastructure accompanies the housing at the appropriate timescales, for example, at various "trigger points" throughout the development. Existing Local Plan 2004 allocations, including two large sites on the edge of Cambridge at Arbury Camp and Chesterton Sidings, and windfall development in non-AAP locations on previously developed land, are permitted to come forward at any time. This will help to provide a continuous supply over the plan period. "Plan, monitor and manage" will keep track of progress, and any adjustments can be made to ensure a continuous supply of housing throughout the plan period.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

3652 - House Builders Federation 2601 - FPD Savills 3558 - Stannifer 3597 - GO-East 3357 - English Partnerships 5462 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 5172 - Laing Homes North Thames 6193 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 1659 - The Marshall Group	Object	Very important that any phasing policy is flexible enough to ensure that phasing constraints are not so unduly onerous as to threaten the District's overall housing delivery requirement. Proper account should be taken of all necessary lead-in times before development commences on site. The Council should not rely on a small number of strategic sites to come forward. The role of Rural Centres should not be forgotten in terms of contribution and delivery of new housing development. Does not set out any realistic mechanism to ensure that housing is phased in accordance with Structure Plan requirements. Should be reworded to reflect the need for the development of previously developed land to be given priority ahead of the development of greenfield sites.	CS21 addresses the need for a district wide phasing policy that will set out a mechanism for ensuring phased delivery of housing and require development at the major sites to come forward in accordance with details to be drawn up in individual Area Action Plans. The AAPs will provide the detail on phasing of individual developments to ensure that the necessary infrastructure accompanies the housing at the appropriate timescales, for example, at various "trigger points" throughout the development. Existing Local Plan 2004 allocations, including two large sites on the edge of Cambridge at Arbury Camp and Chesterton Sidings, and windfall development in non-AAP locations on previously developed land, are permitted to come forward at any time. This will help to provide a continuous supply over the plan period. "Plan, monitor and manage" will keep track of progress, and any adjustments can be made to ensure a continuous supply of housing throughout the plan period.	
4356 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4578 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	The approach on phasing to co-ordinate the development of major sites is supported.	Support noted.	

---

**Decision on CS21 Phasing of Major Developments - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

***Representations******Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD******CS22 Housing Density - Preferred Approach***

3184 - McCann Homes Limited

Object

The circumstances for achieving densities of less than 30 dph should be relaxed further to include reference to providing for a range of house types and sizes. Local character and design requirements should be more important than achieving a minimum density or rural areas.

PPG3 requires densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) in order to make best use of land, and encourages densities of 30-50dph. PPG3 also seeks a greater intensity of development at places with good public transport accessibility. This is carried forward in the Structure Plan which says "Densities of at least 40 dwellings per hectare should be sought in locations close to a good range of existing or potential services and facilities and where there is, or there is the potential for, good public transport accessibility." (from P5/3). CS22 is consistent with the Structure Plan, and is flexible, recognising that higher densities should be achievable in the larger strategic development sites, particularly in the service centres, which will have a greater range of facilities and services and High Quality Public Transport. Density policies for the major developments are included in the AAP's. Higher densities can be achieved without detriment to the environment if carefully designed and integrated with its surroundings. However, a blanket requirement for higher than 30dph across the district would not be considered in keeping with existing development, and should only apply to locations with a good range of facilities and services and good public transport provision, for example in some larger village centres. Very occasionally there may be local circumstances whereby lower densities should be sought, and CS22 allows flexibility for these situations, as the exception rather than the norm.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

4778  
5938 - D H Barford & Co  
4777 - Atkins Property  
Developments Ltd

Object

Potential conflict between policy CS22 and CS8 where the need to respect the surrounding character and the infilling criteria may often result in developments which equate to a density of less than 30 dwellings per hectare. Government guidance does not allow densities below 30 dwellings per hectare.

PPG3 requires densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) in order to make best use of land, and encourages densities of 30-50dph. PPG3 also seeks a greater intensity of development at places with good public transport accessibility. This is carried forward in the Structure Plan which says "Densities of at least 40 dwellings per hectare should be sought in locations close to a good range of existing or potential services and facilities and where there is, or there is the potential for, good public transport accessibility." (from P5/3). CS22 is consistent with the Structure Plan, and is flexible, recognising that densities should take into account the surrounding local character and the need for careful design and integration with its surroundings. Very occasionally there may be local circumstances whereby lower densities should be sought, and CS22 allows flexibility for these situations, as the exception rather than the norm.

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

<p>1490 3181 - CPRE Cambridgeshire 5765 5520 - The Fairfield Partnership 6194 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 1661 - The Marshall Group</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The policy does not indicate a density range high enough to be compatible with PPG3 at sustainable locations. The density indication for Cambridge East should be at least 65 dwellings per hectare. Higher densities than 40 per hectare should only be sought in the centres of the planned communities or in locations within the communities that are particularly well served by public transport. High density developments tacked onto low density villages, or clustered to form new 'towns' or suburbs tend to be soul-less and generally un-loved. Would recommend minimum density is increased to 40 dwellings per hectare unless special circumstances apply.</p>	<p>PPG3 requires densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) in order to make best use of land, and encourages densities of 30-50dph. PPG3 also seeks a greater intensity of development at places with good public transport accessibility. This is carried forward in the Structure Plan which says "Densities of at least 40 dwellings per hectare should be sought in locations close to a good range of existing or potential services and facilities and where there is, or there is the potential for, good public transport accessibility." (from P5/3). CS22 is consistent with the Structure Plan, and is flexible, recognising that higher densities should be achievable in the larger strategic development sites, particularly in the service centres, which will have a greater range of facilities and services and High Quality Public Transport. Density policies for the major developments are included in the AAP's. Higher densities can be achieved without detriment to the environment if carefully designed and integrated with its surroundings. However, a blanket requirement for higher than 30dph across the district would not be considered in keeping with existing development, and should only apply to locations with a good range of facilities and services and good public transport provision, for example in some larger village centres. Very occasionally there may be local circumstances whereby lower densities should be sought, and CS22 allows flexibility for these situations, as the exception rather than the norm.</p>	
---	---------------	--	--	--

---



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3364 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships supports the principles of higher density development i.e. over 40 dwellings per ha. In designing new development opportunities sustainability will be a key consideration and therefore an integral part of the masterplan process. However, in this context of this statement we are unclear as to the wording and intent of the policy as described and would encourage further clarification of its meaning.	Support noted. The Policy on Housing Density will provide greater detail and clarity.	
4247 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	To be consistent, the term "good quality public transport" should be changed to "high quality public transport" throughout, as used later in CS22, and in accordance with Policy P8/6 of the Structure Plan. A definition should also be included here rather than in Chapter 7.	Whilst the Structure Plan refers to High Quality Public Transport, the Local Transport Plan also includes Good Quality Public Transport. CS22 recognises that the urban extensions to Cambridge and Northstowe should be able to achieve HQPT, but provides more flexibility in the rural areas. Whilst it may be an aspiration to achieve HQPT district-wide, it is considered that GQPT is more achievable over the plan period, considering the rural nature of the District. Inclusion of HQPT in all areas would preclude development at higher density in the villages.	Include a definition of High Quality Public Transport and Good Quality Public Transport in the Glossary and cross refer to Transport chapter in supporting text.
2404 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Support	We support in general but in the first sentence consider that the use of the word 'very' in relation to special local circumstances is too limiting and should be removed. In the second sentence the reference to higher dwelling densities for sites in more rural locations with the 'POTENTIAL for GQPT' should include a requirement to prove that such provision is realistic, achievable and sustainable.	PPG3 requires densities of at least 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) in order to make best use of land. Structure Plan Policy P5/3 says that "densities of less than 30 dph will not be acceptable". Therefore, it is therefore important that lower densities are permitted only in very special circumstances. Papworth Everard Policy 1 in Part Two of Local Plan 2004 is one such exception, and treated differently, applying densities of 25dph. This approach should be rolled forward. However, all applications will be considered on a site by site basis and the policy allows for exceptions to the Structure Plan Policy if "very special local circumstances" can be demonstrated. It is not appropriate to weaken the approach.	Roll forward Local Plan 2004 Papworth Everard Policy 1.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5463 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company (TMLC proposed Monsanto Site) 4579 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support the approach towards housing density.	Support noted.	
---	---------	---	----------------	--

---

**Decision on CS22 Housing Density - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified. Roll forward Local Plan 2004 Papworth Everard Policy 1, to reflect special local circumstances.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS23 Market Housing Mix - Preferred Option</i>				
4250 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The greater numbers of 1 and 2-bedroom dwellings will, however, have an impact on the number of children these developments generate. If, in the future, certain sites are expected to have a certain housing mix, the County Council would wish to be involved at an early date to begin pupil forecasting to determine the size and numbers of schools to be built.	Noted. Greater clarity on population profile is more likely to be achieved through the inclusion of policies on housing mix in the Core Strategy and Area Action Plans. Partnership working with Cambridgeshire County Council will also ensure this is addressed.	Ensure continued partnership working with Cambridgeshire County Council.
4251 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 5.24 2nd bullet  Re-lets of council dwellings are also a factor here, not just housing associations.	Noted. Bullet 2 refers to social rented housing typically housing provided by registered social landlords (housing associations). This is an example, and does not preclude other providers, such as re-lets of council dwellings.	
3661 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 4357 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The housing needs study identified a need for 89% of new housing being 1 & 2 bedroom, and Policy 9/1 of the Structure Plan recommends at least 40% of new housing in the Cambridge Sub Region is affordable (some of which is likely to be 3 bed), suggests a lower proportion of 4 bedroom or more dwellings is required in line with alternative option CS26 with a 50-25-25 split.	The targets proposed in Preferred Option CS23 for bedroom sizes for 1&2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedrooms in the proportions 40%:30%:30% are considered appropriate for Northstowe as this would address locally identified housing needs whilst not compromising the creation of a balanced community in an entirely new settlement. However, having regard to representations, the use of these proportions in villages would not address the high level of properties of 4 or more bedrooms that has taken place over the last 10 years or more (around half), or the high level of need for 1 and 2 bedroom properties identified in the Housing Need Survey (89% of all market dwellings). Therefore, the use of targets for bedroom sizes in the proportions 50%:25%:25% (CS26) are proposed for development in villages to help redress the balance in existing communities.	CS23 to be applied to major developments and CS26 for development in villages.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4580 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The option is too prescriptive and does not follow advice in PPG3. There should not be any such option and it should be deleted.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4864 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	The imposition of 40% affordable housing target, as set out by the Structure Plan, will to a great extent influence the make up of housing mix. To impose an extra restriction, the type of mix for market housing, is an over zealous fetter on the housng industry to meet consumer demand.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey. Despite a policy requiring a mix of housing types and sizes in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans, around half of all new dwellings provided by the market over the last 10 years or so have been of 4 or more bedrooms. Targets are therefore proposed to address this. It would be for a developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate on a specific site taking account of local factors. However, this would be an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need identified and the need to respond to the past trend.	
4717 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Objection is raised if the planning authority is suggesting a distortion of market demand for private housing. It is important that land allocations come foward quickly and that there is confidence in market demand for the housing being built.	The Council is responding to the failure of the market to provide an appropriate mix of house sizes over the last 10 years or more, with around half of all new properties being of 4 or more bedrooms, despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans. Targets are therefore now proposed to ensure that this situation is addressed.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

4923 - Cambridgeshire Recycling 5223 5262 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 5283 5284 5303 5327 5388 5398 5406 5414 5425 5434 5365 5373 6362 5751 - The English Courtyard Association 6348 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Housing Needs Survey 2002 does not provide an adequate basis or justification for imposing a target mix of market housing on private developers. There is also no justification under current Government guidance for seeking to impose a mix on developers. Such an approach is therefore unreasonable. Para 5.32 recognises the need for flexibility with affordable housing - there is no reason why the same should not apply for market housing.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey. Despite a policy requiring a mix of housing types and sizes in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans, around half of all new dwellings provided by the market over the last 10 years or so have been of 4 or more bedrooms. Targets are therefore proposed to address this. It would be for a developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate on a specific site taking account of local factors. However, this would be an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need identified and the need to respond to the past trend.	
--	--------	---	--	--

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5936 - D H Barford & Co	Object	Houses have become more efficient and compact, and are smaller than older properties. Whilst number of small households has grown, many have aspirations to larger family accommodation. Although 46% of properties built between 1991 and 2001 were 4 bed +, this will have little impact on the overall housing stock. Account needs to be taken of affordable housing stock, which will primarily be smaller accommodation. It is unlikely to achieve balanced communities. There should be greater flexibility, we favour alternative option 1.	The targets proposed in Preferred Option CS23 for bedroom sizes for 1&2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedrooms in the proportions 40%:30%:30% are considered appropriate for Northstowe as this would address locally identified housing needs whilst not compromising the creation of a balanced community in an entirely new settlement. However, having regard to representations, the use of these proportions in villages would not address the high level of properties of 4 or more bedrooms that has taken place over the last 10 years or more (around half), or the high level of need for 1 and 2 bedroom properties identified in the Housing Need Survey (89% of all market dwellings). Therefore, the use of targets for bedroom sizes in the proportions 50%:25%:25% (CS26) are proposed for development in villages to help redress the balance in existing communities.	CS23 to be applied to major developments and CS26 for development in villages.
2610 - FPD Savills 4772 3210 2870 - Januarys 4767 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd 5469 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 5645 - The Fairfield Partnership 6195 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 1663 - The Marshall Group	Object	The policy is far too prescriptive. Smaller household size should not automatically be equated with smaller homes. The development should be able to respond to market forces prevalent at the time. This policy unreasonably interferes with market forces. The LDF must endure until 2016 during which period housing needs will fluctuate and should be more flexible.	It is acknowledged that some smaller households would prefer to have a home larger than the minimum that they require. However, in an area of high house prices, affordability is also a relevant factor. The Housing Needs Survey took account of both what people would like and what they expect in identifying a need for 89% of all new properties to be 1 and 2 bedroom. Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more and targets are therefore now proposed to address identified needs. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes over the plan period are addressed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6387 - BT Plc 6390 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Specification of housing mix within a policy is not advocated by government guidance. This policy would lead to a mix of houses which is not required by the local community. Such restrictions also restrict the abilities of developers to respond to market demand, and would affect the viability of individual schemes, hence reducing the numbers of houses coming forward. At the very least the policy should be amended to state that it will seek to negotiate a mix of market housing subject to site considerations.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey.	
3656 - House Builders Federation 2502 - Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd 3479 - Royal Mail Group 3556 - Stannifer 3203 - McCann Homes Limited 6067 - Network Rail 5173 - Laing Homes North Thames 6118 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6126 - Centex Strategic Land 6143 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	Concerned that the Council is attempting to prescribe housing mix with little regard to the character and size of individual sites. Housing mix needs to be determined via negotiation on a site by site basis taking account of local needs and market circumstances. The policy should be seen as a guideline rather than an inflexible standard. A restrictive policy could impact on deliverability of otherwise suitable sites.	The Council is responding to the failure of the market to provide an appropriate mix of house sizes over the last 10 years or more, with around half of all new properties being of 4 or more bedrooms, despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans. Targets are therefore now proposed to ensure that this situation is addressed. It would be for a developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate on a specific site taking account of local factors as an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need for smaller units identified and to respond to the past trend.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1705 - Cambridgeshire ACRE	Support	<p>Support this option for new large-scale developments such as the new town at Northstowe as it will provide a suitable mix of properties and help create a mixed community.</p> <p>However I don't feel it is appropriate in established villages as they generally have a high proportion of properties with over 3 bedrooms and it is important to redress this balance. Therefore the proportion of homes with 1 or 2 bedrooms should be higher than indicated in this option.</p>	<p>The targets proposed in Preferred Option CS23 for bedroom sizes for 1&amp;2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedrooms in the proportions 40%:30%:30% are considered appropriate for Northstowe as this would address locally identified housing needs whilst not compromising the creation of a balanced community in an entirely new settlement. However, having regard to representations, the use of these proportions in villages would not address the high level of properties of 4 or more bedrooms that has taken place over the last 10 years or more (around half), or the high level of need for 1 and 2 bedroom properties identified in the Housing Need Survey (89% of all market dwellings). Therefore, the use of targets for bedroom sizes in the proportions 50%:25%:25% (CS26) are proposed for development in villages to help redress the balance in existing communities.</p>	<p>CS23 to be applied to major developments and CS26 for development in villages.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3375 - English Partnerships	Support	<p>This policy should allow for flexibility and take into account emerging guidance from revisions to PPG3 and circular 1/97 in securing housing mix.</p> <p>Each proposal should be considered on its own merits taking into account the socio-economic profile of existing and new communities, housing need assessments, development funding and phasing and market constraints.</p> <p>Market housing mix should consider the context of affordable housing aspirations and industry's ability to deliver the levels of housing. This is a potentially critical issue in determining market viability.</p>	<p>PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey. Despite a policy requiring a mix of housing types and sizes in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans, around half of all new dwellings provided by the market over the last 10 years or so have been of 4 or more bedrooms. Targets are therefore proposed to address this. It would be for a developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate on a specific site taking account of local factors. However, this would be an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need identified and the need to respond to the past trend.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3586 - GO-East	Support	<p>We accept the Council's preferred option as being the most appropriate based on a balanced view of housing need and what is reasonable and viable, as well as the important objective of achieving balanced and sustainable communities. A key point, however, is how this policy approach will be applied in practice, in particular how it will be applied to individual developments across the district.</p> <p>The final policy in the submission DPD should make clear how the approach to market housing mix applies to individual development proposals.</p>	<p>Support noted. The targets proposed in Preferred Option CS23 for bedroom sizes for 1&amp;2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedrooms in the proportions 40%:30%:30% are considered appropriate for Northstowe as this would address locally identified housing needs whilst not compromising the creation of a balanced community in an entirely new settlement. However, having regard to representations, the use of these proportions in villages would not address the high level of properties of 4 or more bedrooms that has taken place over the last 10 years or more (around half), or the high level of need for 1 and 2 bedroom properties identified in the Housing Need Survey (89% of all market dwellings). Therefore, the use of targets for bedroom sizes in the proportions 50%:25%:25% (CS26) are proposed for development in villages to help redress the balance in existing communities.</p>	<p>CS23 to be applied to major developments and CS26 for development in villages.</p>
5572 4573 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	<p>Support proposed option to increase the proportion of smaller dwellings in market housing developments to 40%. The policy for housing mix must be based on local circumstances. In broad terms CS23 seems about right.</p>	<p>Support noted. The targets proposed in Preferred Option CS23 for bedroom sizes for 1&amp;2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedrooms in the proportions 40%:30%:30% are considered appropriate for Northstowe as this would address locally identified housing needs whilst not compromising the creation of a balanced community in an entirely new settlement. However, having regard to representations, the use of these proportions in villages would not address the high level of properties of 4 or more bedrooms that has taken place over the last 10 years or more (around half), or the high level of need for 1 and 2 bedroom properties identified in the Housing Need Survey (89% of all market dwellings). Therefore, the use of targets for bedroom sizes in the proportions 50%:25%:25% (CS26) are proposed for development in villages to help redress the balance in existing communities.</p>	<p>CS23 to be applied to major developments and CS26 for development in villages.</p>

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*District Council's Assessment*

*Approach to Draft DPD*

---

**Decision on CS23 Market Housing Mix - Preferred Option**

CS23 is to be applied to major developments and CS26 for development in villages. This approach will be developed into a policy in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS24 Market Housing Mix - Alternative Option</i>				
4358 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The Council would not support this option	Noted. This option is not recommended to be pursued.	
4581 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The option is too prescriptive and does not follow advice in PPG3. There should not be any such option and it should be deleted.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

4865 - Taylor Woodrow  
Developments Ltd

Object

The imposition of 40% affordable housing target, as set out by the Structure Plan, will to a great extent influence the make up of housing mix. To impose an extra restriction, the type of mix for market housing, is an over zealous fetter on the housing industry to meet consumer demand.

PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey. Despite a policy requiring a mix of housing types and sizes in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans, around half of all new dwellings provided by the market over the last 10 years or so have been of 4 or more bedrooms. Targets are therefore proposed to address this. It would be for a developer to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate on a specific site taking account of local factors. However, this would be an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need identified and the need to respond to the past trend.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5752 - The English Courtyard Association 6349 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The Council should be careful to balance long term market demand based on real aspirations against snap shot assessments of minimum needs based on shorter term horizons and abstract analysis. The 2002 Housing Needs Survey does not comply with current ODPM guidance set out in the Housing Market Assessment Manual (February 2004). Limited evidence that inter district relationships and the wider Cambridge housing market area have been defined or examined in the survey report. Reference should be made to recommendations in the Cambridge Sub Region Key Worker Housing Study 2003. Of the options set out, CS24 is commended as a sensible compromise.	The Housing Needs Survey provides an appropriate assessment of housing need. It took account of both what people would like and what they expect in terms of the size of housing. This identified a need for 89% 1&2 bedroom properties. The targets proposed in Preferred Option CS23 for bedroom sizes for 1&2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedrooms in the proportions 40%:30%:30% are considered appropriate for Northstowe as this would address locally identified housing needs whilst not compromising the creation of a balanced community in an entirely new settlement. However, having regard to representations, the use of these proportions in villages would not address the high level of properties of 4 or more bedrooms that has taken place over the last 10 years or more (around half), or the high level of need for 1 and 2 bedroom properties identified in the Housing Need Survey (89% of all market dwellings). Therefore, the use of targets for bedroom sizes in the proportions 50%:25%:25% (CS26) are proposed for development in villages to help redress the balance in existing communities.	CS23 to be applied to major developments and CS26 for development in villages.
6386 - BT Plc 6389 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Specification of housing mix within a policy is not advocated by government guidance. This policy would lead to a mix of houses which is not required by the local community. Such restrictions also restrict the abilities of developers to respond to market demand, and would affect the viability of individual schemes, hence reducing the numbers of houses coming forward. At the very least the policy should be amended to state that it will seek to negotiate a mix of market housing subject to site considerations.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

4773 3227 3214 - McCann Homes Limited 4769 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd 5471 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 5646 - The Fairfield Partnership 6196 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 1667 - The Marshall Group 1665 - The Marshall Group	Object	The policy is far too prescriptive. Smaller household size should not automatically be equated with smaller homes. The development should be able to respond to market forces prevalent at the time. This policy unreasonably interferes with market forces. The LDF must endure until 2016 during which period housing needs will fluctuate and should be more flexible.	It is acknowledged that some smaller households would prefer to have a home larger than the minimum that they require. However, in an area of high house prices, affordability is also a relevant factor. The Housing Needs Survey took account of both what people would like and what they expect in identifying a need for 89% of all new properties to be 1 and 2 bedroom. Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more and targets are therefore now proposed to address identified needs. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes over the plan period are addressed.	
3657 - House Builders Federation 3480 - Royal Mail Group 6121 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6127 - Centex Strategic Land 6144 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	Concerned that the Council is attempting to prescribe housing mix with little regard to the character and size of individual sites. Housing mix needs to be determined via negotiation on a site by site basis taking account of local needs and market circumstances. The policy should be seen as a guideline rather than an inflexible standard. A restrictive policy could impact on deliverability of otherwise suitable sites.	The Council is responding to the failure of the market to provide an appropriate mix of house sizes over the last 10 years or more, with around half of all new properties being of 4 or more bedrooms, despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans. Targets are therefore now proposed to ensure that this situation is addressed. It would be for a developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate on a specific site taking account of local factors as an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need for smaller units identified and the need to respond to the past trend.	

---



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5933 - D H Barford & Co	Support	Houses have become more efficient and compact, and are smaller than older properties. Whilst number of small households has grown, many have aspirations to larger family accommodation. Although 46% of properties built between 1991 and 2001 were 4 bed +, this will have little impact on the overall housing stock. Account needs to be taken of affordable housing stock, which will primarily be smaller accommodation. It is unlikely to achieve balanced communities. There should be greater flexibility, we favour alternative option 1.	The targets proposed in Preferred Option CS23 for bedroom sizes for 1&2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedrooms in the proportions 40%:30%:30% are considered appropriate for Northstowe as this would address locally identified housing needs whilst not compromising the creation of a balanced community in an entirely new settlement. However, having regard to representations, the use of these proportions in villages would not address the high level of properties of 4 or more bedrooms that has taken place over the last 10 years or more (around half), or the high level of need for 1 and 2 bedroom properties identified in the Housing Need Survey (89% of all market dwellings). Therefore, the use of targets for bedroom sizes in the proportions 50%:25%:25% (CS26) are proposed for development in villages to help redress the balance in existing communities.	CS23 to be applied to major developments and CS26 for development in villages.

#### Decision on CS24 Market Housing Mix - Alternative Option

This option is rejected.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS25 Market Housing Mix - Alternative Option*

4359 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The Council would not support this option	Noted. This option is not recommended to be pursued.	
4582 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The option is too prescriptive and does not follow advice in PPG3. There should not be any such option and it should be deleted.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey.	

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

4866 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Object

The imposition of 40% affordable housing target, as set out by the Structure Plan, will to a great extent influence the make up of housing mix. To impose an extra restriction, the type of mix for market housing, is an over zealous fetter on the housing industry to meet consumer demand.

PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey. Despite a policy requiring a mix of housing types and sizes in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans, around half of all new dwellings provided by the market over the last 10 years or so have been of 4 or more bedrooms. Targets are therefore proposed to address this. It would be for a developer to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate on a specific site taking account of local factors. However, this would be an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need identified and the need to respond to the past trend.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5753 - The English Courtyard Association 6350 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The Council should be careful to balance long term market demand based on real aspirations against snap shot assessments of minimum needs based on shorter term horizons and abstract analysis. The 2002 Housing Needs Survey does not comply with current ODPM guidance set out in the Housing Market Assessment Manual (February 2004). Limited evidence that inter district relationships and the wider Cambridge housing market area have been defined or examined in the survey report. Reference should be made to recommendations in the Cambridge Sub Region Key Worker Housing Study 2003. Of the options set out, CS24 is commended as a sensible compromise.	The Housing Needs Survey provides an appropriate assessment of housing need. It took account of both what people would like and what they expect in terms of the size of housing. This identified a need for 89% 1&2 bedroom properties. The targets proposed in Preferred Option CS23 for bedroom sizes for 1&2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedrooms in the proportions 40%:30%:30% are considered appropriate for Northstowe as this would address locally identified housing needs whilst not compromising the creation of a balanced community in an entirely new settlement. However, having regard to representations, the use of these proportions in villages would not address the high level of properties of 4 or more bedrooms that has taken place over the last 10 years or more (around half), or the high level of need for 1 and 2 bedroom properties identified in the Housing Need Survey (89% of all market dwellings). Therefore, the use of targets for bedroom sizes in the proportions 50%:25%:25% (CS26) are proposed for development in villages to help redress the balance in existing communities.	CS23 to be applied to major developments and CS26 for development in villages.
6385 - BT Plc 6388 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Specification of housing mix within a policy is not advocated by government guidance. This policy would lead to a mix of houses which is not required by the local community. Such restrictions also restrict the abilities of developers to respond to market demand, and would affect the viability of individual schemes, hence reducing the numbers of houses coming forward. At the very least the policy should be amended to state that it will seek to negotiate a mix of market housing subject to site considerations.	The Council is responding to the failure of the market to provide an appropriate mix of house sizes over the last 10 years or more, with around half of all new properties being of 4 or more bedrooms, despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans. Targets are therefore now proposed to ensure that this situation is addressed. It would be for a developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate on a specific site taking account of local factors. However, this would be an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need identified and the need to respond to the past trend.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

4774 3236 2871 - Januarys 4770 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd 5472 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 5647 - The Fairfield Partnership 6197 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 6145 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. 1668 - The Marshall Group	Object	The policy is far too prescriptive. Smaller household size should not automatically be equated with smaller homes. The development should be able to respond to market forces prevalent at the time. This policy unreasonably interferes with market forces. The LDF must endure until 2016 during which period housing needs will fluctuate and should be more flexible.	It is acknowledged that some smaller households would prefer to have a home larger than the minimum that they require. However, in an area of high house prices, affordability is also a relevant factor. The Housing Needs Survey took account of both what people would like and what they expect in identifying a need for 89% of all new properties to be 1 and 2 bedroom. Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more and targets are therefore now proposed to address identified needs. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes over the plan period are addressed.	
3658 - House Builders Federation 3482 - Royal Mail Group 3216 - McCann Homes Limited 6122 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6128 - Centex Strategic Land	Object	Concerned that the Council is attempting to prescribe housing mix with little regard to the character and size of individual sites. Housing mix needs to be determined via negotiation on a site by site basis taking account of local needs and market circumstances. The policy should be seen as a guideline rather than an inflexible standard. A restrictive policy could impact on deliverability of otherwise suitable sites.	The Council is responding to the failure of the market to provide an appropriate mix of house sizes over the last 10 years or more, with around half of all new properties being of 4 or more bedrooms, despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans. Targets are therefore now proposed to ensure that this situation is addressed. It would be for a developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate on a specific site taking account of local factors as an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need for smaller units identified and the need to respond to the past trend.	

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

1707 - Cambridgeshire ACRE  
2519 - Addenbrooke's Hospital  
2878 - Steeple Morden Parish  
Council

Support

Support the need to provide a mix of market housing including a higher provision of smaller units, i.e. 1 and 2 bedroom units than has been provided in recent years because there is a severe shortage and housing needs surveys always show that the largest demand is for these smaller homes. If there was a larger share of smaller properties it may help stabilise or even reduce the high market prices for smaller properties. This in turn could help cut the housing register waiting list as more people could afford these properties. It would also help villages retain sustainable communities as a greater number of younger first time buyers could afford to live there.

Support noted. However, whilst targets with a higher proportion of smaller dwellings than the Preferred Option are now proposed, this option is considered to be too onerous and not a reasonable response to the issue.

---

**Decision on CS25 Market Housing Mix - Alternative Option**

This option is rejected.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS26 Market Housing Mix - Alternative Option*

2275 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Object	Gamlingay Parish Council (GPC) would prefer to split 1 and 2 bedroom houses at 25% and 25% each within this policy to ensure that developers address the balance in responding to the need for 1 bedroom accommodation in particular.	Support for the use of targets for bedroom sizes in the proportions 50%:25%:25% is noted. This would redress the balance in existing communities where there has been a high level of properties of 4 or more bedrooms that has taken place over the last 10 years or more. However it is not considered appropriate to subdivide the target for 1 and 2 bedroom properties. The demand for, and suitability of, 1 bedroom properties is limited given their inflexibility to changes in people's circumstances. Their provision as part of a smaller dwellings target allows greater flexibility.	
3659 - House Builders Federation 3483 - Royal Mail Group 3218 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	Concerned that the Council is attempting to prescribe housing mix with little regard to the character and size of individual sites. Housing mix needs to be determined via negotiation on a site by site basis taking account of local needs and market circumstances. The policy should be seen as a guideline rather than an inflexible standard. A restrictive policy could impact on deliverability of otherwise suitable sites.	The Council is responding to the failure of the market to provide an appropriate mix of house sizes over the last 10 years or more, with around half of all new properties being of 4 or more bedrooms, despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans. Targets are therefore now proposed to ensure that this situation is addressed. It would be for a developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate on a specific site taking account of local factors as an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need for smaller units identified and to respond to the past trend.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4583 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The option is too prescriptive and does not follow advice in PPG3. There should not be any such option and it should be deleted.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey.	



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

4868 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd

Object The imposition of 40% affordable housing target, as set out by the Structure Plan, will to a great extent influence the make up of housing mix. To impose an extra restriction, the type of mix for market housing, is an over zealous fetter on the housng industry to meet consumer demand.

PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey. Despite a policy requiring a mix of housing types and sizes in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans, around half of all new dwellings provided by the market over the last 10 years or so have been of 4 or more bedrooms. Targets are therefore proposed to address this. It would be for a developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority if an alternative approach was more appropriate on a specific site taking account of local factors. However, this would be an exception to the policy in view of the particularly high level of need identified and the need to respond to the past trend.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6383 - BT Plc 6384 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Specification of housing mix within a policy is not advocated by government guidance. This policy would lead to a mix of houses which is not required by the local community. Such restrictions also restrict the abilities of developers to respond to market demand, and would affect the viability of individual schemes, hence reducing the numbers of houses coming forward. At the very least the policy should be amended to state that it will seek to negotiate a mix of market housing subject to site considerations.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach proposed is therefore entirely consistent with government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey.	
5754 - The English Courtyard Association 6351 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The Council should be careful to balance long term market demand based on real aspirations against snap shot assessments of minimum needs based on shorter term horizons and abstract analysis. The 2002 Housing Needs Survey does not comply with current ODPM guidance set out in the Housing Market Assessment Manual (February 2004). Limited evidence that inter district relationships and the wider Cambridge housing market area have been defined or examined in the survey report. Reference should be made to recommendations in the Cambridge Sub Region Key Worker Housing Study 2003. Of the options set out, CS24 is commended as a sensible compromise.	The Housing Needs Survey provides an appropriate assessment of housing need. It took account of both what people would like and what they expect in terms of the size of housing. This identified a need for 89% 1&2 bedroom properties. The targets proposed in Preferred Option CS23 for bedroom sizes for 1&2 bedroom, 3 bedroom and 4 or more bedrooms in the proportions 40%:30%:30% are considered appropriate for Northstowe as this would address locally identified housing needs whilst not compromising the creation of a balanced community in an entirely new settlement. However, having regard to representations, the use of these proportions in villages would not address the high level of properties of 4 or more bedrooms that has taken place over the last 10 years or more (around half), or the high level of need for 1 and 2 bedroom properties identified in the Housing Need Survey (89% of all market dwellings). Therefore, the use of targets for bedroom sizes in the proportions 50%:25%:25% (CS26) are proposed for development in villages to help redress the balance in existing communities.	CS23 to be applied to major developments and CS26 for development in villages.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

4775 3248 2872 - Januarys 4771 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd 5473 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 5648 - The Fairfield Partnership 6198 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 1670 - The Marshall Group	Object	The policy is far too prescriptive. Smaller household size should not automatically be equated with smaller homes. The development should be able to respond to market forces prevalent at the time. This policy unreasonably interferes with market forces. The LDF must endure until 2016 during which period housing needs will fluctuate and should be more flexible.	It is acknowledged that some smaller households would prefer to have a home larger than the minimum that they require. However, in an area of high house prices, affordability is also a relevant factor. The Housing Needs Survey took account of both what people would like and what they expect in identifying a need for 89% of all new properties to be 1 and 2 bedroom. Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more and targets are therefore now proposed to address identified needs. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes over the plan period are addressed.	
1398 - Gamlingay Parish Council 4360 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3189 - CPRE Cambridgeshire	Support	Support this option because it provides the best way of implementing Structure Plan Policy SP9/1. Support the option for 50% 1 and 2 bedroom houses, although would prefer to split 1 and 2 bedroom houses at 25% and 25% each within` this policy to ensure that developers address the balance in responding to the need for 1 bedroom accommodation in particular.	Support for the use of targets for bedroom sizes in the proportions 50%:25%:25% is noted. This would redress the balance in existing communities where there has been a high level of properties of 4 or more bedrooms that has taken place over the last 10 years or more. However it is not considered appropriate to subdivide the target for 1 and 2 bedroom properties. The demand for, and suitability of, 1 bedroom properties is limited given their inflexibility to changes in people's circumstances. Their provision as part of a smaller dwellings target allows greater flexibility.	

---

#### **Decision on CS26 Market Housing Mix - Alternative Option**

CS23 is to be applied to major developments and CS26 for development in villages. This approach will be developed into a policy in the Core Strategy.

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD***CS27 Affordable Housing Target - Preferred Option*

2415 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Object	We support the aims behind this policy but consider the wording should allow for unique situations such as in Papworth Everard. The ongoing developments in this village are aimed at REDUCING the high proportion of Social Housing so as to create a more balanced, sustainable community. The last sentence in CS27 could be altered to "...whether there are other planning OR SOCIAL objectives which need to be given priority..."	The target for Affordable Housing in CS27 allows a degree of flexibility with "approximately 50% of the total dwellings proposed" and that the precise percentage would be determined having regard to a variety of factors. Papworth Everard is unusual in that it already has a high proportion of social rented housing. However, there are a number of other intermediate tenures that also come under the definition of affordable housing which would help create a more balanced community. This will also be taken into account in assessing the appropriate level of affordable housing in the village.
4252 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Para 5.25</p> <p>The Housing Needs survey has an inadequate coverage of the full needs of in-migrants; these reports concentrate on the housing needs of migrants who cannot afford the private market (sale or rent). The Structure Plan forecasts a need for net additional households of 20,000 in 17 years, or 1,176 a year. This is higher than the 1,087 apparently arising from the housing needs survey, which undercounts additional demand by migrants (net) for affordable private sector housing.</p>	The HNS is prepared in accordance with government guidance. Housing needs are assessed on the basis of survey and projections. The figure of 1087 dwellings per annum quoted in paragraph 5.25 is intended to relate to the total annual dwelling requirement in the District. If the Structure Plan average figure of 1176 dwellings per annum is used the affordable housing requirement as a population of all housing is reduced from 80.1% to 74.1%. However, this is still clearly well above the proposed 50% target. The correct figures will be used in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4253 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2524 - Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority 2521 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	There could be a breakdown of affordable housing and the proportion of key worker housing should be specified, yet be variable according to the location, with a higher proportion in closer proximity to public service facilities, such as a major hospital.	The term Affordable Housing is now used to encompass a wide variety of types and tenures of housing for a wide range of people with different personal circumstances, including housing for Key Workers. CS31 allows flexibility for the provision of a mix of affordable housing types, including Key Worker housing, according to the identified local need. Consideration will be given to the inclusion in the supporting text of the Core Strategy to an indicative breakdown of the affordable housing by tenure. However, the actual breakdown will be determined on a case by case basis having regard to local circumstances and the nature of need in the locality at the time of an application. The creation of a balanced community will also be a key consideration.	Consideration will be given to the inclusion in the supporting text of the Core Strategy to an indicative breakdown of the affordable housing by tenure.
3662 - House Builders Federation	Object	Affordable housing is only suitable on sites of a 'substantial scale' - 25 dwellings. The need for affordable housing should be based on a clear understanding of the area throughout the duration of the Plan.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify an Affordable Housing Target of 50% and the lower thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Approach CS30.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4869 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	The adopted Structure Plan does not endorse a 50% target for affordable housing. In addition, emerging Regional Spatial Strategy is likely to contain a figure between 30% and 40%. In such circumstances there can be no justification for the proposed figure in the Northstowe AAP.	The adopted Structure Plan requires "40% or more of the new housing in the Sub Region" to be affordable (Policy P9/1). It does not set an upper limit. The draft RSS14 published December 2004 says that "affordable housing must constitute at least 30% of housing supply in all local authority areas, though the overall aspiration is to secure at least 40% where housing stress warrants higher provision. Provision in excess of 30% will be defined and justified in local development documents and housing strategies, informed by local housing assessments". It also says that social rented housing should be at least "30% of overall provision" (policy SS13). In the Cambridge Sub Region section, paragraph 5.114 says that "40% or more" of new housing needs to be affordable. If this overall target of all new housing development is to be achieved, affordable housing provision on qualifying sites towards the heart of the Cambridge Sub Region where need is greatest will need to be higher than 40%. The Housing Needs Survey 2002 identifies a high level of housing need in South Cambs and recommends a target of 50%. The Preferred Approach towards affordable housing is therefore consistent with both the adopted Structure Plan and the emerging draft RSS14.	
3598 - GO-East 6117 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6123 - Centex Strategic Land 6149 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	No objection in principle to the provision of a material amount of affordable housing, in accordance with national advice. However, a realistic evidence of housing need and viability must underpin any such requirement to demonstrate that what is sought is realistic and reasonable. In this respect, object to the application of a standard affordable housing requirement to be applied to all development schemes.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify an Affordable Housing Target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30. The target for Affordable Housing in CS27 is flexible with "approximately 50% of the total dwellings proposed" and that the precise percentage would be determined having regard to a variety of factors.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2620 - FPDSavills 4929 - Cambridgeshire Recycling 5224 5267 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 5285 5286 5304 5330 5389 5399 5407 5415 5426 5435 3274 5366 5374 5925 - D H Barford & Co 5691 5724 (Land at 17 Whitcroft Road, Meldreth) 5737 2874 - Januarys 4715 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited 3221 - McCann Homes Limited 4887 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department 6363 5755 - The English Courtyard Association 5474 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 5176 - Laing Homes North Thames 5700 - Freshwater Estates Ltd. (Land at 41 Mill Lane, Sawston) 4586 - Bayer CropScience Ltd 1672 - The Marshall Group	Object	50% target is unreasonable and will lead to many schemes, especially small schemes, becoming unviable. It will therefore not achieve any significant improvement in affordability nor in the provision of affordable housing. The proviso that the precise percentage will be determined having regard to development costs is welcomed, but what is not clear is how the Council will determine such matters in a reasonable and objective fashion that does not undermine financial confidentiality issues. In conjunction with the affordable housing requirement, account needs to be taken of the housing mix policy which will achieve greater numbers of small more affordable private market properties that will contribute to meeting the housing need. Taking this into consideration we consider the preferred option target is too high and will not achieve a balanced community on new estates, we therefore support a lower target in line with the structure plan reference.	The South Cambridgeshire Housing Needs Survey 2002 identifies a high level of need in the District of 871 units per annum. It recommends a target of 50% Affordable Housing. Even at this level, not all need over the plan period will be met. The Cambridge Sub-Region Housing Needs Survey identified a similar but higher level of need. A key part of the development strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is about meeting local needs, and the Structure Plan requires at least 40% of all housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region to be affordable. Taking account of the higher level of need and higher house prices at the heart of the sub-region (i.e. Cambridge and South Cambs) and that some sites will not meet the thresholds for providing affordable housing provision, it is necessary for the target for South Cambs to be higher than 40%. The proposed 50% target is therefore considered to be reasonable.  It is also considered that this target would not prejudice the creation of balanced communities. The tenure mix will be key to this and whilst the LDF should not be prescriptive so that it can respond to local needs at the time of an application. Consideration will be given to providing an indicative breakdown of affordable housing by tenure in the supporting text. A study is being undertaken, led by Cambridgeshire Horizons, looking specifically at the factors involved in creating sustainable communities. The findings of this work will help inform the preparation of the LDF.  The target for small sites in smaller villages (under 3000 population) is established in the adopted Local Plan 2004 and is not proposed to be changed. In villages over 3000 population it is proposed to carry forward the threshold from the	

---

*Representations**Nature Representation Summary**District Council's Assessment**Approach to Draft DPD*

---

Local Plan of over 10 dwellings (see CS30). The increase in the target will therefore apply to larger sites in larger settlements. These are the more sustainable locations for development with better services and facilities, including public transport. Affordable housing provision should be maximised in these locations.

The process for assessing viability of individual development proposals and therefore the appropriate level of affordable housing and other obligations for a site is an issue that will need to be resolved. This will need to have regard to financial confidentiality whilst at the same time offering confidence to the local planning authority that the viability concerns are reasonable and genuine, if the level of affordable housing provision is to be varied. Cambridgeshire Horizons will play an important role in this for the major developments.

The implications of the Affordable Housing target taken alongside housing mix targets will need to be taken into account in determining planning applications. However, it is important to recognise that the need identified in the Housing Needs Survey for 1 and 2 bedroom properties was 89% of all market housing. Whilst not all new housing will be for first time buyers and some will be taken by existing home owners upgrading and therefore freeing smaller second hand properties, there is still a need to redress the imbalance that has occurred over the last 10 years or more with around half of all new properties in the district being 4 bedroom or larger. The plan, monitor and manage process will ensure that the effect of the Core Strategy policies on house sizes and balanced communities will be continually assessed and can be reviewed as and when necessary.

---



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6352 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Definitions within paragraph 5.24 are insufficiently clear.</p> <p>The category 'intermediate housing' needs to be properly defined so as to specify the various initiatives it might encompass. 'Special needs' housing and 'affordable' housing are not synonymous. It is inappropriate to simply include 'supported housing' under the general umbrella of 'affordable housing'. Further clarification is needed.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy will provide further detail on the definitions of affordable housing, including the types of intermediate housing. It is agreed that special needs housing and affordable housing are not synonymous. The report explained that the type of special needs housing covered under the term affordable housing is that which is subsidised and where the needs are addressed through the Supporting People initiative. There will be other forms of special needs housing which will be provided by the market eg sheltered housing. This will be clarified in the Core Strategy.</p>	
2504 - Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd 6071 - Network Rail	Object	<p>Whilst it is reasonable to have a District target, this should not be a blanket percentage applied inflexibly to all sites with no regard to viability or differing types of housing need. The provision of high levels of affordable housing in addition to other much needed community benefits could in certain circumstances render a development unviable, in which case the community would receive no benefit at all. The Policy should therefore recognise that a lower affordable housing contribution might be acceptable in certain circumstances.</p>	<p>Whilst the Affordable Housing Target applies district-wide, it is flexible with "approximately 50% of the total dwellings proposed" to be affordable. The precise percentage would be determined having regard to a variety of factors, including local issues and development costs.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6199 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 6631 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The Council's stated 'preference' for a 50% target nor the recommendations upon which this is based are properly justified.</p> <p>The Council's preferred option established in CS27 is not justified. The Council's rejection of CS28 and CS29 is not justified. An overall target of around 30% would prove more appropriate and realistic.</p>	<p>The South Cambridgeshire Housing Needs Survey 2002 identifies a high level of need in the District of 871 units per annum. It recommends a target of 50% Affordable Housing. Even at this level, not all need over the plan period will be met. The Cambridge Sub-Region Housing Needs Survey identified a similar but higher level of need. A key part of the development strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is about meeting local needs, and the Structure Plan requires at least 40% of all housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region to be affordable. Taking account of the higher level of need and higher house prices at the heart of the sub-region (i.e. Cambridge and South Cambs) and that some sites will not meet the thresholds for providing affordable housing provision, it is necessary for the target for South Cambs to be higher than 40%. The proposed 50% target is therefore considered to be reasonable.</p>	
6381 - BT Plc 6382 - Fairview New Homes	Object	<p>Object to 50% target for affordable housing in new developments. Circular 6/98 clearly states that policies for affordable housing should only set "indicative targets for specific sites", not a blanket quota.</p>	<p>This approach was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004. Whilst the Affordable Housing Target applies district-wide, it is flexible with "approximately 50% of the total dwellings proposed" to be affordable. The precise percentage would be determined having regard to a variety of factors, including local issues and development costs.</p>	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

3665 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 4361 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1708 - Cambridgeshire ACRE 2595 - East of England Development Agency 1942 - Cottenham Parish Council 2271 - Cambridge City Council 3255 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust 3377 - English Partnerships 3192 - CPRE Cambridgeshire 4559 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge 6182 - Executors of the Late John Sheldrick 5744 6176	Support	Will best implement Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan. This figure is recommended in the Joint Housing Needs Survey and also reflects the approach being taken by the City Council. There is a very real need for affordable housing in Cambridgeshire, 50% represents this need. The supply of homes, and affordable homes in particular, is a significant constraint on economic growth and competitiveness. It will make an essential contribution to creation of vibrant, socially well balanced sustainable communities.	Support noted.	
--	---------	---	----------------	--

---

**Decision on CS27 Affordable Housing Target - Preferred Option**

Develop the preferred option into a policy in the Core Strategy.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS28 Affordable Housing Target - Rejected Option*

3663 - House Builders Federation	Object	Affordable housing is only suitable on sites of a 'substantial scale' - 25 dwellings. The need for affordable housing should be based on a clear understanding of the area throughout the duration of the Plan.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify an Affordable Housing Target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30.	
4871 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 5475 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Object	It is submitted that the 40% affordable housing target is the appropriate figure to apply. This is a figure set by the adopted Structure Plan Policy P9/1, which the LDF is meant to be conforming with.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify an Affordable Housing Target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30. The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 seeks a target of "40% or more" for new housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Therefore a target of 40% is in accordance with the Structure Plan.	
6119 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6124 - Centex Strategic Land 6152 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	No objection in principle to the provision of a material amount of affordable housing, in accordance with national advice. However, a realistic evidence of housing need must underpin any such requirement. Similarly, the provision of necessary infrastructure as part of the site releases which could have significant financial costs for the developer must be taken into account when negotiating the affordable housing provision. In this respect, object to the application of a standard affordable housing requirement to be applied to all development schemes.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify an Affordable Housing Target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30. The Affordable Housing Target in CS27 is flexible with "approximately 50% of the total dwellings proposed", and that the precise percentage would be determined having regard to a variety of factors.	

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5922 - D H Barford & Co 2875 - Januarys 3224 - McCann Homes Limited 5180 - Laing Homes North Thames 5735 - Bayer CropScience Ltd 1673 - The Marshall Group	Object	In conjunction with the affordable housing requirement, account needs to be taken of the housing mix policy which will achieve greater numbers of small more affordable private market properties that will contribute to meeting the housing need. Taking this into consideration we consider the preferred option target is too high and will not achieve a balanced community on new estates, we therefore support a lower target in line with the structure plan reference. With the addition of other burdensome development costs, this threatens the very delivery of housing growth needed to sustain the sub-region.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify an Affordable Housing Target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30. It also identified a high level of need in market housing for smaller dwellings, in addition to the affordable housing need. The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 seeks a target of '40% or more' for new housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Not all new housing sites will meet the thresholds for securing affordable housing and need is particularly high towards the heart of the sub region. To have a realistic chance that the Structure Plan target will be achieved, a target above that level is required in South Cambs, where much of the new development is proposed, and much is already committed under policies with lower targets. The County Monitoring Report shows that current levels of affordable housing provision in the District is 14.2% of all dwellings. Whilst this is higher than the County average and is steadily increasing a significant increase is required to address the high levels of housing need identified. The target for Affordable Housing includes a degree of flexibility and the precise percentage on an individual site would be determined having regard to a variety of factors. It is not considered that the targets for affordable housing and for market housing mix would prejudice the creation of sustainable communities. A study is being undertaken, led by Cambridgeshire Horizons, looking specifically at the factors involved in creating sustainable communities. The findings of this work will help inform the preparation of the LDF.	
---	--------	---	---	--

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6353 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Definitions within paragraph 5.24 are insufficiently clear.</p> <p>The category 'intermediate housing' needs to be properly defined so as to specify the various initiatives it might encompass. 'Special needs' housing and 'affordable' housing are not synonymous. It is inappropriate to simply include 'supported housing' under the general umbrella of 'affordable housing'. Further clarification is needed.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy will provide further detail on the definitions of affordable housing, including the types of intermediate housing. It is agreed that special needs housing and affordable housing are not synonymous. The report explained that the type of special needs housing covered under the term affordable housing is that which is subsidised and where the needs are addressed through the Supporting People initiative. There will be other forms of special needs housing which will be provided by the market eg sheltered housing. This will be clarified in the Core Strategy.</p>	
6200 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 6632 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The Council's stated 'preference' for a 50% target nor the recommendations upon which this is based are properly justified.</p> <p>The Council's preferred option established in CS27 is not justified. The Council's rejection of CS28 and CS29 is not justified. An overall target of around 30% would prove more appropriate and realistic.</p>	<p>The South Cambridgeshire Housing Needs Survey 2002 identifies a high level of need in the District of 871 units per annum. It recommends a target of 50% Affordable Housing. Even at this level, not all need over the plan period will be met. The Cambridge Sub-Region Housing Needs Survey identified a similar but higher level of need. A key part of the development strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is about meeting local needs, and the Structure Plan requires at least 40% of all housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region to be affordable. Taking account of the higher level of need and higher house prices at the heart of the sub-region (i.e. Cambridge and South Cambs) and that some sites will not meet the thresholds for providing affordable housing provision, it is necessary for the target for South Cambs to be higher than 40%. The proposed 50% target is therefore considered to be reasonable.</p>	
2621 - FPDSavills	Support	<p>The 40% figure remains too high and threatens the delivery of new housing within the Government's designated growth area.</p>	<p>Support for the rejection of this option is noted. However, it is not accepted that a target of 40% is too high (see CS27).</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4362 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4884 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department	Support	This should be a rejected option	Support for the rejection noted.	
4563 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	We recognise that the level of housing need in south cambs would justify an affordable housing target of 50% of total dwellings proposed, but are concerned that any such target rigidly enforced could already affect development viability of some sites. The university would support a policy that seeks to achieve a min of 40% and up to 50% where achievable taking into account the particular costs of development, including planning obligations.	Support for the rejection of this option is noted. The Preferred option is flexible with approximately 50 of the total dwellings proposed to be affordable. The precise percentage would be determined having regard to a variety of factors, including local issues and development costs.	

#### **Decision on CS28 Affordable Housing Target - Rejected Option**

This option should continue to be rejected.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS29 Affordable Housing Target - Rejected Option*

2572 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	Key worker needs should be recognised in this section of the document.	The term Affordable Housing is now used to encompass a wide variety of types and tenures of housing for a wide range of people with different personal circumstances, including housing for 'Key Workers' as set out in paragraph 5.24.	
2627 - FPDSavills 5182 - Laing Homes North Thames 1674 - The Marshall Group	Object	Support the target of 30% as it may be achievable, taking into account development costs and will balance the need for the delivery of new dwellings and also the need to secure affordable housing. A critical issue to be addressed in terms of affordable housing is that of funding and its effects on delivery of housing numbers. The community to be created offers the opportunity better to respond to the housing and social needs of the area.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify an Affordable Housing Target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30. The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 seeks a target of "40% or more" for new housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Therefore a target of 30% is not in accordance with the Structure Plan.	
6120 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6125 - Centex Strategic Land 6153 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Object	No objection in principle to the provision of a material amount of affordable housing, in accordance with national advice. However, a realistic evidence of housing need must underpin any such requirement. Similarly, the provision of necessary infrastructure as part of the site releases which could have significant financial costs for the developer must be taken into account when negotiating the affordable housing provision. In this respect, object to the application of a standard affordable housing requirement to be applied to all development schemes.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify a target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30. The target for Affordable Housing in CS27 is flexible with "approximately 50% of the total dwellings proposed", and that the precise percentage would be determined having regard to a variety of factors.	

---



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6354 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Definitions within paragraph 5.24 are insufficiently clear.</p> <p>The category 'intermediate housing' needs to be properly defined so as to specify the various initiatives it might encompass. 'Special needs' housing and 'affordable' housing are not synonymous. It is inappropriate to simply include 'supported housing' under the general umbrella of 'affordable housing'. Further clarification is needed.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy will provide further detail on the definitions of affordable housing, including the types of intermediate housing. It is agreed that special needs housing and affordable housing are not synonymous. The report explained that the type of special needs housing covered under the term affordable housing is that which is subsidised and where the needs are addressed through the Supporting People initiative. There will be other forms of special needs housing which will be provided by the market eg sheltered housing. This will be clarified in the Core Strategy.</p>	
3226 - McCann Homes Limited 5736 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	<p>The 50% preferred option is not supported by the Structure Plan policy and is unsuitable for the villages. An unachievable target is more likely to lead to delay in the orderly release of housing sites that will undermine the objective of securing a reliable continuous supply of building land in the Cambridge growth area. Different, higher ratios could be considered for the greenfield urban expansion sites through the relevant Area Action Plan.</p>	<p>The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify an Affordable Housing Target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30. The adopted Local Plan already has a target of 50% for all villages under 3000 population. Then proposed 50% target is therefore only a change for larger villages and major developments. The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 seeks a target of '40% or more' for new housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Therefore a target of 50% is in accordance with the Structure Plan.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6633 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 6201 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The Council's stated 'preference' for a 50% target nor the recommendations upon which this is based are properly justified.</p> <p>The Council's preferred option established in CS27 is not justified. The Council's rejection of CS28 and CS29 is not justified. An overall target of around 30% would prove more appropriate and realistic.</p>	<p>The South Cambridgeshire Housing Needs Survey 2002 identifies a high level of need in the District of 871 units per annum. It recommends a target of 50% Affordable Housing. Even at this level, not all need over the plan period will be met. The Cambridge Sub-Region Housing Needs Survey identified a similar but higher level of need. A key part of the development strategy for the Cambridge Sub-Region is about meeting local needs, and the Structure Plan requires at least 40% of all housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region to be affordable. Taking account of the higher level of need and higher house prices at the heart of the sub-region (i.e. Cambridge and South Cambs) and that some sites will not meet the thresholds for providing affordable housing provision, it is necessary for the target for South Cambs to be higher than 40%. The proposed 50% target is therefore considered to be reasonable.</p>	
3664 - House Builders Federation	Support	<p>Affordable housing is only suitable on sites of a 'substantial scale' - 25 dwellings. The need for affordable housing should be based on a clear understanding of the area throughout the duration of the Plan.</p>	<p>Support noted. The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify a target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30. Addressing the particularly high level of housing need in the District is a key part of the development strategy and the use of thresholds below the 25 dwellings normal threshold and the 15 dwelling threshold in exception circumstances was demonstrated to the Inspector's satisfaction. The level of need has risen since that plan was prepared which further supports the carrying forward of the targets.</p>	
4363 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5574	Support	<p>This should be a rejected option. Affordable housing is one of the most important issues to be faced in the LDF. Affordable housing must have a high priority. The target should be informed by local housing needs surveys and a target of 30% from evidence is too low.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*District Council's Assessment*

*Approach to Draft DPD*

---

**Decision on CS29 Affordable Housing Target - Rejected Option**

The rejection of this option is confirmed.

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD***CS30 Affordable Housing Thresholds - Preferred Approach*

1400 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Object	<p>Affordable Housing Thresholds - Due to the size and nature of Gamlingay, it seems that being of &gt;3,000 population, but with limited development sites (due to deficiencies in infrastructure) identified in the Urban Capacity Study (60 Units from 6 sites) Gamlingay falls in a 'grey area' with regard to affordable housing Thresholds. Gamlingay Parish Council (GPC) strongly supports the much needed requirement of 50% new housing developments to be affordable housing, but it seems likely that when sites on Map 12 come forward they are likely to be at best 'borderline' with regard to the provisional thresholds set out in policy CS30. Other villages of similar size, and lack of infrastructure, must fall into this category.</p> <p>Although the Parish Council is broadly supportive of this policy of introducing thresholds, it is essential that the policy needs of the villages such as Gamlingay are addressed at this point in the LDF process, otherwise it is possible that no affordable housing will be secured in Gamlingay over the next plan period, which can not be acceptable in terms of sustainability.</p> <p>GPC recommends that the policy is reworded to ensure this loophole is closed, and developers are clear that on smaller sites affordable housing provision is a requirement. One way is to tie in numbers of units/thresholds with policies CS7 and CS52- 8 units.</p> <p>GPC strongly recommends that this policy be reviewed with regard to the needs of settlements of 3,000 + population.</p>	<p>This refers to sites identified in the UCS. The affordable housing thresholds proposed to be rolled forward from the adopted Local Plan are already as low as can be justified under current government policy. PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.</p>
---------------------------------	--------	---	--

---

<i><b>Representations</b></i>	<i><b>Nature</b></i>	<i><b>Representation Summary</b></i>	<i><b>District Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Approach to Draft DPD</b></i>
-------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------

---

2281 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Object	<p>Please see comments made on a) Urban Capacity Study Map 12 and b) CS7 Mix of housing. Affordable Housing Thresholds - Due to the size and nature of Gamlingay, it seems that being of &gt;3,000 population, but with limited development sites (due to deficiencies in infrastructure) identified in the Urban Capacity Study (60 Units from 6 sites) Gamlingay falls in a 'grey area' with regard to Affordable Housing Thresholds. Gamlingay Parish Council (GPC) strongly supports the much needed requirement of 50% new housing developments to be affordable housing, but it seems likely that when sites on Map 12 come forward they are likely to be at best 'borderline' with regard to the provisional thresholds set out in policy CS30. Other villages of similar size, and lack of infrastructure, must fall into this category.</p> <p>Although the Parish Council is broadly supportive of this policy of introducing thresholds, it is essential that the policy needs of the villages such as Gamlingay are addressed at this point in the LDF process, otherwise it is possible that no affordable housing will be secured in Gamlingay over the next plan period, which can not be acceptable in terms of sustainability. GPC recommends that the policy is reworded to ensure this loophole is closed, and developers are clear that on smaller sites affordable housing provision is a requirement. One way is to tie in numbers of units/thresholds with policies CS7 and CS52- 8 units.</p> <p>GPC strongly recommends that this policy be reviewed with regard to the needs of settlements of 3,000 + population.</p>	<p>This refers to sites identified in the UCS. The affordable housing thresholds proposed to be rolled forward from the adopted Local Plan are already as low as can be justified under current government policy. PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.</p>	
---------------------------------	--------	--	--	--

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3588 - GO-East	Object	The final policy in the submission DPD should include justification for the particular thresholds proposed; and consideration should be given to taking a comprehensive approach to thresholds by including a site-size threshold as well as one based on scheme size.	Noted. The policy justification will include thresholds. The issue of including a site size threshold will be considered in preparing the draft Core Strategy.	Ensure the policy justification includes thresholds. The issue of including a site size threshold will be considered in preparing the draft Core Strategy.
3670 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	The different thresholds for requiring affordable housing will tend to drive developments towards larger settlements, with no adequate control on sustainability issues, and will deprive such communities of much needed affordable housing. A consistent threshold of 2 dwellings should be applied across the District.	The Council is exploring ways of securing affordable housing on very small sites in villages, consistent with its adopted Local Plan policy. The aim is not to stifle development, but smaller villages are at the end of the sequence for sustainability and a key justification for new development is to meet local needs for affordable housing through 50% of sites of 2 or more dwellings and exceptions affordable housing sites. Thresholds of 2 dwellings in larger villages would not be consistent with current government guidance. PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.	
3666 - House Builders Federation 3243 - McCann Homes Limited 4587 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Affordable housing is only suitable on sites of a 'substantial scale' - the threshold should be 25 dwellings to accord with PPG3 guidance. The need for affordable housing should be based on a clear understanding of the area throughout the duration of the Plan. The thresholds are too low and may deter development.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify a target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30. Addressing the particularly high level of housing need in the District is a key part of the development strategy and the use of thresholds below the 25 dwellings normal threshold and the 15 dwelling threshold in exception circumstances was demonstrated to the Inspector's satisfaction. The level of need has risen since that plan was prepared which further supports the carrying forward of the targets.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2576 - Addenbrooke's Hospital 5756 - The English Courtyard Association	Object	Key worker needs should be recognised in this section of the document. Need to have considered the needs of sheltered housing as part of policy.	The term Affordable Housing is now used to encompass a wide variety of types and tenures of housing for a wide range of people with different personal circumstances, including housing for 'Key Workers' as set out in paragraph 5.24. CS31 allows flexibility for the provision of a mix of affordable housing types, including Key Worker housing and sheltered housing.	
5917 - D H Barford & Co 5693 5725 (Land at 17 Whitcroft Road, Meldreth) 5738 5701 - Freshwater Estates Ltd. (Land at 41 Mill Lane, Sawston)	Object	Thresholds should be the same in settlements of all sizes and equate to the thresholds set out in circular guidance.	The Council is exploring ways of securing affordable housing on very small sites in villages, consistent with its adopted Local Plan policy. The aim is not to stifle development, but smaller villages are at the end of the sequence for sustainability and a key justification for new development is to meet local needs for affordable housing through 50% of sites of 2 or more dwellings and exceptions affordable housing sites. Thresholds of 2 dwellings in larger villages would not be consistent with current government guidance. PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5225 5269 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 5287 5288 5305 5331 5390 5400 5408 5416 5427 5436 5367 5375 6364	Object	The two dwelling threshold for smaller settlements, coupled with the proposed target, will have the effect of making such developments unviable. This is therefore an unreasonable approach. If the Council's intention is to prevent any development in these settlements occurring other than single dwellings then it should say so.	The Council is exploring ways of securing affordable housing on very small sites in villages, consistent with its adopted Local Plan policy. The aim is not to stifle development, but smaller villages are at the end of the sequence for sustainability and a key justification for new development is to meet local needs for affordable housing through 50% of sites of 2 or more dwellings and exceptions affordable housing sites. The policy in the draft Core Strategy would roll forward the tests in the adopted Local Plan which requires up to 50% affordable housing and includes consideration of the particular costs associated with the development. The onus is therefore on the developer to demonstrate that it is not viable to provide or contribute towards affordable housing in connection with a specific development proposal. See also CS33.	
6379 - BT Plc 6380 - Fairview New Homes	Object	This option should reflect the guidance set out in PPG3, ie that affordable housing should not be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings.	Support noted. The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify a target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30. Addressing the particularly high level of housing need in the District is a key part of the development strategy and the use of thresholds below the 25 dwellings normal threshold and the 15 dwelling threshold in exception circumstances was demonstrated to the Inspector's satisfaction. The level of need has risen since that plan was prepared which further supports the carrying forward of the targets.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1393 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	GPC are aware that all sites identified in this exercise are of a similar size and are likely to yield approximately 8-13 units each. GPC has concerns over the implications this has with regard to other policies in the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies document, in particular policy CS30 - Affordable Housing Thresholds. The GPC strongly supports the need for affordable housing to continue to be provided in this village over the plan period, and states it would strongly recommend that 50% affordable housing proportion be applied to all remaining sites put forward in the Urban Capacity Study, and any future windfall sites.	This refers to sites identified in the UCS. The thresholds proposed to be rolled forward from the adopted Local Plan are already as low as can be justified under current government policy. PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.	

---

**Decision on CS30 Affordable Housing Thresholds - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS31 Affordable Housing Mix - Preferred Approach*

2574 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	Key worker needs should be recognised in this section of the document.	The term Affordable Housing is now used to encompass a wide variety of types and tenures of housing for a wide range of people with different personal circumstances, including housing for "Key Workers" as set out in paragraph 5.24. CS31 allows flexibility for the provision of a mix of affordable housing types, including Key Worker housing.	
3667 - House Builders Federation	Object	Affordable housing is only suitable on sites of a 'substantial scale' - 25 dwellings. The need for affordable housing should be based on a clear understanding of the area throughout the duration of the Plan.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify a target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30. Addressing the particularly high level of housing need in the District is a key part of the development strategy and the use of thresholds below the 25 dwellings normal threshold and the 15 dwelling threshold in exception circumstances was demonstrated to the Inspector's satisfaction. The level of need has risen since that plan was prepared which further supports the carrying forward of the targets.	
5757 - The English Courtyard Association	Object	Policy too prescriptive. Housing needs change over time and need to concentrate on elderly housing market provision. Let providers determine choice, mix and numbers.	The term Affordable Housing is now used to encompass a wide variety of types and tenures of housing for a wide range of people with different personal circumstances, including housing for the elderly. CS31 provides flexibility for the provision of a mix of housing tenures and sizes of affordable housing to meet the identified needs and priorities, and recognises that housing needs change over time, by requiring affordable housing mix to be determined at the time of the development rather than setting the mix in the Core Strategy itself. The Council would normally liaise with relevant RSLs in deciding appropriate mix on a particular site.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

3258 - McCann Homes Limited 4917 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department 6355 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The views of the RSL, as the housing provider and manager, should be paramount in considering the mix of affordable housing tenures. The tenure mix should not be prescribed in the policy but be flexible negotiated at the time of the planning application. Site, market and viability considerations are likely to be equally as important as "identified needs and funding priorities". Provision should be made for all types and tenures of affordable housing and it should be dispersed throughout the development as far as possible.	CS31 provides flexibility for the provision of a mix of housing tenures and sizes of affordable housing to meet the identified needs and priorities, and spread within the development. The delivery of affordable housing that meets local needs and can be delivered and managed in the longer term are key considerations. The Council would normally liaise with relevant RSLs in deciding appropriate mix on a particular site.	
4931 - Cambridgeshire Recycling 5226 5270 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 5289 5290 5306 5332 5391 5401 5409 5417 5428 5437 5368 5376 6365	Object	The approach is eminently reasonable and should be applied to the market elements of new developments, which need to respond to market demand and their own funding constraints.	PPG3 advises local planning authorities plan to meet the needs of the whole community and provide wider housing opportunity, choice and a better mix of size and type. PPG3 states that account should be had of housing needs in the area, the need to widen the range of housing opportunities to meet these needs and that policies should be set having taken into account such an assessment of need. Past trends have been for larger homes despite policies seeking a mix of house types. As a result, specific Market Housing Mix Options are proposed, suggesting a mix of house types to meet the identified needs (see CS23-CS26). However, the policy will provide a degree of flexibility where it can be demonstrated that local circumstances, whether relating to a particular settlement or site, indicate that a different mix would be better suited.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2880 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Support	We feel this is a good approach, provided that any commuted payment for off-site affordable dwellings remains earmarked for use within the parish.	The policy for the use of monies collected from a site is a matter for further consideration. The objective would normally be to use it for the provision of affordable housing on a site as close as possible to that from which it was generated. However, the suggested test may be too specific and could result in money not being spent if a suitable site capable of being delivered within the required timeframe cannot be found. It is important to ensure that commuted sums are not lost due to a requirement to be used very locally. The priority is to ensure delivery of affordable housing on the ground.	
4364 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6202 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 4588 - Bayer CropScience Ltd 1675 - The Marshall Group	Support	Agree that there is little certainty on funding for affordable housing (particularly from the Government through the Housing Corporation) and given these considerations there is most definitely a need for flexible and innovative approaches to affordable housing provision and tenure mix.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS31 Affordable Housing Mix - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS32 Affordable Housing Funding - Alternative Option</i>				
2630 - FPD Savills	Object	Subsidy issues relating to affordable housing are likely to remain uncertain. Any flexibility suggested by the Council must be supported. In this context, the reference to "considered" in CS32 should be objected to.	Support noted. In the light of further consideration and taking account of responses received, further flexibility is needed to address the funding issue surrounding affordable housing and Options CS32 and CS33 could both have a role in providing such flexibility in different circumstances. In cases of insurmountable subsidy issues, the approach to provide a lower proportion of built units on site could be appropriate district wide (CS32). With financial contributions for off-site provision, this will be most relevant for small sites and will not be appropriate for major developments, where on site provision is a key part of creating a sustainable communities.	CS32 will be pursued district wide. CS33 will be pursued, in particular for small sites. It will not apply to major development sites e.g. where there are AAP's.
3285	Object	The Objection is submitted to the wording of the Policy which is considered unduly prescriptive.  3.14 An OBJECTION is submitted to Policy CS32. The requirement upon a developer to show 'insurmountable subsidy issues' imposes an inappropriate level of burden. It is submitted that the word 'insurmountable' should be replaced with 'significant'.	Use of 'significant' in CS32 would open the policy up to abuse. This approach is intended only to be used in exceptional circumstances and not as an optional alternative to the normal provision of affordable housing. The word 'insurmountable' is more appropriate in this context.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3593 - GO-East 3380 - English Partnerships	Object	The Council should consider whether both policy options (CS32 & CS33) have merits, which might be applicable in different circumstances, rather than being mutually exclusive. Both options should be retained and considered on a site by site basis taking into account robust site development analysis and the ability or otherwise for affordable housing to be delivered by third parties on other sites in a realistic and agreed schedule/time frame. Policies should also have the ability to respond to potential future changes in funding mechanisms over the Plan period.	In the light of further consideration and taking account of responses received, further flexibility is needed in exceptional circumstances to address the current uncertainties over funding for affordable housing primarily from the Housing Corporation, and Options CS32 and CS33 could both have a role in providing such flexibility in different circumstances. In a case of insurmountable subsidy issues, the idea of a lower proportion of built units on site could be appropriate district wide (CS32). However, to ensure that this approach does not prejudice securing significant affordable housing provision in the light of high levels of need, further work is required in preparing the draft Core Strategy to identify an appropriate minimum requirement in such exceptional circumstances. It is unlikely that this would be below the Structure Plan minimum of 40%. With financial contributions for off-site provision, this will be most relevant for small sites where there are prejudicial issues over delivery and management and will not be appropriate for major developments, where on site provision is a key part of creating a sustainable community.	CS32 will be pursued district wide. CS33 will be pursued, in particular for small sites. It will not apply to major development sites e.g. where there are AAP's.
3668 - House Builders Federation	Object	Affordable housing is only suitable on sites of a 'substantial scale' - 25 dwellings. The need for affordable housing should be based on a clear understanding of the area throughout the duration of the Plan.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify a target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5515 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to CS32 which will mean that private housing will subsidise affordable housing. In the context of new settlements this option does not go far enough, owing to the need for the development to finance services and other infrastructure costs associated with the development of new settlements.	The intention behind Option CS32 is that the same financial contribution would be secured from the developer as providing for the full proportion of affordable housing. However, where other funding is not available at the time of implementation, e.g. from the Housing Corporation, the developer contribution would exceptionally be used in a different way to secure fewer built units on the ground rather than free serviced land as is normally the case.	
4365 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The Council would not support this option as the approach in CS31 provides sufficient flexibility.	This option would only come into play in the exceptional circumstances that there were insurmountable subsidy issues, to ensure that the affordable housing provision was not lost. Under normal circumstances it is envisaged that CS31 would be the appropriate policy to bring forward an appropriate mix of affordable housing.	
4932 - Cambridgeshire Recycling 5228 5271 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 5292 5293 5307 5333 5392 5402 5410 5418 5429 5438 5369 5378 6366	Object	Where there are insurmountable funding issues the developer should not be expected to provide affordable housing units either on or off-site. This is contrary in principle to current Government guidance in Circular 6/98 and PPG3.	The option refers to insurmountable subsidy issues which relates specifically to funding from other bodies, primarily the Housing Corporation. There is no intention to increase the financial obligation on the developer, but to consider alternative ways of using that developer contribution to secure affordable housing on the ground.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

2888 - Januarys 3260 - McCann Homes Limited 5477 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 6356 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 6203 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 4589 - Bayer CropScience Ltd 1679 - The Marshall Group	Support	This seems to be a pragmatic and sensible solution to a growing problem and should be carried through in policy in due course. Rightly identifies the current and longer term uncertainties regarding funding affordable housing via Section 106 sites. Both CS32 and CS33 are commended as possible solutions where there are insurmountable subsidy issues. The amount and consistency of funding to help secure affordable housing will be critical. Both options appear to create some latitude in how that might be achieved.	Support noted.	
--	---------	--	----------------	--

---

**Decision on CS32 Affordable Housing Funding - Alternative Option**

CS32 will be pursued district wide. CS33 will be pursued, in particular for small sites. It will not apply to major development sites e.g. where there are AAP's.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS33 Affordable Housing Funding - Alternative Option</i>				
3293	Object	<p>The Objection is submitted to the wording of the Policy which is considered unduly prescriptive.</p> <p>3.15 An OBJECTION is submitted to Policy CS33. The requirement upon a developer to show 'insurmountable subsidy issues' imposes an inappropriate level of burden. It is submitted that the word 'insurmountable' should be replaced with 'significant'.</p>	Use of 'significant' in CS32 would open the policy up to abuse, as it is a very ambiguous phrase, open to interpretation. On the other hand, use of the word 'insurmountable' is much clearer, in recognising that where there are problems that cannot be overcome, leeway will be applied.	
2285 - Gamlingay Parish Council 2881 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	The monies should be ring fenced to be spent within that village (or 3 mile radius).	The policy for the use of monies collected from a site is a matter for further consideration. The objective would normally be to use it for the provision of affordable housing on a site as close as possible to that from which it was generated. However, the suggested test may be too specific and could result in money not being spent if a suitable site were not found in a reasonable timeframe that met the distance test.	Develop approach to use of contributions for off-site provision of affordable housing.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2633 - FPDSavills 3594 - GO-East 3382 - English Partnerships	Object	The Council should consider whether both policy options (CS32 & CS33) have merits, which might be applicable in different circumstances, rather than being mutually exclusive. Both options should be retained and considered on a site by site basis taking into account robust site development analysis and the ability or otherwise for affordable housing to be delivered by third parties on other sites in a realistic and agreed schedule/time frame. Policies should also have the ability to respond to potential future changes in funding mechanisms over the Plan period.	In the light of further consideration and taking account of responses received, further flexibility is needed in exceptional circumstances to address the current uncertainties over funding for affordable housing primarily from the Housing Corporation, and Options CS32 and CS33 could both have a role in providing such flexibility in different circumstances. In a case of insurmountable subsidy issues, the idea of a lower proportion of built units on site could be appropriate district wide (CS32). However, to ensure that this approach does not prejudice securing significant affordable housing provision in the light of high levels of need, further work is required in preparing the draft Core Strategy to identify an appropriate minimum requirement in such exceptional circumstances. It is unlikely that this would be below the Structure Plan minimum of 40%. With financial contributions for off-site provision, this will be most relevant for small sites where there are concerns over delivery and management and will not be appropriate for major developments, where on site provision is a key part of creating a sustainable community.	CS32 will be pursued district wide. CS33 will be pursued, in particular for small sites. It will not apply to major development sites e.g. where there are AAP's.
3669 - House Builders Federation	Object	Affordable housing is only suitable on sites of a 'substantial scale' - 25 dwellings. The need for affordable housing should be based on a clear understanding of the area throughout the duration of the Plan.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a level of need sufficient to justify a target of 50% and thresholds used in Local Plan 2004, as proposed as the Preferred Option CS30.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4367 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The Council would not support this option as the approach in CS31 provides sufficient flexibility.	Whilst the concerns of the County Council are understood, and to some extent shared by the District Council in the context of the high level of housing need in the Cambridge area, it is considered that further flexibility is needed in exceptional circumstances to address the current uncertainties over funding for affordable housing primarily from the Housing Corporation, and Options CS32 and CS33 could both have a role in providing such flexibility in different circumstances. In a case of insurmountable subsidy issues, the idea of a lower proportion of built units on site could be appropriate district wide (CS32). However, to ensure that this approach does not prejudice securing significant affordable housing provision in the light of high levels of need, further work is required in preparing the draft Core Strategy to identify an appropriate minimum requirement in such exceptional circumstances. It is unlikely that this would be below the Structure Plan minimum of 40%.	
4590 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	These ideas are a proper response to the problem of lack of subsidy.	Noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6204 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The recognition of the difficulties faced in the provision of affordable housing in CS33 is welcomed.</p> <p>However, fundamentally, Gallagher does not consider that off site provision can address the difficulties that would result from the setting of affordability targets too high or through the lack of funding to support affordable housing provision.</p> <p>To this extent CS33 is not likely to result in the resolution of those difficulties. Rather it is fundamentally more important that the affordable housing targets are set at realistic levels and that within discussions aimed at achieving those targets that proper account is taken of site specific issues and the availability of funding.</p>	<p>CS33 will be more appropriate for small sites where there are also issues over delivery and management of a small number of affordable houses. It will not be appropriate for major sites where provision on-site of affordable housing (social and key worker) as a key part of creating a sustainable community.</p>	
1401 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	<p>Gamlingay Parish Council (GPC) supports off site payments on exceptionally small sites (2 or less) within villages. GPC is supportive, with the following provisos:-</p> <p>a) if the monies are ring fenced to be spent within that village (or 3 mile radius).</p> <p>b) monies are held by the Parish Council until a suitable site/opportunity comes forward.</p> <p>This method would work in a similar way to the identified method in para.8.6 on page 58 (policy CS52- Open Space and New Developments-PA)</p>	<p>Support noted. The policy for the use of monies collected from a site is a matter for further consideration. The objective would normally be to use it for the provision of affordable housing on a site as close as possible to that from which it was generated. However, developer contributions can only be held for a limited period and the priority must be to ensure they are spent on a scheme that is capable of being deferred in that timeframe. It would not be appropriate for the Parish Council to hold such monies. The delivery of affordable housing is a specialist area and needs to be coordinated by the District Council.</p>	<p>Develop approach to use of contributions for off-site provision of affordable housing.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1711 - Cambridgeshire ACRE 2889 - Januarys 5478 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 6357 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 1683 - The Marshall Group	Support	This would ensure that all developers contribute a similar amount towards affordable housing and even if the financial help given is used in a different location it is still helping to increase the amount of affordable housing available. This option introduces more flexibility into the affordable housing issue. This seems to be a pragmatic and sensible solution to a growing problem. The amount and consistency of funding to help secure affordable housing will be critical.	Support noted.	

---

**Decision on CS33 Affordable Housing Funding - Alternative Option**

CS32 will be pursued district wide. CS33 will be pursued, in particular for small sites. It will not apply to major development sites e.g. where there are AAP's.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS34 Meeting Housing Needs for Employment Development - Alternative Option*

1684 - The Marshall Group	Object	<p>Marshall objects to the preferred approach set out. Whilst Marshall itself is a mature company, much of the recent success around Cambridge has been achieved by small new companies, many of whom find achieving funding for the business very challenging. The whole thrust of such businesses has to be at funding the business itself, whether it be premises, staff, research costs or the like. For such businesses to be challenged to find additional funding to support housing, will inhibit the spawning and success of these small new companies.</p>	<p>The principle is to seek contributions from employment development that is likely to have an impact on the demand for affordable housing in the Cambridge area. This is established in the Structure Plan. It is considered that it would be not be reasonable to require this from very small companies, particularly new companies. The principle is to seek contributions from employers where their business will generate a material impact on demand for affordable housing, a key element of the high housing requirements in the Cambridge area. Clarification will be provided in the Core Strategy and a Supplementary Planning Document will be prepared to provide further guidance on how the need to make contributions will be assessed.</p>	
2605 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	<p>This policy and the supporting text should make clear that some types of employment - such as health care provision - should not be required to make financial or other provision for affordable housing or other community infrastructure requirements, as these facilities are already part of the community's social infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Core Strategy will define the types of employment development that would be required to make contributions towards affordable housing. It is intended that this would include hospitals (Use Class C2) as a major employer, particularly of key workers. It would not include other health care uses. Addenbrooke's generates a need for a minimum of 247 units per annum, which is 57% of all key worker needs in the Cambridge Sub Region (Source: Cambridge Sub Region Key Worker Housing Research: August 2003). A common approach to this issue is required for the Cambridge Area and this approach would also be consistent with the City Local Plan: Redeposit Draft 2004. If key worker employers can demonstrate that they are providing or contributing towards the provision of key worker housing for their staff, this would satisfy the requirement, where that employment development is to be occupied by that employer.</p>	

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

2539 - Norfolk, Suffolk and  
Cambridgeshire Strategic Health  
Authority  
3263 - South Cambridgeshire  
Primary Care Trust

Object

The Core Strategy will define the types of employment development that would be required to make contributions towards affordable housing. It is intended that this would include hospitals (Use Class C2) as a major employer, particularly of key workers. It would not include other health care uses.

3486 - Royal Mail Group

Object

It is the Council's statutory duty to identify sufficient housing land to meet the needs of its population over the period of the plan. This should include forecasts of housing need on the basis of employment development, both existing and proposed.

The market will deliver housing including affordable housing for all tenures- -social rented, shared ownership, or key worker.

The requirement to provide affordable housing or financial contributions from employment for this could make such development unviable. The need to provide such an obligation does not sit comfortably with the requirements of circular 1/97 Planning Obligations. This approach could throttle new employment development, especially SMEs. The Policy should be deleted.

The principle of employment development contributing towards affordable housing provision is established in the Structure Plan. This is in recognised of that it is the employment success of the Sub Region that is driving the high level of housing requirement, of which a key element is affordable housing.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6205 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher is extremely concerned that a requirement for affordable housing in association with employment development could imply a requirement for affordable housing in strategic mixed use developments which is greater than the target for affordable housing in those developments as set out in the forthcoming LDF and object to any such expectation. This is in urgent need of clarification.</p> <p>A clear distinction should be drawn between employment developments per se and strategic developments (such as Northstowe) which will include employment elements in creating new sustainable communities. In this circumstance the provision for employment (including in the new town) should not impose a further financial requirement on the development.</p>	<p>The employment contributions to affordable housing would normally be financial contributions used to help bring forward affordable housing secured on sites in the area. They would not require more than 50% affordable housing to be provided in a mixed development. The contribution would go to a central source to help fund affordable elsewhere in the development or the District as appropriate. In the case of Northstowe, this is most likely to be at the new town. It would be for a developer to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Council that a development could not support the employment contribution. This should be done on a site-by-site basis. The principle of employment development contributing to affordable housing is established in the Structure Plan.</p>	
5916 - D H Barford & Co 5839 - Merton College	Object	<p>The statement is vague and ambiguous. What criteria will the council use to decide whether development is 'likely to have an impact on demand for affordable housing'? Policy should take into account economic considerations for the employment development. The demand could make development unviable, and be prejudicial to the local economy and even nationally important development. Should be addressed in DPD not SPD.</p>	<p>The principle is to seek contributions from employment development that is likely to have an impact on the demand for affordable housing in the Cambridge area. This is established in the Structure Plan. It is considered that it would be not be reasonable to require this from very small companies, particularly new companies. The principle is to seek contributions from employers where their business will generate a material impact on demand for affordable housing, a key element of the high housing requirements in the Cambridge area. Clarification will be provided in the Core Strategy and a Supplementary Planning Document will be prepared to provide further guidance on how the need to make contributions will be assessed.</p>	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3851 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford) 5513 - The Fairfield Partnership 6377 - BT Plc 6378 - Fairview New Homes 4591 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Object to the principle of providing affordable housing in association with employment development. It is unreasonable and could hinder employment development. It is important that contributions sought as a result of a policy are necessary and directly associated to the proposed development. The rationale for this option is not clear and it would be counterproductive if employment development is held back due to lower levels of financial viability.	The principle of employment development contributing towards affordable housing provision is established in the Structure Plan. This is in recognised of that it is the employment success of the Sub Region that is driving the high level of housing requirement, of which a key element is affordable housing.	
2288 - Gamlingay Parish Council 1402 - Gamlingay Parish Council 4368 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2273 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Support option CS34 because it is consistent with the provisions in the Structure Plan and the approach being taken by the City Council in its Local Plan.	Support noted.	

**Decision on CS34 Meeting Housing Needs for Employment Development - Alternative Option**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

## *Chapter 6. Economy & Tourism*

### *CS35 Economy & Tourism Objectives - Preferred Approach*

4257 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	The preferred approach could beneficially identify the clusters located within South Cambridgeshire. The policy should identify - What industries are to be monitored - What areas are to be monitored - How commuting is to be measured 4th bullet "the appropriate expansion of existing forms where appropriate" needs more careful wording to be meaningful. 5th bullet Reference to workplace travel plans is needed. Also recognition of the role of tele-communications and IT facilities in reducing the need to travel.	The clusters present in South Cambs can be included in Reasoned Justification, reflecting those listed in Structure Plan Policy P9/6. A monitoring strategy must be included in LDF, which will include monitoring of employment land supply.  Appropriate expansion of existing firms will be given further detail through employment policies, as opposed to the objectives for the chapter.  Workplace travel plans are most appropriately dealt with in the Travel Chapter. The potential role of IT in reducing need to travel is acknowledged.	Include list of clusters in reasoned justification.
806 - East of England Tourist Board	Object	Support the proposed Tourism Objective, however change wording in paragraph 6.5 to: "To support the growth of the tourism industry whilst...".	Agree that the District Council should support appropriate growth of the tourism industry.	Amend objective 'To support the growth of the tourism industry of South Cambridgeshire, whilst ensuring that new facilities and accommodation do not have an adverse impact on the built and natural environment.'
2599 - East of England Development Agency	Object	EEDA supports the objectives outlined within the policy. However, EEDA considers that the supporting text to policy CS35 would benefit from the acknowledgement of significant key sector and cluster development within the district. Clusters and sectors should be positively planned for including a suitable supply of employment land to meet the qualitative and quantitative needs of businesses. Detailed employment land availability appraisals are likely to be required.	The clusters present in South Cambs can be included in Reasoned Justification, reflecting those listed in Structure Plan Policy P9/6. The Area Action Plans offer particular opportunities to support clusters through provision of Strategic employment sites.	Include list of clusters in reasoned justification.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4255 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4254 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Growth figures need updating.	In drafting the submission LDF, officers will seek the most up to date information, including from the County Council Research Group.	
4012 - Bidwells Property Consultants	Object	The Plan does not address clusters. In particular, Great Abington. The employment policies are confused and confusing.	The plan will include policies for supporting clusters, as required by the Structure Plan. In particular clusters will be supported at the Strategic Employment sites. The LDF will endeavour to include clear employment policies.	
2891 - Januarys	Object	Support general thrust, but would wish to see greater support being offered for establishment of new overnight tourist accommodation, including where appropriate, in key locations on major transport routes.	Policies relating to overnight tourist accommodation will be required in the LDF. They will seek to locate tourist facilities in sustainable locations, in line with the objectives of the plan.	Prepare appropriate policies for overnight tourist accommodation in the LDF.
4431 - Imperial War Museum	Object	The document contains no policies on tourism which underplays the importance of the issue to the District. Duxford IWM is the largest paid visitor attraction in the East of England and is the single most important sub-regional tourism facility outside Cambridge City and there we are seeking re-instatement of a policy similar to RT9 from the adopted Local Plan. It is particularly important to note that the airfield is treated as a special case as a major tourist/recreation facility. The policy as drafted contains a number of criteria to which the IWM adhere and in particular it includes a designated policy area which covers the built area of the museum.	The policy on Duxford IWM was agreed through the Local Plan review, taking account of its national significance. It should be included in the submission LDF.	Carry forward Policy RT9 from Local Plan 2004 into the submission LDF.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4746 - Engineering and Design Plastics Ltd (Land South of Yarrow Road, Cherry Hinton)	Object	It is urged that the LDF reject such reliance on Northstowe, Cambridge Airport and the 'large developments' for all future employment floor space requirements and focuses on other fringe areas (particularly the site south of Yarrow Road) to meet demand in a more certain and sustainable manner. This will require attention to Green Belt boundaries.	Northstowe and the Urban extensions are not relied upon for all future employment floorspace. However, as Strategic Employment Locations identified in the Structure Plan, they play a major role in the employment strategy. They must therefore remain the focus of additional land allocations, given existing commitments in the District. Site south of Yarrow Road Cherry Hinton is in the Green Belt, and a preferred option is to keep the green belt boundaries unchanged outside area action plans.	
2754 1493 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	Need to develop rights of way networks, bridleways and equestrian tourism.	Rights of Way are dealt with elsewhere in the LDF. Policies are needed to be supportive of farm diversification, and reuse of rural buildings, for tourism, which could potentially include equestrian tourism.	Develop policies to support farm diversification, and use of redundant rural buildings for tourism.
5575 3488 - Royal Mail Group 4553 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge 4017 - Imperial War Museum 6457 - The Countryside Agency 4592 - Bayer CropScience Ltd 1685 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for the objectives.	Support noted.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

6206 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	<p>Gallagher welcome the fundamental principles of the policy, to sustain the economic growth of the Cambridge Sub-region and to reduce commuting distances. With the advent of planned communities and the new town at Northstowe, it is now more important to pay particular attention to the need for a range of employment opportunities in those developments if those communities are to be inclusive.</p> <p>To this end Gallagher propose an additional bullet point that reads something like; "to provide within Northstowe and the planned urban extensions, a range of employment opportunities to cater for a diverse cross section of the population".</p>	Support noted. Objectives for employment relating the urban extensions and Northstowe should be part of the Area Action Plans.	
5971 - Chancerygate Asset Management Ltd. (Charlton & Duffields land at Cambridge Research Park)	Support	<p>Support in terms of what CS35 seeks to achieve in supporting the Cambridge area's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, higher education and research, especially through the development and expansion of clusters. Objective of utilising Previously developed land in this context is also supported. Our clients have interest in land at Landbeach adjacent to Cambridge Research Park, the employment area boundaries should be extended to include this land. This would facilitate recycling of this historically identified site.</p>	General support for objectives noted. The site specific issue is dealt with under the Major Employment Site option.	

---

#### **Decision on CS35 Economy & Tourism Objectives - Preferred Approach**

Use the preferred approach in developing the core strategy, subject to amendments. Also include policy on Duxfors Imperial War Museum in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS36 Selective Management of Employment - Preferred Option</i>				
3492 - Royal Mail Group	Comment	Paragraph 6.6 should be amended to include the 'provision of new or extended facilities for statutory underatkers as nessessary for them to fulfil their statutory obligations.'	Such development is recognised in Structure Plan policy P9/7 that includes 'the provision of office or other development providing an essential service for Cambridge as a local or sub-regional centre.' Policy in the submission LDF will reflect this.	
2602 - East of England Development Agency	Object	EEDA fully supports the principle of this policy as a positive approach appropriate to areas of strong market demand. However, the policy should contain a reference to monitoring to ensure that it continues to be an appropriate response to an area of high economic buoyancy.	Support noted. The submission LDF will include a monitoring strategy, to guide the LDF Annual Monitoring Report.	Include appropriate economic indicators in the monitoring strategy.
4258 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 6.6  Who is to identify what 'large-scale high tech firms which could equally well locate in other areas of the county'? Everything up to this point accepts all hi-tech growth, not a subset	The text reflects P/9/7 of the Structure Plan requiring development to demonstrate a clear need to be located in the area in order to contribute to the continuing success of the sub-region as a centre of high technology and research. If development can locate equally well elsewhere in the county then it would not be permitted. This test should apply to all types of industry, including High-tech.	
6207 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Further to the comments expressed in relation to CS35 Gallagher is concerned that the application of these policies within the planned developments of the new town and the urban extensions should be considered very carefully and applied with some flexibility. This issue has not been addressed previously.  In particular, if those communities are to be inclusive and are not to appeal only to those working in the higher skilled cluster sectors then a range of employment opportunities must be provided in the communities. These will include part time jobs that are locally available. In setting out policies for selective management of employment this issue should be addressed.	While the objective is to develop a mixed economy with a range of employment, the selective management policy will still apply. This approach is developed further in the Area Action Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5915 - D H Barford & Co	Object	It must be recognised that employment development away from the immediate area of Cambridge will be influenced by other market towns and issues such as accessibility and road connections. In some locations the link to Cambridge is not particularly good and Cambridge based business will not find development in these settlements attractive. e.g. Gamlingay.	While policies should be developed to support the economy of villages, it is not the intention to allow unsustainable large-scale employment development in rural areas on the edge of the District; therefore removal of such areas from the selective management policy would be inappropriate.	
1892 - Saunders Boston Ltd (Land at Weston Colville Hall, Church End, Weston Colville)	Support	<p>We propose that Hall Farm Weston Colville is suitable for development as an incubator centre for emerging companies in the Biotech industry.</p> <p>We support the Council's policy of Selective Management of Employment Development, to discriminate in favour of uses that have an essential need for a Cambridge location. This includes high technology, research and development industries, recognising the importance of the area, and in particular the clusters, to the regional and national economy.</p> <p>We support policy CS36 Selective Management of Employment (The area of selective management of employment should cover the whole District of South Cambridgeshire).</p>	Support Noted. Strategic Employment Locations identified in the Structure Plan play a major role in the employment strategy. They must therefore remain the focus of additional land allocations, given existing commitments in the District. It would be inappropriate to allocate employment land at Weston Colville.	
4370 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4593 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS36 Selective Management of Employment - Preferred Option**

Use the preferred option in developing the core strategy. The area of the selective management policy will cover the whole of south Cambridgeshire.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS37 Selective Management of Employment - Rejected Option*

5913 - D H Barford & Co 5833 - Merton College 5829 - Merton College	Object	Employment development away from Cambridge is influenced by market towns and other issues. In some locations e.g. Gamlingay, links to Cambridge are not good and Cambridge based businesses will not find the location attractive.	While policies should be developed to support the economy of villages, it is not the intension to allow unsustainable large-scale employment development in rural areas on the edge of the District; therefore removal of such areas from the selective management policy would be inappropriate.	
4371 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The rejection of the option is supported.	Support for rejection of this option noted.	

**Decision on CS37 Selective Management of Employment - Rejected Option**

This option is rejected. The area of the selective management policy will cover the whole of South Cambridgeshire.



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS38 Density of Employment Allocations - Preferred Option*

2606 - East of England Development Agency	Object	EEDA supports the need for employment allocations as a key element in achieving a balance of housing and jobs. However, in terms of the density of employment allocations, EEDA considers that evidence needs to be demonstrated to show that sites will actually be delivered at higher densities via, for example, the development of Master Plans before EEDA could endorse an approach which reduced the level of employment land required by the Structure Plan. Without evidence, land should be allocated with phasing and a monitoring safeguard.	Agree that policies would be required to ensure sufficient density is achieved. Success of these policies also needs to be monitored.	
2286 - Cambridge City Council	Object	<p>Agree employment density likely to be higher than before and there may be a case for expressing allocations as jobs rather than hectareage, but difficult to monitor/control.</p> <p>The Structure Plan EiP, would have considered that employment density may be higher than before.</p> <p>Unnecessary to allocate all 50ha in Northstowe/Cambridge East. Other locations eg CNF East, NW Cambridge or larger Villages. Could allow residual for smaller windfall sites, as allowed under option CS42. Important that 50ha of employment be allowed to 2016, if the demand. Plan, monitor and manage and application of the <input type="checkbox"/> Selective management <input type="checkbox"/> policy will help manage economy.</p>	<p>Agree that land supply must be carefully monitored to ensure land supply targets are adhered to, and sufficient jobs are provided.</p> <p>Land could be accommodated at any of the strategic employment locations in the District. Also agree that the full amount of employment land should be provided up to 2016 if demand exists.</p>	Refer to all Strategic Employment locations when considering employment land supply. If 50 ha. of land is not required or provided at strategic employment locations, it should be used to accommodate additional windfall development.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2811 - Carisbrooke Swavesey General Partners	Object	<p>Widen the option to include existing Major Employment Areas where some 'densification' could occur bringing efficiencies in the use of land.</p> <p>At Buckingway Business Park at Swavesey, there is potential for further development over and above the floorspace for which consent has been granted.</p> <p>This could also be achieved by allocating some additional land on the periphery of this and other Major Employment Areas, thus adding to the immediate 'cluster'.</p>	<p>Major employment areas are dealt with elsewhere in the plan. Any infill or redevelopment on these sites would need to be considered against all the policies of the development plan.</p> <p>Additional employment land allocation outside strategic sites is not required.</p>	
4551 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	<p>Precise wording of the Structure Plan refers to 'The new mixed developments on the fringe of Cambridge' and not, as referred to in para 6.8 and preferred option CS38, just Northstowe and Cambridge East. Both the paragraph and policy should reflect the intentions and wording of the approved structure plan and recognise that north west cambridge is designated as a strategic employment location.</p>	Agree.	Refer to all Strategic Employment locations when considering employment land supply.
5511 - The Fairfield Partnership 6208 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Should maximise employment provision at Northstowe. Needed to support clusters. Council cannot guarantee higher densities will be achieved.</p>	<p>The exact densities will need to be established through the Area Action Plan and master planning of Northstowe. The most important consideration is the provision of sufficient numbers of jobs in the new town, as opposed to the amount of land.</p>	
1687 - The Marshall Group	Support	<p>Marshall supports CS38 and objects to CS39. At Cambridge East, the current attitude towards the provision of employment is to seek an emphasis on a mixed use urban quarter. Whilst there may be some areas of exclusive employment use, the intended emphasis is on mixed use where higher employment density than on traditional business parks, can be achieved. Policy CS38 is to be preferred.</p>	Support for higher employment densities noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4372 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The Council support this approach, albeit with the proviso that:- a) there is a firm requirement for the higher density allocations, to ensure sufficient employment; and b) the requirement for the strategic waste management facility at Northstowe will be accommodated.	Support noted. Agree that policies would be required to ensure sufficient density is achieved to provide the required numbers of jobs.  The requirement for a major waste management facility at Northstowe is included in the Waste Local Plan 2003. The master planning process will need to take account of this.	

#### **Decision on CS38 Density of Employment Allocations - Preferred Option**

The Preferred option should be carried forward into LDF policy. However, policies should refer to all strategic employment allocations as opposed to just Northstowe and Cambridge East. Higher density employment areas should be provided at the strategic employment sites. The focus of the area action plans should be to provide sufficient numbers of jobs as opposed to land. However, full provision of the 50 ha. can be made across the district, with the remaining land utilised for windfalls if not required at the strategic sites.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

*CS39 Density of Employment Allocations - Rejected Option*

1688 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall supports CS38 and objects to CS39. At Cambridge East, the current attitude towards the provision of employment is to seek an emphasis on a mixed use urban quarter. Whilst there may be some areas of exclusive employment use, the intended emphasis is on mixed use where higher employment density than on traditional business parks, can be achieved. Policy CS38 is to be preferred.	Support for provision of high density employment noted.	
6209 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The principle of providing employment development at higher densities is appropriate. Northstowe will provide such opportunities.</p> <p>However, the policy must recognise that in order to satisfy the strategic role assigned to Northstowe it may not be appropriate that all employment allocations within the site should be developed at higher densities. A mix of opportunities will need to be provided. To urge that all employment development takes place at higher densities may be to ignore important cluster activities.</p> <p>It is therefore premature to agree to make less provision for employment land than is set out in the Structure Plan and to start from this premise.</p>	High density employment development can still accommodate a variety of types of employment, in order to meet the range of uses needed to serve the new town. It does however means that land should be used efficiently and innovatively.	
2294 - Cambridge City Council	Support	Support the rejection of the option. It is necessary to allocate all 50ha in Northstowe/Cambridge East. Other locations eg CNF East, NW Cambridge or larger Villages. Could allow residual for smaller windfall sites, as allowed under option CS42. It is important that 50ha of employment be allowed to 2016, if there is demand. Plan, monitor and manage and application of the "Selective management" policy will help manage economy.	Support for full provision of 50 ha. noted (see CS38 2286).	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

4373 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4594 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support rejection of this option.	Support for rejection of this option noted.	
--	---------	-----------------------------------	---	--

---

**Decision on CS39 Density of Employment Allocations - Rejected Option**

This will continue to be rejected.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS40 Existing Employment Allocations - Preferred Approach*

3493 - Royal Mail Group	Object	RMG major operations - delivery offices, sorting offices and mail centres, are classified as Sui Generis. These uses are best located on sites providing B1, B2 and B8 development. The policy fails to encompass comparable employment generating uses such as RMG deliver offices, sorting offices and mail centres. The approach fails to accord with PPG12, which requires LPAs to consider the land use requirements of public service providers when preparing development plans. Policy should be amended to provide for sui generis uses to be located on all sites.	Sui generis by definition covers a very wide range of uses, some of which would not be appropriate on the allocations. Applications for appropriate sui generis uses should be dealt with on a case by case basis.	
5911 - D H Barford & Co	Object	Policy overlooks employment allocation on land south of Station Road, Gamlingay. Although this has the benefit of planning permission, it has yet to come forward and it should be recognised as an opportunity for well related local employment development that will meet village needs.	Agree that allocations should be included where the site has yet to be completed. This would reflect the approach utilised following the Local Plan inspectors report. This would provide a context for any future planning applications. Sites are particularly important in the years upto 2006, and should be reassessed as part of a future review of the LDF.	Carry forward Local Plan 2004 allocations even when they have the benefit of planning permission.
3161 - Highways Agency	Support	The Agency did not object to the principle of Papworth Everard and Histon allocations in the Local Plan modifications (2002) and do not wish to do so here. However there may be traffic increases affecting the A14 and A428 as a result. Consequently there could be a material impact on the trunk road and therefore the Agency would require Transport Assessments to be undertaken	Noted. Transport assessments will be required at the planning application stage.	
4374 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5576 4595 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	General support for the option.	Support noted.	

---

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*District Council's Assessment*

*Approach to Draft DPD*

---

**Decision on CS40 Existing Employment Allocations - Preferred Approach**

Carry forward Local Plan 2004 employment allocations, but include those that already have the benefit of planning permission but have yet to be developed.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS41 Major Development Areas - Preferred Approach</i>				
2639 - FPDSavills	Object	In circumstances of closure of Major Employment Areas, we consider that the sites have greater potential than the current approach suggested by the Council.	In the event of an employer leaving a site, the Council would seek to retain employment use. The sites identified have a number of employers present.	
3307	Object	An Objection is submitted in the omission of an additional allocation for employment land at Cambourne to meet the needs of the enlarged population.	It is anticipated that Cambourne Business Park will exceed its originally anticipated employment level; therefore no additional employment allocation is required.	
4259 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	There are also major employment areas at Melbourn, Histon and Bourn. In the supporting text here is no mention about how employment and the economically active population is to be monitored - nor how hi-tech/cluster employment is to be monitored - nor how commuting is to be monitored. There are policies affecting all of these. Self-employment is also a critical issue.	The focus of this policy is major employment areas outside village frameworks and not in the green belt. The sites referred to appear not to fall into this categorisation. The submission LDF will include a monitoring strategy, to guide the LDF Annual Monitoring Report.	
3150 - Highways Agency	Object	Sites where development could be intensified which may affect the trunk roads are: Granta Park, Great Abington - A11 impact Wellcome Trust Campus, hinxton - A11 impact Ciba Polymers/Hexcel, south of Duxford - A11 impact Buckingway Business Park - A14 impact Cambridge Road Park, Waterbeach A policy should be included in Travel(Chapter 13) to make it clear that there are potential constraints in relation to capacity and access to the trunk road and that the Highways Agency's policy on control of development would apply	Any planning applications on these sites would be subject to all policies in the development plan, including those relating to transport.	
3785 - English Heritage	Object	We are unable to consider these allocations in the absence of a proposals map defining them.	These are not allocations, but existing employment sites. The extents will be defined in the submission LDF.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5974 - Chancerygate Asset Management Ltd. (Charlton & Duffields land at Cambridge Research Park)	Object	Support designation of Cambridge Research Park as Major Employment Area, and the statement that redevelopment of existing buildings and appropriate infill development will be allowed on such sites. Object to the fact that area is not defined as Cambridge Research Park, Waterbeach, and adjoining land to the north;. Site is previously developed, and could benefit from redevelopment for general employment use given that it is currently underused.	Agree that this particular site could be included in a major employment site. However it is not the intention of this policy to determine the type of uses suitable on a site. This site is currently being used for 'dirty' uses, and provides a useful function. By including it in an employment area the LDF would not be automatically supporting its redevelopment for research and development. Considerations of land supply and other policies across the District would still apply. The main role of the policy would be to provide a context, acknowledging the employment use of these sites in the countryside.	Include site adjoining Cambridge Research park when defining site boundaries for area around Cambridge Research Park.
6612 - Carisbrooke Swavesey General Partners	Support	Buckingway Business Park could be extended to the east, and south-east.	Additional employment allocations are not required, outside strategic employment allocations, in order to meet Structure Plan land supply requirements. The site is also greenfield land, in a rural location.	
2847 - Vantico	Support	This option reflects Vantico's ambitions to develop further the site at "Ciba Polymers/Hexcel Corporation", South of Duxford.  Note that Ciba Polymers is now known as Vantico.  Vantico also consider that the Council should encourage higher density employment use on Major Employment Areas than have been the 'norm' in the past.	Support noted. Whilst efficient use of land is supported, development will be subject to all policies in the plan, including development principles.	Rename 'Ciba Polymers / Hexcel Corporation' as 'Vantico'.
2835 - Carisbrooke Swavesey General Partners	Support	Ancillary facilities should also be permitted on Major Employment Areas.	Ancillary facilities could cover a broad range of uses. Consideration would have to be against all policies in the plan, including development principles, to ensure it was appropriate in scale to its location. This particular policy would allow development to support the employment use of the site, which could include appropriate ancillary facilities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3852 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)	Support	We support the identification of our site as a Major Employment Area allocation, subject to the boundary being redefined to release part of the site for residential led development.	Support noted. Potential for residential development on this site is considered through responses to other representations.	
5577 4596 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	General support for the option.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS41 Major Development Areas - Preferred Approach**

Use the preferred approach in developing the core strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS42 New Employment within Frameworks - Preferred Approach</i>				
1491	Object	This proposal does not take into account the effect on the amenity of residents, which should be given at least the same weight as employment potential.  Amenity aspects need to be made explicit here, even if inferred by other policies elsewhere.	Issues of design and impact on residential amenity will be dealt with through a development principles policy elsewhere in the plan. It is a specific intention in the LDF to avoid repetition of policy.	
2296 - Cambridge City Council	Object	We do not consider that this option sufficiently reflects the Selective Management of the Economy policy, as set out in the Structure Plan. This could have particular implications for Cambridge East, part of which is located within the City boundary where our intention is to apply the "Selective Management of the Economy" policy.	The 'selective management' policy would apply to proposals relating to the new employment within frameworks policy.	
3600 - GO-East	Object	It would provide clarity in the operation of the relevant policy if an indication is given of what constitutes 'small scale employment development.'  Also, the policy approach seems to restrict small-scale employment opportunities within village frameworks of Rural Centres, without any explanation. Further consideration should be given to this issue in the submission DPD.	Agree that small scale provision should be defined in the policy. A policy would allow for employment development (as appropriate determined by other policies in the plan) in all village frameworks. Additionally, previously developed near to the most sustainable villages (Rural Centres) could also be utilised for employment. Therefore it will not overly restrict small scale employment development at rural centres.	Define small scale employment provision in policy in the submission LDF.
5910 - D H Barford & Co	Object	Policy should be widened to encourage the creation of local employment opportunities within all village frameworks.	A policy would allow for employment development (as appropriate determined by other policies in the plan) in all village frameworks. Additionally, previously developed near to the most sustainable villages (Rural Centres) could also be utilised for employment.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5970 (Land North of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton) 6616 (Land South of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton) 4421 - Hallam Land Management Ltd 5923 - The Davison Group (Avenue Business Park, Elsworth) 6187 (Land North of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton) 6618 (Land South of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton) 6078 (Land at Buckingway Business Park, Huntingdon Road, Swavesey) 6168 (Land at Beach Road, Cottenham)	Object	Employment allocations should be dispersed across the District. This would lessen the distance between housing and jobs and contribute towards sustainability. Sites suggested: Melbourne Science Park; Buckingway Business Park; Green Acre Farm Girton; Beach Road Cottenham; Avenue Business Park in Elsworth.	The focus of new employment allocations is the Strategic Employment sites detailed in the Structure Plan. There is sufficient employment land supply available not to allocate further sites in rural areas.	
--	--------	---	--	--

4375 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6458 - The Countryside Agency 5665 - Gallagher Waterbeach Limited 4597 - Bayer CropScience Ltd 1689 - The Marshall Group	Support	General support for the option.	Support noted.	
---	---------	---------------------------------	----------------	--

6055 - Balsham (Building) Ltd (7 High Street, Balsham)	Support	The option of planning permission being granted for employment uses within village frameworks is supported. However, it is hoped that reference to small-scale will not prohibit the redevelopment of existing employment sites where this is considered appropriate. In particular, reference is made to Balsham (Building) site which is centrally located within Balsham.	The reference to small scale reflects the nature of the village environment that must be protected.	
--	---------	--	---	--

---

**Decision on CS42 New Employment within Frameworks - Preferred Approach**

Follow approach detailed in preferred approach, and include definition of small scale in LDF policy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

*CS43 Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses - Preferred Approach*

2644 - FPDSavills	Object	Non-conforming employment uses within or adjacent to villages should be considered for future redevelopment.	The policy will allow for this within village frameworks where the criteria are met.	
2893 - Januarys	Object	A further criterion should be whether housing would be a more appropriate use in view of local geography.	This would be included in the consideration of the benefit of a proposal.	
5184 - Laing Homes North Thames	Object	Whilst we generally support this policy we would suggest that the Council acknowledge that there are a number of industrial sites within villages which are considered to be non-conforming uses in that they cause noise, pollution or other unacceptable impacts on neighbouring properties or the highway network and therefore the redevelopment of these sites for other uses may be appropriate.	The policy would allow for redevelopment of such sites where the relevant criteria are met.	
6163 (Site at Whitecroft Road, Meldreth) 6070 (Site at back of 1 Whitecroft Road, Meldreth)	Object	More flexibility required, to give greater weight to the overall benefit of the proposal. Site may be inefficient use of a brownfield site or detrimental to local amenity.	Benefit of redevelopment over loss of employment must be considered on a case by case basis. The importance of retaining village employment can not be overstated.	
6376 - BT Plc	Object	BT's operational sites do not generate employment and this policy should not apply to BT or other telcommunication buildings. The policy is contradictory in that it states all criteria should be met and then has "or" after each one. An additional criteria should be added "There would be no loss of employment"	Whether a BT site was covered by this policy would depend if a site was manned or not. Loss of employment is addressed in the third criteria.	
5721 - Dixon International Group Ltd	Object	This option does not assist in achieving the general land use objectives of PPG3 and the Structure Plan in securing the most appropriate and efficient uses of land. It does not take account of overall employment land supply in the district.	Rural employment is vital to support sustainable communities, bringing homes and workplaces closer together, and employment sites are a scarce resource which should be retained where possible.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5847 5860 5867 5820 - P B Moore & Sons 5787 - Stamford Homes Ltd 5808 - Westbury Homes Ltd	Object	Option conflicts with achievement of urban capacity study housing figures.	The conflict between this policy and housing development is acknowledged in the urban capacity study. It is likely that a number of sites will pass the tests over the plan period. This is backed up by an assessment of past rates from this source in the study. It would be unrealistic to assume no sites will pass the test. Also a policy of protecting village employment has been in place since the 1993 Local Plan, therefore it has been taken account of in the assessment of small windfalls.	
3853 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford) 4013 - Bidwells Property Consultants 6635 - Dixon International Group Ltd 4599 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Object to the requirement to meet ALL the criteria.	Agree that there is an internal contradiction in the option. Any of the options should be met, however, it is important that if this is the case the third criteria is made sufficiently robust. Overall benefit should be based on benefit to the community, for example provision of affordable housing.	Amend option to refer to any of the criteria being met.  Amend third bullet to 'The overall benefit TO THE COMMUNITY of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of employment land and premises.'
3132	Support	The condition suggested at the second bullet should be strengthened to avoid misinterpretation by industrial/commercial owners seeking to capitalise housing market site value (ie) moving production elsewhere to "release land".	Agree that criteria will need to be clearly established.	Use the following requirement in the policy: Applications for change of use of premises in or last occupied by employment use will need to be accompanied by documentary evidence that the sites are not suitable or capable of being made suitable for continued employment use, evidence would be required that the property has been adequately marketed for a period of not less than twelve months on terms that reflect the lawful use and condition of the premises.
3298 - McCann Homes Limited	Support	The policy should recognise that the employment site would suitable for redevelopment if it has been unused or underused for a a period of 6 months	Six months is considered an insufficient amount of time for marketing a site. The principle of 12 months has been established through the Local plan review.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6459 - The Countryside Agency	Support	We support the preferred approach - to resist the loss of existing employment sites in village frameworks unless all the stated criteria are met.  With respect to the second criterion, we would expect the LDD policy to establish an appropriate market test to demonstrate lack of market demand.	Support noted. The policy will establish an appropriate marketing test, for not less than 12 months on terms that reflect lawful use and condition of premises.	
4376 - Cambridgeshire County Council 2882 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
<b>Decision on CS43 Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses - Preferred Approach</b>				
Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.				

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

## *Chapter 7. Services and Facilities*

### *CS44 Services and Facilities Objectives - Preferred Approach*

2609 - East of England Development Agency	Object	EEDA requests that the Local Development Framework include an implementation strategy which would need to address the need to bring together central, regional and local government, utilities, service delivery agents, private sector and developers to enable a joined-up approach to delivery of the framework.	Such a strategy is being developed for the sub-region by Cambridgeshire Horizons.	
3290 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	The core strategy should recognise that local services and facilities would be supported by the allocation of new residential development sites, and that this should be an essential part of the plan.	While the strategy permits a level of residential development within frameworks, it would be contrary to the Structure Plan policy to allow significant amounts of residential developments in smaller villages.	
3175 - Addenbrooke's Hospital 3279 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Object	When referring to services, health and social care should be mentioned specifically.	Agree as a general principle that when referring to services and facilities, ensure health and social care services are included.	When referring to services and facilities, ensure health and social care services are included.
4260 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Chapter 7  It might be useful to acknowledge the role services and facilities play in providing local jobs.	This could be used in a reasoned justification for policies in the LDF.	Refer to role services and facilities play in providing local jobs, in reasoned justification.
4261 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 7.4  Suggest an explicit reference to protecting Public Rights of Way as well as open space. Change "offered appropriate protection" to "appropriately protected".	It is not the role of the Council to protect rights of Way. This is dealt with through other legislation. A policy would be superfluous.	
3513 - Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Object	Reference to the relocation to the Cambridge wastewater treatment works would be appropriate in setting out the objectives for services and facilities.	Until a better site for the sewage treatment works is identified than the present site, a commitment should not be made in the LDF. Development can still take place on the northern fringe east site even if they remain in the same location.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4382 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4598 - Sport England	Object	Object to lack of reference to built sports facilities. Rights of way should be included. Final bullet should refer to standards.	Public transport is dealt with through the travel chapter. Rights of way is covered in the objective to 'create connectivity with the wider countryside'. Agree suggest change to final bullet point.	Change final bullet point: 'To ensure the proper provision and maintenance of open space AND SPORTS FACILITIES consistent with levels of planned residential development AND IDENTIFIED OPENSACE STANDARDS.'
4377 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 7.6  Preference for Community Schools - need to be very cautious about using this terminology. The term Community school is a specific type of school, one of four, the others being Foundation, Voluntary Controlled and Voluntary Aided. The text implies that The Council would only look to provide Community Schools when, in fact, they may wish to work with other promoters such as the Dioceses to establish church schools. However, the Council would support a statement that indicates all schools should serve their community in an inclusive way.	Agree dual use is potentially possible in all types of school.	Where appropriate, ensure dual use policies refer to all types of school.
4585 - Sport England	Object	Paragraph is objected to because no reference is made to built sports facilities. New developments create additional need for built sports facilities such as sports halls and swimming pools and, therefore, new developments should provide or improve such facilities where existing facilities are inadequate, as well as outdoor sports facilities. Paragraph 23 of PPG 17 advocates that development should make provision for sport and recreation facilities in broad terms, not just open space. To address this objection, it is requested that "built sports facilities" is added after "formal and informal public open space".	Agree, built facilities have been particularly addressed in the Area Action Plans. The following change is proposed.	Amend 7th bullet to read: 'To meet the formal and informal sport and recreation needs of the District, including provision of high quality INDOOR AND OUTDOOR facilities.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4714 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited 4712 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Dual use is only suitable for meeting local needs.	Dual use has proved to be the most effective method of providing facilities in villages. It is generally built facilities that have been secured for community use by dual use agreements. Facilities providing for more than a local need must be located an accessible location appropriate to their scale, which will be captured in development principles policies.	
870 - The National Trust 1494 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	Amendments to penultimate bullet point suggested.	Agree suggested changes.	Change penultimate bullet point: 'To protect and enhance important areas of LOCAL AND STRATEGIC openspace for their recreation and amenity value, and create connectivity with EXISTING PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY AND the wider countryside.'
2757	Support	Bridleway network requires to be improved and widened, providing links to existing network and the countryside.	This is covered by the objective to improve connectivity with the wider countryside.	
2082 - Cambridge Community Church Trust	Support	However, there is no mention of the specific needs of, or indeed the role that can be played by, faith groups in sustaining and helping meet the social needs of the community. Government policy specifically acknowledges the role that faith groups can play. This policy should therefore state that the needs of faith communities will be secured as a part of new developments, and that preference will be given to those faith groups that can demonstrate the capacity to partner with other voluntary and publicly funded providers.	Falls under the broad term 'community facilities'. The needs of faith groups have been specifically addressed in the Area Action Plans.	
3933 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature supports the provision of public open space (bullet points 9 and 10), but would encourage the adoption of green open space, ie areas that would have benefit to wildlife and people.  In addition, English Nature would encourage the use of 'Accessible Green Space Standards'.	Green open spaces will in particular be addressed by policies relating to strategic openspace, and policies relating to biodiversity and habitat creation.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5579 3878 - Network Rail (Town Planning Team) 6210 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 4600 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	General support for the option.	Support noted.	
---	---------	---------------------------------	----------------	--

---

**Decision on CS44 Services and Facilities Objectives - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into LDF policy, as modified.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS45 Protection of Village Services and Facilities - Preferred Approach</i>				
3494 - Royal Mail Group	Object	RMG is best placed to determine if its existing post offices and facilities can continue to meet its needs. Where Post Offices are surplus to requirements, RMG premises should be permitted to be used for alternative uses, without the need for a 12 month marketing period or for alternative premises to be provided. Preferred approach should be amended to provide sufficient flexibility in allowing the loss of such facilities.	Disagree, due to the importance of such facilities to the local community. Additional flexibility would undermine the policy.	
4610 - Sport England	Object	Sport England objects to the preferred approach, because the examples of village services that should be protected should include sports facilities, as they are considered to be of at least equal importance for village communities as the other services referred to, particularly if the Community Strategy's vision (referred to in paragraph 2.4) of creating active and healthy communities is to be realised. To address this objection, it is requested that "or sports facilities" is added after "health centres" in the second line of the Preferred Approach.	Agree, a policy to protect recreation facilities is required in the LDF, reflecting PPG17.	Include a policy to provide appropriate protection for recreation facilities.
5780 5848 5861 5868 3308 - McCann Homes Limited 5778 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department 5762 - Amblecroft Ltd 5821 - P B Moore & Sons 5772 - Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd 5788 - Stamford Homes Ltd 5809 - Westbury Homes Ltd	Object	Restricting scale of additional development in villages conflicts with this option. Without additional development many village services and facilities will become unviable.	While the strategy permits a level of residential development within frameworks, it would be contrary to the Structure Plan policy to allow significant amounts of residential developments in smaller villages. Most South Cambridgeshire villages are at the margins of sustainability when it comes to additional growth. The Rural Settlement policy permits a level of development appropriate to the size and availability of services. Development above a limited scale is likely to result in a disproportionate number of journeys. Policies will permit a level of development to meet local needs, but experience has shown limited or even modest levels of development do not provide significant additional support to village services.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1363	Support	Faith Groups and Churches need a separate policy. Consideration as to the classification of new church buildings and their proximity to residential areas.	Faith groups and churches can be considered as 'community meeting places', which are proposed to be covered by the policy.	
2291 - Gamlingay Parish Council 1403 - Gamlingay Parish Council 5580 2884 - Steeple Morden Parish Council 6460 - The Countryside Agency	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
4262 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Another reference to "good quality public transport" that should be changed to "high quality public transport".	Good public transport is defined in the Local Transport Plan. The reference to 'good' moves on from the local plan 2004 which simply uses the term 'convenient' access. It is considered that in order to be consistent with other policies in the LDF the 'good' definition should be used.	

#### **Decision on CS45 Protection of Village Services and Facilities - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into policy in the core strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

*CS46 Retail Hierarchy - Preferred Approach*

1690 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the Preferred Approach and asks that the urban extension at Cambridge East, based on the airport, should be placed alongside Northstowe in the hierarchy. Housing at Cambridge East will provide approximately 12,000 homes, albeit in at least two phases. The airport may accommodate about 8,000 homes. There is a need to ensure that the District Centre, which comes to be established, has appropriate provision principally for those who will live there. Just as Northstowe needs an appropriate level of convenience floorspace, so does Cambridge East.	Whilst it is important that Cambridge East has sufficient facilities to meet the needs of its residents, given its location close to Cambridge City Centre, it does not fulfil the role of a town. It does however meet the definition of a district centre in PPG6, and the Structure Plan.	
2301 - Cambridge City Council 2302 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The only urban extension to have a District Centre will be Cambridge East. The other extensions will have local centres.	Apart from Cambridge East, the centres of the urban extensions will be situated within Cambridge City.	In the retail hierarchy refer to Cambridge East as a district centre, and not all the urban extensions to Cambridge.
4320 - W M Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Object	It is considered that given the presence of Morrisons and other shops, services and facilities, the proposed retail hierarchy should recognise the role of Cambourne as a "District Centre".  The retail hierarchy should be amended to the following terminology, in accordance with PPG6 and the Structure Plan: Town Centres District Centres Local Centres	PPG6 para 1.11 "Adopting a sequential approach means that first preference should be for town centre sites, where suitable sites or buildings suitable for conversion are available, followed by edge-of-centre sites, district and local centres and only then out-of-centre sites in locations that are accessible by a choice of means of transport." Cambourne is not a city or a town. It is out of centre, and therefore should remain at the local centre level.	
4766 4765 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd	Object	Retail hierarchy proposed would harm vitality and viability of existing retail centres.	Disagree, the hierarchy is intended to protect the role of Cambridge and the market towns, as well as villages.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3157 - Highways Agency	Support	Whilst the supporting text states Northstowe will not be a sub-regional centre the wording appears to allow the possibility for some large scale supermarket provision.  Highways Agency support is subject to the wording being made clear and unambiguous. This is to ensure the development is sustainable and any impact on the trunk road network is minimised.	Detail will be provided in the Northstowe Area Action Plan.	
3786 - English Heritage 5581 3384 - English Partnerships 6211 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
<b>Decision on CS46 Retail Hierarchy - Preferred Approach</b>				
Develop preferred approach into policy in the core strategy, as modified.				

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS47 Applications for New Retail Development - Preferred Approach*

3589 - GO-East	Object	<p>The only policy test that appears to be applied to new retail development is that of accessibility, which itself is only one of the key policy tests for new development in PPG6. While we recognise that new retail development will be provided within major new developments, any generic policy approach that is not location specific should not need to repeat national policy.</p> <p>For this reason, any generic policy approach to this issue in the submission DPD should simply state that proposals for new retail development will be judged against the policy tests in PPG6 (or its successor policy statement).</p>	<p>The principle being tested in the preferred options report was a test proposed based on the definition of 'good quality public transport' in the Local Transport Plan. Other tests, reflecting PPG6 will be needed in the LDF policies, but agree that repetition should be avoided.</p>	
5509 - The Fairfield Partnership	Support	<p>Support CS47 which demonstrates that there is need for consideration to be given to the master planning of the new settlement at Northstowe to maximise access from a wider area served by the Guided Busway emphasises the need for as much of the new settlement as possible to be accessible from the Guided Bus Stop.</p>	<p>The Fairfield site suggested offers only marginal accessibility benefits above options put forwards by the Council, from the County Council's Guided Bus scheme.</p>	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6212 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	<p>The general approach taken in CS47 is appropriate.</p> <p>Some clarification of the text relating to sub-regional shopping provision (paragraphs 7.9 and 7.10) may be beneficial. The text identifies the need to make exceptions in relation to major retail development in Northstowe (as defined by the thresholds of 1,400 sq metres and 10,000 sq.m.). This is supported.</p> <p>Those thresholds will need to be exceeded in Northstowe in order to ensure that the new town is sustainable. It may be helpful to clarify the second sentence on paragraph 7.10 in order that it is explicit in this respect: "Exceptionally, in Northstowe, there will be a need for convenience and comparison floorspace of a scale which is excess of these thresholds and which ensures that the town is sustainable."</p>	Agree.	Incorporate text in LDF: 'EXCEPTIONALLY, IN NORTHSTOWE, THERE WILL BE A NEED FOR CONVENIENCE AND COMPARISON FLOORSPACE OF A SCALE WHICH IS EXCESS OF THESE THRESHOLDS AND WHICH ENSURES THAT THE TOWN IS SUSTAINABLE.'

---

**Decision on CS47 Applications for New Retail Development - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

*CS48 Telecommunications - Preferred Approach*

3196 - CPRE Cambridgeshire	Object	Would add to policy: Mast must be in keeping with the character and setting of the area.	Such considerations will be covered by the development principles policies in the LDF.	
5583 2885 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	
6500 - Mobile Operators Association	Support	We support both the supporting paragraphs 7.13 - 7.15 and the draft policy CS48. The concise and flexible nature of the drafting is in full accordance with the advice set out in PPS12 and in PPG8.	Support noted.	

**Decision on CS48 Telecommunications - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the core strategy.

*CS49 Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope - Preferred Approach*

4547 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	Support safeguarding policy. Will ensure that developments which would potentially cause interference and which would disrupt the work of the observatory would not be permitted. University will supply an updated plan showing extent of area where restrictions should apply.	Support noted.	
--	---------	--	----------------	--

**Decision on CS49 Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope - Preferred Approach**

Use the preferred approach in developing the core strategy.

---

<i><b>Representations</b></i>	<i><b>Nature</b></i>	<i><b>Representation Summary</b></i>	<i><b>District Council's Assessment</b></i>	<i><b>Approach to Draft DPD</b></i>
-------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------

---

*CS50 Public Art - Preferred Approach*

6374 - BT Plc 6375 - Fairview New Homes	Object	The criteria mentioned in circular 1/97 should be included in any policy. That the Public Art should be: 1) necessary 2) relevant to planning 3) directly related to the post-development 4) fairly and reasonably related in scale and in kind to the proposed development 5) reasonable in all other respects.	Whilst the criteria of circular 1/97 are relevant, the policy makes clear that the Council will seek to negotiate with developers, as oppose to require provision.	
3674 - House Builders Federation 2646 - FPDSavills 3330 - McCann Homes Limited 4545 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge 5506 - The Fairfield Partnership 6213 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 4601 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	A policy should encourage contributions not require them. Requiring 1-5% is unrealistic, and could conflict with other requirements. Choice of what constitutes art should be determined by the provider. In Northstowe, should be limited to main public access areas.	The Council's public art policy 'encourages' provision rather than 'requires' provision. The actual amount is sought through negotiation, so while the top end of the scale may appear high for some developments, it may be suitable or others. Similarly the Council will assist in suggesting local artists, or third party arts agencies that may be able to assist, but will not impose inappropriate art on a developer. The costs of other requirements, such as affordable housing, can be taken account of in the negotiation. Implementation of the policy will be dealt with by a Supplementary Planning Document.	

**Decision on CS50 Public Art - Preferred Approach**

Use the preferred approach in developing the core strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

## *Chapter 8. Recreation*

### *CS51 Open Space Standards - Preferred Approach*

4264 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Comment	There is concern that the minimum standard for open space is likely to be adopted as the maximum a developer can provide. Is the contribution of strategic open space (CS54) to come out of the informal open space mentioned in CS52? (Section 8.8 refers to a 'further type of open space' identified, implying it is additional to that in CS52).	The minimum standard being used as a maximum by developers has always been an issue. This is why the minimum must be set at a sufficient level to meet the needs of the population. The recreation study indicates that this is the case with the recommended standards. Informal openspace will perform a different function to Strategic Openspace and each have their own standard. Clear definitions will be included in the LDF.	
2761 1496 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Object	Should include equestrian sports.	Equestrian facilities are a highly specific form of recreation, which can be judged against other polices in the LDF. It would be inappropriate to set a standard for such facilities, although the provision of paths, bridleways, and countryside access will be dealt with elsewhere in the plan.	
4263 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	CS51, 8.1-8.11  There is no mention of whether informal open space or outdoor sports facilities are adequate, and this section could cross refer to the results of the recreation studies. As regards Secretary of State, although the definition has been provisionally refined, this has not yet been approved by all stakeholders. If the LDF timescale allows, any new definition should be inserted. Otherwise it is suggested the following be inserted, at the end of 8.8: "This definition is currently being refined to complement District Council's PPG17 open space assessments."	Agree quality as well as quantity is important, and considerations of quality as identified in the recreation study will be included in both policy and an accompanying Supplementary Planning Document. The definition of Strategic openspace will need to be based on the work currently being undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council.	Amend definition of Strategic Openspace to reflect outcome of studies and sub-regional approach.
2897 - Januarys	Object	Level of provision sought excessive on smaller sites. Should be negotiated on a case by case basis, and may include payment of commuted sums in lieu of on-site provision.	Payment in lieu of onsite provision may be suitable in some circumstances, particularly on smaller sites. This will be detailed further in a Supplementary Planning Document.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3605 - GO-East	Object	<p>This paragraph refers to the audit assessment undertaken to establish the need for additional open space. We commend this as an important part of the evidence base to underpin the development strategy (and a requirement in PPG17). However, the DPD appears to make little obvious connection between the outcomes of this work and the standards/strategy for open space in the DPD.</p> <p>We consider therefore that the submission DPD should include further justification for the approach taken based on the assessment work.</p>	Agree that the Reasoned Justification must make a clear connection to the recreation study. This can build on text contained within the study.	Develop Reasoned Justification for policy, to establish a link to the Recreation Study.
3671 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	The standard for informal open space should be 0.6 hectares per 1000 people.	The Recreation Study considered best practice examples both within the District and from other Local Authorities, and determined that 0.4ha. was the most appropriate standard for the District.	
4914 - Sport England	Object	<p>With reference to Chapter 8 Recreation: Sport England objects to the omission of a policy in the recreation chapter, which provides guidance on how the Council will assess planning applications that will result in the loss of, or prejudice the use of, sports and recreation facilities. Whilst detailed policies would be inappropriate in view of existing guidance in PPS12, a policy should be included in the recreation chapter. To address this objection, it is requested that a new policy and reasoned justification be added to the recreation chapter after paragraph 8.4.</p>	Agree. The intention of the preferred options report was not to be comprehensive in terms of all policies that will be included in the DPDs, but to put forward options where there were no real choices to be made. A policy is required by PPG17, and will be included in the LDF.	Include policy to provide appropriate protection to recreation facilities.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5140 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Object	CS51 & Para 8.1  It seems unjust that four times as much open space is allocated to Outdoor Sport, as compared with Informal Open Space, when activities such as walking are known to be far the most popular outdoor recreations. Participation in organised games is enjoyed by only a small minority of the population, whereas walking and other informal outdoor pursuits are available to people of all ages and social groups.	Many sports have specific space requirements, while walking can be achieved on linear routes, such as footpaths or green corridors. Areas of formal sports provision also provide for informal use at other times. Most villages also have access to the countryside through footpaths and bridleways. The informal open space standard is a new requirement which recognises the importance of informal recreation to quality of life. The Strategic Open space option puts forward a requirement to contribute towards large open spaces suitable for walking and other informal recreation.	
5893 - D H Barford & Co	Object	The standard of 2.8 hectares per 1000 people exceeds the nationally recognised 6 acre per 1000 standard.	PPG17 advocates that standards should be set locally, based on audits and assessments of need. The Recreation Study indicated that a standard higher than the NPFA standard was appropriate. The NPFA standard also did not include informal open space. This is a new requirement which recognises the importance of informal recreation to quality of life.	
2293 - Gamlingay Parish Council 1405 - Gamlingay Parish Council 4634 - Sport England 5585	Support	General support for his option.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS51 Open Space Standards - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into LDF policy. Include policy to provide appropriate protection for recreation facilities.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS52 Open Space and New Developments - Preferred Approach</i>				
2306 - Cambridge City Council	Object	The City Council considers that occupiers of sheltered housing schemes (although not residential homes) should also contribute towards the provision of informal open space. This would be in accordance with the City Council Open Space requirements and is based on the premise that occupants of such schemes are likely to make use of Open Space.	Agree.	Require sheltered dwellings to contribute towards informal open space.
4084 - Sport England	Object	Whilst the principle of including a policy that seeks the provision or improvement of playspace to serve the needs of a development is supported, object to this policy on the following grounds: (1) no detail is provided about how the policy will be implemented in practice; (2) the policy only applies to residential developments - PPG 17 advises provision to be sought from new development in general; (3) the policy excludes built sports facility provision in new developments □ inexplicable given the extent and nature of new development that will take place. Policy should be amended to address these issues/omissions.	General support noted. Detail of the policy will be provided in the Core Strategy, and a supplementary planning document. PPG17 companion guide advocates assessments based on population, and are not employment based. Where appropriate new employment development will be required to undertake landscaping schemes and amenity space for the benefit of employees. Built facilities will be covered by the community facilities policies in the LDF.	
3672 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	The approach does not go far enough. Support the contribution towards playspace and informal open space. However, all dwellings should, in addition, contribute towards the provision or improvement of local facilities (village halls etc). Moreover, a methodology is required to establish a fair rate.	Support noted. Contributions for other community facilities will be dealt with elsewhere in the plan. A methodology establishing a fair rate will be included in a supplementary planning document.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3677 - House Builders Federation 5908 - D H Barford & Co 3601 - GO-East 6372 - BT Plc 6373 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Development should only provide facilities necessary directly as a result of new development, and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind. Will result in unreasonable additional costs for small developments.	Recreation facilities are required to meet the needs of new development where there is inadequate provision in terms of quantity and quality of open space. Therefore improvements will be needed as a direct result of a development, to meet its residents needs. The scale of the requirement (set by the proposed standards, and detailed in a supplementary planning document) will relate directly in scale and kind to the development, whether this is 1 dwelling or 100. Costs and delays for small dwellings will be minimised, as a standard approach and cost formula will be developed through SPD. This will create a degree of certainty to developers where previously could have been greater delays.	
6214 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The policy requires further clarification regarding expected contributions towards play space.</p> <p>Gallagher consider it inappropriate that all new dwellings, of necessity, are to be expected to contribute towards the provision of children's play space. It is unreasonable to request that non-family dwellings (such as 1 bedroom apartments) should contribute towards children's play space. This is accepted in the adopted local plan.</p> <p>Equally it would be inappropriate for dwellings aimed at older people to contribute towards formal pitch provision.</p>	Agree that only dwellings suitable for families should contribute to children's play space. The option addresses the issue of accommodation for older people. Exact requirements will be detailed in a policy, and through a Supplementary Planning Document.	Only family dwellings (of 2 bedrooms or more) should contribute to the children's play space element of the open space.
3023 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee 5586	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS52 Open Space and New Developments - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.



***Representations******Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD******CS53 Open Space and New Developments On Site Provision - Preferred Approach***

2298 - Gamlingay Parish Council 1406 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Object	Threshold should be 8 units, to reflect the group village threshold.	The figure of 10 dwellings was chosen because of the amount of openspace it would be required to provide by the minimum standards. This space would be large enough to provide a playspace for young children. These spaces are the most crucial in terms of accessibility. Reducing the threshold would result in a requirement for even smaller spaces on site, which may cause some problems in the adoption process, particularly for some Parish Councils.
--	--------	--	---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2650 - FPDSavills	Object	The threshold size of 10 dwellings is too low given the possibility of site characteristics which would affect the capacity of the site. In addition, there is no acknowledgement of the need to assess existing provision within the immediate area.	PPG17 Companion Guide para 6.15 states, 'Including a minimum acceptable size within provision standards provides a transparent, policy-based way of deciding whether to require a developer to make on-site or contribute to off-site provision. It helps to prevent provision which will be too small to be of benefit to local communities, or unnecessarily expensive to maintain. It will often be better to aggregate contributions from several small developments in the same area than to waive a provision standard or require each developer to make a tiny amount of on-site provision.' The figure of 10 dwellings or above for onsite provision of play space is set because it is a reasonable size of development needed to achieve enough open space requirement for a useful play space on site, capable of being reasonably maintained by a Parish Council or other body. The need to assess existing provision in an area still exists. The Recreation Study provides a great deal of information, but it will be a matter for negotiation with the District Council, and the Parish Council, as to the best form of spaces to provide, and potentially facilities that could be improved, to best meet the needs of the development. For example, consideration must be made of accessibility and type of surrounding play spaces, in order to complement existing provision. A Supplementary Planning Document will be prepared to detail this process, and provide guidance to developers.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2898 - Januarys	Object	Threshold is far too low. 50 dwellings would be more appropriate.	PPG17 Companion Guide para 6.15 states, 'Including a minimum acceptable size within provision standards provides a transparent, policy-based way of deciding whether to require a developer to make on-site or contribute to off-site provision.' The figure of 10 dwellings or above for onsite provision of playspace is set because it is a reasonable size of development needed to achieve a useful play space on site, capable of being reasonably maintained by a Parish Council or other body. Providing sites as part of larger sites would result in under provision, reducing accessibility to playspace, particularly impacting on younger children.	
3678 - House Builders Federation	Object	Development should only be required to make provision for those facilities that are necessary as a direct result of new development and which fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the development proposed. Standards should only be applied to developments over a certain threshold of 10 dwellings at the very least in order that practical difficulties can be overcome.	Recreation facilities are required to meet the needs of new development where there is inadequate provision in terms of quantity and quality of open space. Therefore improvements will be needed as a direct result of a development, to meet its residents needs. The scale of the requirement (set by the proposed standards, and detailed in a supplementary planning document) will relate directly in scale and kind to the development. The ten dwelling threshold will apply to on site provision, but smaller developments should still contribute in order to avoid a worsening in the shortfall of provision.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3673 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Mechanisms are required to ensure that the off-site provision of play space, outdoor sport and informal open space can be delivered. In areas where recreational space is under provided, new development should only be agreed if the developer can identify how they will meet the recreational space requirements. Furthermore, for developments of 10 or more dwellings should only be permitted if the required play space can be identified within 5 minutes walk to which they can make a contribution for the enhancement or maintenance.	The approach proposed is that generally developers of 10 or more dwellings will be required to provide onsite provision of children's play space. Mechanisms for appropriate off site provisions and contributions will be developed through a Supplementary Planning Document.	
5503 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to CS53 as it is inconsistent with the hierarchy in the NPFA 6 acre standard targets for provision.	The Council has developed its own standards, as opposed to the NPFA standard, as recommended by PPG17.	
3029 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee 3025 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee 5587	Support	General support for this option.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS53 Open Space and New Developments On Site Provision - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS54 Strategic Open Space - Preferred Approach</i>				
4265 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	When the LDF is further advanced, it should have an indication of how much strategic open space already exists within the District. It is likely to be short of such space, and therefore the opportunity should be taken to rectify this as another 'infrastructure deficit' issue - i.e. to make up for past shortages as well as planning for future population growth.	The outcomes of Strategic Openspace studies taking place will need to feed into the LDF preparation process.  Work is currently underway by Cambridgeshire County Council, to carry out an audit and needs assessment of Strategic Open Space, in order to create a suitable minimum standard of provision for the Cambridge Sub-Region. It is likely that studies will indicate a shortfall in provision. This will become more acute given the scale of development required. Therefore, it is appropriate that developers provide strategic open space sufficient to meet the needs of new development.	
3675 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	The definition of "strategic open space" includes "strategic green corridors" but the approach is not adequately developed, and specifically does nothing to protect or maintain those corridors.	The Area Action Plans in particular aim to create and protect strategic green corridors into Cambridge. Other green corridors through rural areas which link key locations will be identified in SPD e.g. River Cam between Cambridge and Ely.	
4383 - Cambridgeshire County Council 5142 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Object	Developers should contribute to improving rights of way network, to improve public access to the countryside in Cambridgeshire.	The Area Action Plans will include strategies for providing access to the wider countryside through an enhanced network of footpaths and bridleways. The approach is being developed in partnership with the County Council.	Refer to the Cambridgeshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan in the Area Action Plans.
3679 - House Builders Federation 5903 - D H Barford & Co 6370 - BT Plc 6371 - Fairview New Homes 6215 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd 4603 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Development should only provide facilities necessary directly as a result of new development, and fairly and reasonably in scale and kind. It must only be sought where there is a proven shortage. No justification for seeking contribution from any development other than residential.	Work is currently underway by Cambridgeshire County Council, to carry out an audit and needs assessment of Strategic Open Space, in order to create a suitable minimum standard of provision for the Cambridge Sub-Region. It is likely that studies will indicate a shortfall in provision. This will become more acute given the scale of development required. Therefore, it is appropriate that developers provide strategic open space sufficient to meet the needs of new development.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

871 - The National Trust 3929 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 4183 - Sport England 5588 3389 - English Partnerships 2642 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 3466 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 3859 - The Woodland Trust 6461 - The Countryside Agency	Support	General support for this option. It is important that the form and function of strategic open space relates to the needs of the development and local community and this is an integral part of the masterplan and design process of major developments.	Support for the approach to Strategic open space is noted. Agree that policies must consider the needs of communities in order to produce sustainable sites. Such issues will be considered through the area action plans.	
--	---------	--	--	--

---

**Decision on CS54 Strategic Open Space - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS55 Papworth Hospital - Preferred Option</i>				
4267 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6609 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Object	Options regarding Papworth Hospital should not be in the Recreation Chapter.	This is purely a formatting error in the Preferred Options Report. It will be included in an appropriate chapter in the submission LDF.	
3787 - English Heritage	Object	If any development does take place, a landscape plan should be required to safeguard the setting of the Hall.	There are many aspects of the current site that must be protected. Such considerations must be included in a Supplementary Planning Document for the site, and criteria based policy.	
4384 - Cambridgeshire County Council 1830 - Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust 2028 - Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority 3288 - Addenbrooke's Hospital 3590 - GO-East 4544 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	This issue is outside the scope of the planning system to require, i.e. retention of an existing medical facility. The Relocation is part of the 2020 vision, and is supported.	Agree that it is inappropriate for an LDF policy to require the retention of the cardio-thoracic services on its present site. However, it can set the Council's preferred use for the site as suggested in CS55. It is recognised that the LDF must also provide suitable criteria based policies to allow appropriate planning for the site should the unit move, and this is addressed in CS56 - 58.	
3131	Support	The retention of the Hospital on its present site is essential to South Cambs residents and to patients. Transfer to Addenbrookes or another location should be actively resisted.	Agree that it is inappropriate for an LDF policy to require the retention of the cardio-thoracic services on its present site. However, it can set the Council's preferred use for the site as suggested in CS55. It is recognised that the LDF must also provide suitable criteria based policies to allow appropriate planning for the site should the unit move, and this is addressed in CS56 - 58.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2441 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Support	<p>SUPPORT STRONGLY</p> <p>We strongly support statements in paras 8.14, 8.15 and 8.17.</p> <p>As the process to relocate the hospital to Addenbrooks is well underway, and a group is already looking into possible alternative uses for the Papworth site (see 8.13) there is now CONSIDERABLE URGENCY for SCDC to prepare the policy and criteria outlined in 8.17. PE parish Council and other interested parties should be consulted on the preparation of the policy and criteria.</p>	<p>Support noted. An appropriate response to the proposed relocation is a criteria based policy in the Core Policies, supported by a Supplementary Planning Document providing a detailed development brief. Both would be subject to full public participation. A mixed use scheme, predominantly employment but incorporating some housing, appears most appropriate in order to maintain the employment balance in the village. This could include other health services. This would effectively be a hybrid of the available options.</p> <p>Considerations of the policy must include:  1) Maintaining the vitality and viability of Papworth Everard village centre. 2) Maintaining the setting of Papworth Hall. 3) Preserving other buildings on the site that contribute to the setting of the Village and the history of the site. 4) Traffic generation and access to the site.</p>	

#### **Decision on CS55 Papworth Hospital - Preferred Option**

Whilst the preferred approach remains retention of the cardio thoracic services on site, it is recognised that that it is inappropriate for an LDF policy to require this.

An appropriate response to the proposed relocation is a criteria based policy in the Core Policies, supported by a Supplementary Planning Document providing a detailed development brief. Both would be subject to full public participation. A mixed use scheme, predominantly employment but incorporating some housing, appears most appropriate in order to maintain the employment balance in the village. This could include other health services. Considerations of the policy must include: 1) Maintaining the vitality and viability of Papworth Everard village centre. 2) Maintaining the setting of Papworth Hall. 3) Preserving other buildings on the site that contribute to the setting of the Village and the history of the site. 4) Traffic generation and access to the site.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS56 Papworth Hospital - Alternative Option</i>				
4268 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6610 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Object	This policy should be under 'Employment' or 'Services', not 'Recreation'	This section was included in the recreation chapter in the preferred options report due to a formatting error. It will be included in a more appropriate section in the submission LDF.	
6613 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Object	There should not be a requirement to retain 'buildings of character' if that might compromise the redevelopment. New buildings should be of high quality, relate to and respect the park environment, and have facades that retain the general form and proportions of the original buildings.	Buildings that contribute to the character and history of the village should be protected. The future of the site should be subject to consultation on a supplementary planning document.	
2905 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Object	This option is preferable to that of CS57.  The policy should be slightly broader to incorporate other health-related facilities which could generate an acceptable level of activity.	The policy proposed will allow a broader range of uses.	
1832 - Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust 2030 - Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority 3788 - English Heritage	Object	A Supplementary Planning Document should be produced, with public consultation, to decide the future of the site.	An appropriate response to the proposed relocation is a criteria based policy in the Core Policies, supported by a Supplementary Planning Document providing a detailed development brief. Both would be subject to full public participation.  A mixed use scheme, predominantly employment but incorporating some housing, appears most appropriate in order to maintain the employment balance in the village. This could include other health services.  Considerations of the policy must include: 1) Maintaining the vitality and viability of Papworth Everard village centre. 2) Maintaining the setting of Papworth Hall. 3) Preserving other buildings on the site that contribute to the setting of the Village and the history of the site. 4) Traffic generation and access to the site.	Develop a criteria based policy and supplementary planning document to provide planning policy if the existing functions of Papworth Hospital are relocated.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4385 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3169 - Highways Agency	Support	Support alternative NHS services on the site. Hospital uses will generate consistent flows of traffic throughout the day.	An appropriate response to the proposed relocation is a criteria based policy in the Core Policies, supported by a Supplementary Planning Document providing a detailed development brief. Both would be subject to full public participation. A mixed use scheme, predominantly employment but incorporating some housing, appears most appropriate in order to maintain the employment balance in the village. This could include other health services. Considerations of the policy must include: 1) Maintaining the vitality and viability of Papworth Everard village centre. 2) Maintaining the setting of Papworth Hall. 3) Preserving other buildings on the site that contribute to the setting of the Village and the history of the site. 4) Traffic generation and access to the site.	Develop a criteria based policy and supplementary planning document to provide planning policy if the existing functions of Papworth Hospital are relocated.

#### **Decision on CS56 Papworth Hospital - Alternative Option**

Whilst the preferred approach remains retention of the cardio thoracic services on site, it is recognised that that it is inappropriate for an LDF policy to require this.

An appropriate response to the proposed relocation is a criteria based policy in the Core Policies, supported by a Supplementary Planning Document providing a detailed development brief. Both would be subject to full public participation. A mixed use scheme, predominantly employment but incorporating some housing, appears most appropriate in order to maintain the employment balance in the village. This could include other health services. Considerations of the policy must include: 1) Maintaining the vitality and viability of Papworth Everard village centre. 2) Maintaining the setting of Papworth Hall. 3) Preserving other buildings on the site that contribute to the setting of the Village and the history of the site. 4) Traffic generation and access to the site.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS57 Papworth Hospital - Alternative Option*

2911 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Object	Option CS56 is preferable to this option.  It should not be a requirement to retain 'buildings of character' if that might compromise redevelopment or deter a potential user. New buildings should relate to and respect the adjacent park environment, be of high architectural quality and retain the general form and proportions of the facades of the original buildings.	Disagree. It is important to retain the buildings of character due to their contribution to the village and its history. Agree that the setting of Papworth Hall should be protected. The proposed policy will support provision of other health services on the site, as part of a mixed use development.	
1833 - Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust 2031 - Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority 3789 - English Heritage 3391 - English Partnerships	Object	Decision is premature, other uses should not be ruled out. Should be a supplementary planning document and consultation on the future of the site. A landscape plan is required for the setting of the hall.	An appropriate response to the proposed relocation is a criteria based policy in the Core Policies, supported by a Supplementary Planning Document providing a detailed development brief. Both would be subject to full public participation. A mixed use scheme, predominantly employment but incorporating some housing, appears most appropriate in order to maintain the employment balance in the village. This could include other health services. Considerations of the policy must include: 1) Maintaining the vitality and viability of Papworth Everard village centre. 2) Maintaining the setting of Papworth Hall. 3) Preserving other buildings on the site that contribute to the setting of the Village and the history of the site. 4) Traffic generation and access to the site.	Develop a criteria based policy and supplementary planning document to provide planning policy if the existing functions of Papworth Hospital are relocated.
4270 - Cambridgeshire County Council 6611 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Object	This entry should come under 'Employment' or 'Services', not 'Recreation'	This option was placed in the recreation section of the preferred options report due to a formatting error. It will be placed in a more appropriate section of the submission LDF.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4386 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3167 - Highways Agency	Support	Support for employment use as opposed to housing.	An appropriate response to the proposed relocation is a criteria based policy in the Core Policies, supported by a Supplementary Planning Document providing a detailed development brief. Both would be subject to full public participation. A mixed use scheme, predominantly employment but incorporating some housing, appears most appropriate in order to maintain the employment balance in the village. This could include other health services. Considerations of the policy must include: 1) Maintaining the vitality and viability of Papworth Everard village centre. 2) Maintaining the setting of Papworth Hall. 3) Preserving other buildings on the site that contribute to the setting of the Village and the history of the site. 4) Traffic generation and access to the site.	Develop a criteria based policy and supplementary planning document to provide planning policy if the existing functions of Papworth Hospital are relocated.

#### **Decision on CS57 Papworth Hospital - Alternative Option**

Whilst the preferred approach remains retention of the cardio thoracic services on site, it is recognised that that it is inappropriate for an LDF policy to require this.

An appropriate response to the proposed relocation is a criteria based policy in the Core Policies, supported by a Supplementary Planning Document providing a detailed development brief. Both would be subject to full public participation. A mixed use scheme, predominantly employment but incorporating some housing, appears most appropriate in order to maintain the employment balance in the village. This could include other health services. Considerations of the policy must include: 1) Maintaining the vitality and viability of Papworth Everard village centre. 2) Maintaining the setting of Papworth Hall. 3) Preserving other buildings on the site that contribute to the setting of the Village and the history of the site. 4) Traffic generation and access to the site.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS58 Papworth Hospital - Rejected Option*

1834 - Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust 2032 - Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire Strategic Health Authority 3393 - English Partnerships	Object	Supplementary planning guidance of the future use of the site should be prepared, including public consultation. Residential development could help secure the future of the site.	An appropriate response to the proposed relocation is a criteria based policy in the Core Policies, supported by a Supplementary Planning Document providing a detailed development brief. Both would be subject to full public participation. A mixed use scheme, predominantly employment but incorporating some housing, appears most appropriate in order to maintain the employment balance in the village. This could include other health services. Considerations of the policy must include: 1) Maintaining the vitality and viability of Papworth Everard village centre. 2) Maintaining the setting of Papworth Hall. 3) Preserving other buildings on the site that contribute to the setting of the Village and the history of the site. 4) Traffic generation and access to the site.	Develop a criteria based policy and supplementary planning document to provide planning policy if the existing functions of Papworth Hospital are relocated.
4271 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	CS55-CS58.This section would be better included under Services and Facilities	This section was included in the recreation chapter in the preferred options report due to a formating error. It will be included in a more appropriate section in the submission LDF.	
2913 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Support	If the hospital eventually moves out of the village, with the associated and significant loss of employment for local residents, the Parish Council are emphatically opposed to the redevelopment of the site for housing.	The emphasis must remain on employment, in order to support the vitality and viability of the village centre. Some housing may be appropriate as part of a mixed use site.	

**Decision on CS58 Papworth Hospital - Rejected Option**

Whilst the preferred approach remains retention of the cardio thoracic services on site, it is recognised that that it is inappropriate for an LDF policy to require this.

An appropriate response to the proposed relocation is a criteria based policy in the Core Policies, supported by a Supplementary Planning Document providing a detailed development brief. Both would be subject to full public participation. A mixed use scheme, predominantly employment but incorporating some housing, appears most appropriate in order to maintain the employment balance in the village. This could include other health services. Considerations of the policy must include: 1) Maintaining the vitality and viability of Papworth Everard village centre. 2) Maintaining the setting of Papworth Hall. 3) Preserving other buildings on the site that contribute to the setting of the Village and the history of the site. 4) Traffic generation and access to the site.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS59 Land Allocations for Community Facilities - Preferred Approach*

4272 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Cambs CC Archaeology have previously commented directly to Gamlingay Parish Council regarding the archaeological sensitivity of this site (letter of 14th February 2003). Significant archaeological remains are likely to survive in the area which would require mitigation including, if appropriate, preservation in situ.	Any planning application would be required to accord to policies in the LDF relating to archaeological remains.	
3676 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 4210 - Sport England 5501 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Support the allocation of this site, but there are other requirements, particularly for recreation, that should be allocated across the District.	While the recreation study did indicate the need for additional facilities in some villages, a strategy of additional allocations has not been developed at this stage, and could be developed at a later review. The council is developing policies on recreation land and new developments to ensure adequate facilities, and where appropriate funding, is provided to meet the needs of new residents. Funds secured may be pooled to provide additional sites, or improve existing sites.	
5806 - Merton College	Object	Allocation of land west of St.Mary's Church for additional graveyard does not have support of land owner. Situated on village edge in Conservation area. Would impact on character/ setting of listed properties, as well as approach and views into village along station road. Additional car parking would have detrimental impact on residential properties. No evidence an evaluation has taken place on alternative sites.	The site was selected in consultation with statutory bodies, in order to best meet the purposes it is needed for. The location is close to the church and existing graveyard. Potential negative impacts can be considered, and where possible mitigated, through any planning application.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2300 - Gamlingay Parish Council 1407 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	Gamlingay Parish Council (GPC) strongly supports the need for this site to come forward as a new cemetery. GPC is strongly committed to continue to provide a facility for burial and cremation burials in Gamlingay, and the current cemetery is almost full. It is likely that a new cemetery will be required within the next 5 years. The most suitable location has been identified west of St Mary's Church in central Gamlingay. Further information concerning this proposal can be provided as necessary during the LDF process.	Support noted.	

---

**Decision on CS59 Land Allocations for Community Facilities - Preferred Approach**

The preferred approach should be carried forward into the submission DPD.

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD****Chapter 9. The Natural Environment***CS60 Natural Environment Objectives - Preferred Approach*

3683 - House Builders Federation	Object	The achievement of SAP ratings is too simplistic a matter to be dealt with by a single numerical target and is more complicated than a simple pass / fail number. This matter should properly be administered by the Borough Council's Building Control Department taking account of all the relevant factors and technical considerations.	Agreed; consistent with the emerging policy ENV8 of RSS14, it is appropriate to require developments to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction etc, but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards beyond Building Regulations. A standard above Building Regulations requirements could be "traded" for part of the renewable energy requirement through negotiation.	Amend CS63 to make it clearer that it is encouraging new development to reduce their CO2 emissions by a further 10% over that required by the Building Regulations.
3790 - English Heritage	Object	The appearance of the landscape reflects the shaping hand of man over many centuries, and is both natural and man-made. It would perhaps help to include a cross reference to the historic environment chapter.	There is already recognition of the fact that man has altered the landscape in the introduction to Chapter 11: Protecting South Cambridgeshire's Landscapes and Chapter 12, in the subsection on Historic Landscapes.	
3896 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Object	Whilst English Nature appreciate that the full LDF will contain a complete range of policies and guidance on nature conservation issues and protected sites and also that a Biodiversity Strategy will be prepared, it nevertheless considers that a specific policy should be included in the Core Policy document on the subject of Habitat Creation. It is noted that a policy on habitat creation is included within the Area Action Plan for Cambridge East (policy CE51), which is welcomed, but consider that a similar policy should also be included in the Core Policy Document to ensure that this issue is covered across the whole of the District.	Agree, there should be an overarching policy in the Core Strategy on Habitat Creation.	Include a policy on Habitat Creation within the Core Strategy.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3925 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Object	In general English Nature welcomes the Natural Environment Objectives as set out in Policy CS60 as it establishes an overall approach to the natural environment which will ensure that the wide range of issues relating to natural resources are taken into account when future development is considered. However there is no specific reference to the safeguarding of soil quality from polluting developments or uses which, it is considered is an omission and should be included in this policy.	Support noted. This is an issue that should be sufficiently covered by other policies in the LDF, in both the Development Principles and Natural Environment Chapters, which should ensure that potentially polluting developments are controlled. In addition, Local Plan Policy ES1 deals with redevelopment of contaminated land.	Roll forward Local Plan policy ES1.
4604 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The option in respect of climate proofing; new developments goes beyond government advice and should be reconsidered.	The inclusion of 'climate proofing' stems from the need for all new development to be sustainable, which is in accordance with Government guidance.	
6216 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Gallagher suggests that when setting out objectives for the natural environment in relation to climate proofing and the protection of the various elements of the natural environment, reference should be made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the need to ensure that specific proposals are technically practical;</li> <li>b. the need to ensure that specific proposals are financially viable;</li> <li>c. the need to ensure that proposals are inclusive and do not impose additional costs in particular for which affordability will be an issue;</li> <li>d. the need to mitigate the impact of development where development is necessary.</li> </ul>	The Objectives set out the overarching principles for protecting the natural environment. The details as how these will be achieved will be dealt with in other policies. These issues will be addressed in the Development Principles and Natural Environment Chapters, including a new criteria-based policy CS61.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources.
5591 2645 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 2886 - Steeple Morden Parish Council 6462 - The Countryside Agency	Support	Support objectives that provide a good, holistic approach to protect and enhance the environment.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2763 1497 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	Strategy falls short and should require Public Rights of Way.	This is not an objective for the Natural Environment Chapter, which is concerned with protecting natural resources, not providing access. This is an issue covered in the Recreation and Travel Chapters.	
3602 - GO-East	Support	With regard to the final objective (to protect high quality agricultural land) consideration should be given as to whether any specific areas need to be protected in accordance with PPS7 (paragraph 29).	Noted. The final bullet refers to the protection of high quality agricultural land. The development strategy (emanating from RPG6 and the Structure Plan) clearly sets out future levels of housing growth and its location. Growth is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. Detailed examination of housing land supply information shows that at the Rural Centres there is scope to more than meet the outstanding housing numbers at Cambourne through increased densities on the remaining land. Therefore, there is no need to allocate greenfield sites on the edge of any other Rural Centre or other lower order villages. As development will be restricted to 'windfall' development within the development framework, there is no need to protect high quality agricultural land, as it is already protected by the development strategy.	
3860 - The Woodland Trust	Support	<p>Although the Trust supports the need to ensure the new developments are "climate proofed", there is also a pressing need to ensure existing habitats are helped to adapt to the threats of climate change.</p> <p>The Trust publication, Space for Nature (available on request on from <a href="http://www.woodland-trust.org.uk">www.woodland-trust.org.uk</a>) outlines our considered approach to both this and wider landscape-scale issues (outlined below).</p> <p>In addition, the Trust fully supports the need to "protect and enhance the character and appearance of landscapes and natural heritage" and the need to "protect and enhance biodiversity".</p>	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4274 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Welcome the fact that both mitigation and adaptation are included. Also welcome 'protect and enhance biodiversity' and landscapes, but perhaps a specific mention of protecting designated areas could be added.	Support noted. Agree, CS60 should also include a reference to designated areas.	Amend bullet 2 to read 'to protect and enhance the character and appearance of landscapes and natural heritage, including designated areas.'

---

**Decision on CS60 Natural Environment Objectives - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified. Also develop policies on habitat creation and renewable energy sources.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

## *Chapter 10. Energy*

### *CS61 Developing Renewable Energy Sources - Preferred Approach*

2313 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Support renewable energy generation but object to prescriptive nature of approach, identifying wind as primary source and stating that large wind farms would not be suitable. Inconsistent with PPS22. "Delivering renewable energy in the Cambridge Sub-region" indicates good potential for solar hot water, solar photovoltaics at all development sites, biomass at Northstowe and Cambourne, and wind at Northstowe. Northstowe identified as offering greatest potential. Policy for Northstowe should go even further. Core Strategy should be supportive of renewable energy and decisions on type of scheme should be assessed on a site-by-site basis, based upon policy criteria.	Support noted. Agree, that should not relate exclusively to wind power. A criteria-based policy is needed to assess development proposals on a site-by-site basis, in accordance with PPS22, and having regard to the CSR report.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources.
2917 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Object	The general principles incorporated in CS61 are supported provided that they are combined with a policy to identify appropriate criteria to govern the siting of wind farms in South Cambridgeshire.	CS61 should be amended to a criteria-based policy which includes consideration of the issue of siting. Such development proposals will also need to comply with other policies in the LDF, including those in the Development Principles Chapter, which will also address siting issues.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22.
3198 - CPRE Cambridgeshire	Object	While agreeing with the trust of the policy, all windfarm developments regardless of size should respect the character and setting of the area.	Agree, a criteria-based policy is needed to assess development proposals on a site-by-site basis, in accordance with PPS22. This should include criteria relating to the character and setting of the area.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22.
2890 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	Add to the final sentence "the visual impact on their local setting and potential noise nuisance."	A criteria-based policy is needed to assess development proposals on a site-by-site basis, in accordance with PPS22. This should include criteria relating to the visual and noise impact.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3591 - GO-East	Object	A policy approach more consistent with the requirements of PPS22 should, in our view, be included in the final submission DPD. This should focus on the key criteria that will be used to judge development proposals. This will ensure that any proposal can be judged objectively in the particular circumstances of the case rather than general assumptions being made about the possible impact of types of development (Large wind farms would be likely to compromise the need to maintain the quality of the countryside).	Agree, a criteria-based policy is needed to assess development proposals on a site-by-site basis, in accordance with PPS22.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22.
5592	Object	Whilst renewable energy is important, potential impacts on biodiversity and on the natural environment itself need to be given more weight within CS61. Protecting South Cambridgeshire's Landscapes must also be considered when specific wind turbine schemes are proposed.	Agree. A criteria-based policy is needed to assess development proposals on a site-by-site basis, in accordance with PPS22. This should include criteria relating to the impact on biodiversity, the natural environment and landscape.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22.
4605 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The option is too prescriptive, broad ranging and goes further than is required by government guidance and should therefore be deleted in its current form.	Agree. A criteria-based policy is needed to assess development proposals on a site-by-site basis, in accordance with PPS22.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22.
4276 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 10.4  As a point of clarification, 20% CO2 reduction target by 2010 is not an aspiration, but a UK goal. 60% by 2050 is a UK Government aspiration.	Noted.	Amend text accordingly.
4277 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 10.6  Noted that the target for predicted energy requirements from renewable sources is 10%, as set out in the saved RPG14, and this is lower than the 14% target proposed by the East of England Sustainable Round Table - see paragraph 7.19 of the Structure Plan.	Noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4279 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 10.9  'Wind farms may also have an adverse impact on wildlife'. Other potential impacts in addition to the migratory patterns of birds are currently under investigation. As our understanding improves, these impacts should be taken into account.	Noted.	
4387 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Although the preferred approach to encouraging small groups of wind turbines is acceptable in principle, to be in conformity with Structure Plan Policy P7/7 areas of search also need to be considered. Account should be taken of potential impact on residential amenity and whether the proposal can be efficiently connected to new or existing energy demands.	"Delivering renewable energy in the Cambridge Sub-Region" already indicates where potential for wind power exists. A criteria-based policy is needed to assess development proposals on a site-by-site basis, in accordance with PPS22. This should include criteria relating to the impact on residential amenity and efficient connection to new or existing energy demands.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22.
3791 - English Heritage	Support	While the need to generate renewable energy is supported, this should be done in a way that is sensitive to the historic environment. Turbines, for instance, may affect the settings of individual historic buildings such as churches, or conservation areas. We suggest the last sentence of the policy should be amended to read '...potential impact on biodiversity, historic character and the landscape.'	Support noted. Agree, a criteria-based policy is needed to assess development proposals on a site-by-site basis, in accordance with PPS22. This should include criteria relating to the impact on biodiversity, historic character and landscape.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22.
1823 - Boxworth Parish Meeting 3922 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 2649 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	Support the overall aims, as it encourages the development of renewable energy provision but also states that account should be taken of the potential impact on biodiversity. Also recognises the impact of large groups of turbines on the landscape.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4937 - Future Energy Solutions	Support	Welcome reference to the need to promote and encourage renewable energy development in order to meet electricity requirements of the region, and the recognition given to the types of renewable energy that can potentially be developed. Policy should include: Guidance on circumstances where renewable energy proposals will be permitted; phrased so they are applicable to all renewable energy technologies; outline government policy; refer to Energy White Paper; reference to regional targets; recognition of the need to balance benefits with any adverse effects.	Support noted. A criteria-based policy is needed to assess development proposals on a site-by-site basis, in accordance with PPS22. This should set out criteria to make it clear when renewable energy proposals will be permitted, by ensuring the full impact of proposals is considered. Chapter 10 already includes references to regional targets.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22.
5636 - Arrington Parish Council	Support	Para 10.10 talk of tree belts but this could contradict the nature of south cambs landscape and this would need careful monitoring to ensure this did not happen on an adhoc bases. Enhanced consideration should be given to ground source heat pumps (10.7) for all new developments in order to alleviate the use of wind power if research proves this to be an efficient method.	Noted. Landscaping would need to accord with other policies in the LDF, including those in the Development Principles Chapter. This could also be a consideration for the criteria-based policy.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22.
4278 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 10.8  Although permitting development is positive, given the stated acknowledgement of the need for action to tackle climate change, a more welcome statement would 'Encourage' development.	Agree.	Amend text to read "encourage the development of renewable energy technologies."

#### **Decision on CS61 Developing Renewable Energy Sources - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach in to a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified. A criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22 is required.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

*CS62 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development - Preferred Approach*

1692 - The Marshall Group	Object	It is too soon to specify that at least 10% of energy requirements should be from renewable energy sources. This is a changing and developing technology. To specify a minimum is unnecessary. It may add considerably to capital costs.	The Government has set a clear target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect larger developments to contribute towards this target. The emerging RSS14 includes a policy (ENV8) which would require all developments above a certain threshold to demonstrate that 10% of energy requirements can be met by renewables. This approach would therefore be consistent. However, the District Council will be seeking a consistent approach on the threshold i.e. 1,000 sq m or 10 dwellings.	
1809 - Boxworth Parish Meeting	Object	<p>1) A large turbine can cost between 700,000 and 1 million pounds to instate.</p> <p>2) Turbines barely break even in terms of replacing investment cost. It is subsidy that makes them viable. A huge amount of CO2 is produced in their manufacture and siting.</p> <p>3) Wind levels are comparatively low in our County, and "economic" returns demand larger and higher units to attain higher wind levels</p> <p>4) Do we want a landscape littered with huge industrial units?</p>	The Government has set a clear target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect larger developments to contribute towards this target. CS61 will ensure that the development of renewable energy from a variety of sources, including through wind turbines, has regard for its surroundings. The emerging RSS14 includes a policy (ENV8) which would require all developments above a certain threshold to demonstrate that 10% of energy requirements can be met by renewables. This approach would therefore be consistent. However, the District Council will be seeking a consistent approach on the threshold i.e. 1,000 sq m or 10 dwellings.	
2652 - FPDSavills	Object	We consider that this matter is more relevant to Building Regulations. Notwithstanding this issue the approach from the Council should be to encourage rather than require.	Agreed; consistent with the emerging policy ENV8 of RSS14, it is appropriate to require developments to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction etc, but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards beyond Building Regulations. A standard above Building Regulations requirements could be "traded" for part of the renewable energy requirement through negotiation.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2339 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Support approach, but concerned dwelling threshold is different City Council's threshold (10, rather than 50). Threshold chosen by the City because follows the definition in GDPO for "major development". Threshold also been used by other authorities. The City Council prefer threshold of 10 dwellings as will cover more developments. Local Plan policy allows flexibility, as an alternative to on-site provision is achieving high energy efficiency standards. This approach should be considered. Concerned that if City and South Cambridgeshire have different thresholds, not a level playing field, which could affect development patterns.	Support noted. Agree that it would be appropriate for a consistent approach. 10 dwellings approximates 1,000 sq m better than 50 dwellings.	Amend dwellings threshold to 10 dwellings.
3685 - House Builders Federation	Object	The achievement of SAP ratings is too simplistic a matter to be dealt with by a single numerical target and is more complicated than a simple pass / fail number. This matter should properly be administered by the Borough Council's Building Control Department taking account of all the relevant factors and technical considerations.	Agreed; consistent with the emerging policy ENV8 of RSS14, it is appropriate to require developments to maximise energy efficiency through sustainable design and construction etc, but encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards beyond Building Regulations. A standard above Building Regulations requirements could be "traded" for part of the renewable energy requirement through negotiation.	
4606 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The option is too prescriptive, broad ranging and goes further than is required by government guidance and should therefore be deleted in its current form.	PPS22 sets out the Government target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.	
4284 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 10.10  Energy use minimization is above renewables in an energy hierarchy, also meeting both mitigation and adaptation objectives for climate change as noted, and reversing their order could reflect this.	Noted. These are all identified objectives in the LDF, both in the Energy and Development Principles Chapters. Note point for drafting of policies.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6368 - BT Plc 6369 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Object to the requirement that development proposals greater than 1000m sq or 50 dwellings have at least 10% of their energy needs provided by renewable energy. This policy needs to refer to the economics provision of the individual circumstances of each site, including other requirements that are sought in conjunction with the development. This option should be amended to conform with PPG22 or be deleted entirely.	PPS22 suggests the inclusion of local policies that require a percentage of energy to be used to come from renewable energy developments. The threshold applied in CS62 takes into consideration the viability issue by only requiring larger developments to contribute to the target. It is proposed to alter the threshold to 1,000sq m or 10 dwellings in line with the definition of "major development" in the GPDO and the approach being adopted by Cambridge City Council.	Amend the threshold to 1,000sq m or 10 dwellings.
6217 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Renewable energy implementation needs to be subject to viability and proper evaluation. It is inappropriate to include a minimum requirement.  The RPG refers to electricity generation. Our view would be that any policy should refer to project electricity demand or its equivalent rather than energy.	PPS22 suggests the inclusion of local policies that require a percentage of energy to be used to come from renewable energy developments. The threshold applied in CS62 takes into consideration the viability issue by only requiring larger developments to contribute to the target.	
5947	Object	The town of Woking should be studied as an example of what can be achieved by power savings and reduced greenhouse gas emissions. With regard to energy issues, Royston and its satellite villages could be considered as an energy centre. The same idea could be introduced with reference to Cambridge and its satellite villages, hence in the future when oil and gas reserves have been used up alternative methods of electrical power generation could be more easily contrived. The LDF report has not given specific energy saving measures for each region of Cambridgeshire.	Noted. The LDF relates to South Cambridgeshire and not the whole of Cambridgeshire, therefore specific energy saving measures for each region of Cambridgeshire is not part of its remit. CS63 Energy Efficiency deals with potential measures that could save energy in new or converted buildings.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2507 - Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd 6072 - Network Rail	Object	It is not clear how developments will meet the target of 10%. The Policy should be reworded to include "where feasible" to ensure that the viability of proposals is not compromised.	PPS22 sets out the Government target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. Whilst it may be considered unreasonable to expect all development to contribute to this target, CS62 only requires larger developments to contribute. The emerging RSS14 includes a policy (ENV8) which would require all developments above a certain threshold to demonstrate that 10% of energy requirements can be met by renewables. This approach would therefore be consistent. CS62 allows flexibility for each new development to consider how to meet the target. However, the District Council will be seeking a consistent approach on the threshold i.e. 1,000 sq m or 10 dwellings.	
6229 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Para 10.9  Electricity generated within a development does potentially need to be available for local sale rather than for sale to the national grid. The reason is that revenues per unit of electricity are very small from the national grid and make local generation unviable.	It is proposed that electricity generated should be supplied to the national grid rather than made available for sale locally. This will not impose any maintenance costs on those supplied and enable competition in the market to keep prices reasonable.	
1820 - Boxworth Parish Meeting	Support	We approve all your housing ideas, and the impetus to use various technologies, and invest in new technologies. Alas, the big CO2 increase is brought about by the endless expansion of freight and air transport, both of which require Europe wide initiatives, and it is hard to see how county policy can affect this. Living near a place of work is one way, good public transport, and educating public attitudes another. Beyond this we need national and international initiatives, which will be judged uncommercial. Maybe it is time to reappraise nuclear power.	Noted. The LDF strives to achieve the location of type of land uses such to minimise the need to travel and offer a choice of means of travel by more sustainable modes. In addition, other measures will contribute to the reduction of CO2, through the energy efficiency of buildings and requiring the use of renewable energy sources. These are measures that can be implemented at the local level and the results will contribute to the global situation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2653 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust welcomes the intention to require energy to be provided from renewable sources. However, the target needs to be progressively increased over time and the Council should monitor the situation to ensure that more than the bare minimum of 10% is achieved.	Support noted. The target reflects Government guidance in PPS22. Agree, this should be monitored.	Add the 10% renewable energy target to the monitoring section.
3031 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Support	We strongly support the ideals behind this policy.	Support noted.	
4938 - Future Energy Solutions	Support	Welcome reference to the need to promote and encourage renewable energy development in order to meet electricity requirements of the region, and the recognition given to the types of renewable energy that can potentially be developed. Policy should include: Guidance on circumstances where renewable energy proposals will be permitted; phrased so they are applicable to all renewable energy technologies; outline government policy; refer to Energy White Paper; reference to regional targets; recognition of the need to balance benefits with any adverse effects.	Support noted. A criteria-based policy is needed to assess development proposals on a site-by-site basis, in accordance with PPS22. This should set out criteria to make it clear when renewable energy proposals will be permitted, by ensuring the full impact of proposals is considered. Chapter 10 already includes references to regional targets.	Include a criteria based policy on Developing Renewable Energy Sources in accordance with PPS22.
4281 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Noted that there is no reference to the renewable energy requirements caveat on over-burdening cost, which is included in the supporting text in the Area Action Plan reports, and is therefore at odds with the Core Strategy. Our view is that such caveats should not be included.	Support noted to Core Strategy approach. Agree not appropriate to include caveat.	
4283 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	This firm policy is welcomed, although it is suggested that its implementation could be assisted by clarifying that the 10% provision is based on an energy assessment undertaken once adequate levels of energy efficiency have been adopted. (For consistency with the City Local Plan, a target of 1,000m <sup>2</sup> or 10 dwellings could be considered, rather than the 50 dwellings in the preferred approach CS62).	Support noted. Agree that it would be appropriate for a consistent approach. 10 dwellings approximates 1,000 sq m better than 50 dwellings.	Amend the threshold to 1,000sq m or 10 dwellings.

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*District Council's Assessment*

*Approach to Draft DPD*

---

**Decision on CS62 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into policy in Core Strategy, as modified.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS63 Energy Efficiency - Preferred Approach*

1693 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to this Preferred Approach, not because of disagreement over the objective but on how best the objective should be achieved. Building Regulations are the obvious instrument for securing desired levels of energy efficiency. Alterations to the Building Regulations can achieve whatever the desirable level should be. That straightforward approach is much to be preferred to seeking to use planning policy, which is the principal instrument to achieve appropriate land use.	PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.	
2655 - FPDSavills	Object	Similar to our views on CS62, their view that the nature of this approach if translated into policy advice would not be appropriate for an LDF since we are of the view that this matter should be more appropriately dealt with in the context of Building Regulations legislation.	PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.	
3403 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships encourages the LPA to consider additional BREEAM and NHER standards such as Eco-homes for development and in the District. Environmental standards can assist in establishing high quality design and efficient site management and use of materials.  In relation to Northstowe we recommend that the Local Authority seeks to achieve a 'Very Good' BREEAM rating as a minimum environmental standard for the development components, with an aspiration to seek an 'Excellent' rating.	CS63 does not preclude the achievement of a higher environmental standard. It is not appropriate to require through planning permission a standard beyond Building Regulations.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2342 - Cambridge City Council	Object	Although the principle behind this approach is supported, the City Council is worried about how this would be implemented in practice and whether developers would be able to provide this information and development control officers would have the expertise to assess planning applications against this requirement. This is almost straying into the area of building control.	PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.	
3686 - House Builders Federation	Object	The achievement of SAP ratings is too simplistic a matter to be dealt with by a single numerical target and is more complicated than a simple pass / fail number. This matter should properly be administered by the Borough Council's Building Control Department taking account of all the relevant factors and technical considerations.	PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.	
3603 - GO-East	Object	We support the first half of the preferred approach, which seeks to increase energy efficiency through measures that it is appropriate for planning policy to address. The second half, however, ('The standard for new' and 'shape as that proposed') is inappropriate as it includes requirements that are outside the scope of planning and different to those in the existing Building Regulations. Such an approach is contrary to the expectation that the planning system will not normally duplicate, or seek to override, other legislative requirements (see paragraph C3 of PPG1).  Any subsequent policy approach in the submission DPD should reflect these requirements of national policy.	PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4607 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The option is too prescriptive, broad ranging and goes further than is required by government guidance and should therefore be deleted in its current form.	PPS22 sets out the Government target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.	
4285 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 10.11  Draft Part 'L' building regulations are now released and some reference to their contents, which explicitly refer to climate change as a driver, could be made.	Noted, regard should be included on draft part 'L' of the building regulations as far as appropriate. however, it would not be appropriate to base policy on draft regulations.	Consider extent to which draft part 'L' of the building regulations should be taken into account.
6218 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Energy conservation beyond Building Regulations will be financially burdensome. If Government felt it appropriate and sustainable to require measures well in excess of Building Regulations these would be included within the basic Regulations. It is inappropriate to consider one particular aspect of energy issues in isolation. The specific target in CS63 is therefore inappropriate.	PPG3 and Circular 1/97 are currently being reviewed with regard to affordable housing. Consultation drafts are expected to be published soon. If those include proposals to change the approach to thresholds, those proposed for the Core Strategy will need to be reviewed.	
2659 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	While supporting the preferred approach, the Council needs to recognise that current building regulation fall far short of what is technically achievable and that the 10% further reduction in Carbon Dioxide is only a start. Further more stringent energy efficiency standards should be required over time.	Support noted. CS63 does not preclude the achievement of a higher environmental standard. It is not appropriate to require through planning permission a standard beyond Building Regulations.	
3035 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Support	We like the aim, though how it is to be achieved is open to question.	Support noted.	
3920 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	English Nature supports CS63 Energy Efficiency as it will reduce the use of fossil fuels and contribute to the sustainable use of natural resources.	Support noted.	



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4288 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The Council welcomes the statement, in that it sets a target, a measurement, and a method, but suggests rewording to be less confusing - references in subsequent documents would then also require amendment. The approach should, nevertheless, be as outlined in Draft Part L of the Building Regulations (recently out for consultation - see Section 1 paras 56,87,89 and Section 2 paras 4,7 & box on page 8).	Support noted, regard should be included on draft part 'L' of the building regulations as far as appropriate. However, it would not be appropriate to base policy on draft regulations.	Consider extent to which draft part 'L' of the building regulations should be taken into account.
4289 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Noted that there is no reference to the renewable energy requirements caveat on over-burdening cost, which is included in the supporting text in the Area Action Plan reports, and is therefore at odds with the Core Strategy. Our view is that such caveats should not be included.	Support noted to Core Strategy approach. Agree not appropriate to include caveat.	
4673 - Environment Agency	Support	Support the policy, but does it need to be reproduced in area action plans?	Support noted. The overarching policy should be in the Core Strategy and therefore applicable district-wide, including in the major development areas. If there is scope for a different approach in a major development area, for example through economies of scale achievable from larger developments, then this could be reflected in the relevant Area Action Plan(s).	

#### **Decision on CS63 Energy Efficiency - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into policy in Core Strategy, as modified.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

## *Chapter 11. Protecting South Cambridgeshire's Landscapes*

### *CS64 Landscape Character Areas - Preferred Approach*

2894 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	We would stress the need for Landscape Character Assessments to be carried out, in sufficient detail to take into account the distinctive variations in local character, rather than being content with a more generalised regional view.	This is a matter of detail that should be addressed in SPD.	
4366	Object	The proposed development contravenes the preferred approach, as it does not respect, retain or enhance the local character.	Future development is to be accommodated on the edge of Cambridge, Northstowe new town, and in the rural areas, at Rural Centres. As such, this will minimise the impact of development on the landscape as no new greenfield allocations will be made in, or on the edge of villages. Detailed Area Action Plans for the large development areas on the edge of Cambridge and at Northstowe will detail how they will address this issue.	
4388 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Chapter 11  The Urban Fringe is not addressed here. This is a sensitive area which requires special consideration and should be addressed by SCDC in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P7/5 which requires strategies to maintain and enhance their character and conservation value and improve public access to the countryside.	This issue will be addressed in detail in the relevant Area Action Plans for development locations on the edge of Cambridge.	
1826 - Boxworth Parish Meeting 3406 - English Partnerships 6463 - The Countryside Agency 4608 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support		Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3769 - English Heritage	Support	The historic environment can help define local character and a thorough understanding of the historic evolution of an area is key to creating high quality new development which fits its context. A new tool for doing this is Historic Landscape Characterisation [HLC], which provides an additional layer to Landscape Character Assessments by showing the historic evolution of the landscape on a GIS database. The HLC for Cambridgeshire has been developed by the County Council and is virtually complete. It would be appropriate to refer to the use of this data in policies relating to landscape character and new development. In cases where landscape features have been lost, the HLC can provide information on historic field boundaries and features, and provide a framework for enhancement and reinstatement.	Noted. Consider that to include policies relating to the Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) Tool in this section of the Core Strategy DPD would be unnecessarily prescriptive. Agree that the HLC is a useful resource; policies relating to it should be included in the district wide design guide SPD. Reference to the HLC will also be made in the section of the Core Strategy DPD addressing Historic Landscapes.	In the "Historic Landscapes" section of Chapter 12 of the Core Strategy DPD, add the following sentence to paragraph 12.4: □The Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database, developed by the County Council, provides a valuable tool in defining the evolution of the landscape and in identifying historic landscapes. Regard will be had to the database in determining whether proposals would have an adverse impact on historic landscapes. □

**Decision on CS64 Landscape Character Areas - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach in to policy in Core Strategy, as modified.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS65 Natural Areas - Preferred Approach*

3861 - The Woodland Trust	Object	<p>The Trust welcomes and supports the option "planning permission will not be granted for development if it would have an adverse impact on the biodiversity of the District's Natural Areas" and "these should be respected, retained and enhanced."</p> <p>However, we object, on behalf of irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland, to the caveat "if developers can demonstrate that the need for the development clearly outweighs the need to retain features or habitat types characteristic of the relevant Natural Areas, they would be required to provide appropriate mitigation and/or compensatory measures."</p>	<p>The wording of the policy is consistent with the approach taken in draft Planning Policy Statement 9 and in Policy 7/2 of the Structure Plan. Agree that ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat which should be safeguarded from development in all but the most exceptional of circumstances.</p>	
4609 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	<p>The impact of development on biodiversity should be a material consideration in planning decisions but NOT an overriding consideration as is proposed in the wording of the draft option.</p>	<p>CS65 does not imply that biodiversity is an overriding consideration in determining planning decisions. As the wording states "if developers can demonstrate that the need for the development clearly outweighs the need to retain features or habitat types characteristic of the relevant Natural Areas, they would be required to provide appropriate mitigation and/or compensatory measures". Impact on biodiversity is a material consideration with significant weight attached to it, but CS65 does not state that adverse impact on diversity will preclude development. The Preferred Approach is consistent with the draft Planning Policy Statement 9 and with Policy 7/2 of the Structure Plan.</p>	
3919 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 2667 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support		<p>Support noted.</p>	

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

4293 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Welcomed, but again needs to include designated protected areas. The provision of compensation could be limited geographically to benefit the area affected by the development.	The LDF will designate protected areas. The provision of appropriate compensatory measures is a matter of detail to be negotiated on a site by site basis, through the planning application.	
--------------------------------------	---------	---	--	--

---

**Decision on CS65 Natural Areas - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into policy in Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

*CS66 Biodiversity - Preferred Approach*

4611 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The impact of development on biodiversity should be a material consideration in planning decisions but NOT an overriding consideration as is proposed in the wording of the draft option.	CS66 is consistent with the advice set out in draft Planning Policy Statement 9 and with Policy 7/2 of the Structure Plan.	
3862 - The Woodland Trust	Support	The Trust welcomes and supports the statement "The District Council is committed to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity" and Paragraph 11.5 which identifies Biodiversity Action Plans which "provide guidance on targets and actions for habitat and species conservation". The Trust would anticipate that the proposed Local Biodiversity Policy, to be adopted as a supplementary planning document, will closely follow the existing Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Action Plan. In particular, with regard to woodland, the Woodland Local Habitat Action Plan for Cambridgeshire.	Noted. The forthcoming Local Biodiversity Policy will have close regard to existing Cambridgeshire Biodiversity Action Plan and to the Woodland Habitat Action Plan for Cambridgeshire.	
3909 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team	Support	<p>English Nature supports the overall aims of this policy on Biodiversity, and will welcome the opportunity to be consulted on the forthcoming Biodiversity Strategy which will set out detailed guidance and targets.</p> <p>We consider that policies for statutorily designated sites (including cSACs, SSSIs and NNRs), RIGs, LNRs, CWS and previously developed sites should appear in the Local Development Framework in accordance with the emerging PPS9, and understands from SCDC officers that this will be the case.</p> <p>We would welcome the requirement on development proposals to show how the proposals will contribute to the achievement of the local Biodiversity Action Plan.</p>	Support noted. The LDF will include policies on designated sites. Through the Biodiversity Checklist, developers will be required to demonstrate how they will meet the targets in the Action Plans.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

3913 - English Nature,  
Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire  
Team

Support

PARA 11.5 - SUPPORT  
English Nature supports the use of Biodiversity  
Action Plans and the Biodiversity Checklist. In  
order to implement this policy, development  
proposals could state how they will contribute to  
meeting targets set out in the Local Biodiversity  
Action Plan.

Support noted. Through the Biodiversity Checklist,  
developers will be required to demonstrate how  
they will meet the targets in the Action Plans.

4389 - Cambridgeshire County  
Council  
1831 - Boxworth Parish Meeting  
3915 - English Nature,  
Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire  
Team  
2671 - Wildlife Trust for  
Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire,  
Northamptonshire & Peterborough

Support

Support noted.

---

**Decision on CS66 Biodiversity - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into policy in Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS67 River Valleys - Preferred Approach</i>				
3514 - Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Object	The approach should recognise that impacts may arise in meeting other policy objectives. These may involve relocation of the Cambridge wastewater treatment works.	The LDF policies are not mutually exclusive and should be used in conjunction with each other. It is noted that meeting some policy objectives may impact upon others, therefore it is a question of balance.	
4613 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	This option is unnecessary as the intent is covered by other environmental options.	Relative to the arable farmland that is the predominant land use in the district, river valleys provide varied habitats and support a wealth of biodiversity. The importance of River Valleys in this regard merits the inclusion of a policy in the Core Strategy DPD.	
4294 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 11.9  Add, - "The removal of riparian vegetation which provides shading and food sources, protects river banks and filters pollutants."	Agree.	Add bullet point to paragraph 11.9, to read as follows: "The removal of riparian vegetation which provides shading and food sources, protects river banks and filters pollutants".
6538 - Conservators of the River Cam (Land North of the Cam, Fen Road, Cambridge)	Object	Recreational and other pressures on the Cam in Cambridge are growing and will continue to grow. Although the City Council will probably introduce a mooring policy for the Commons, the number of residents houseboats will likely continue to rise. Space needs to be found for an off river mooring site. The Council is asked to recognise this need and designate the following site for this purpose.	Allocating land in the Cambridge Green Belt for the development of a large marina would be contrary to policy. The approach in Local Plan 2004 (Policy RT13) has been to permit additional moorings through the provision of cuts. Such an approach is more in keeping with the sensitivity of the location and should continue.	Roll forward Local Plan 2004 Policy RT13.
4295 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3906 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team 5593 2674 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 4645 - Grantchester Parish Council	Support	Support.	Support noted.	



---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*District Council's Assessment*

*Approach to Draft DPD*

---

**Decision on CS67 River Valleys - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into policy in Core Strategy, as modified. Roll forward Local Plan 2004 Policy RT13 on the River Cam.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS68 Flood Risk - Preferred Approach</i>				
1837 - Boxworth Parish Meeting	Object	This is not really an objection, but I have not seen any where a reference to flooding as a natural and in many ways beneficial process, from the point of view of biodiversity, and equally in the sense that a flood plain is a giant sponge, which can absorb seasonal excess, and sustain life in drought.	Agree that flooding can in some circumstances be a beneficial process and acknowledge the role that flooding has in terms of biodiversity. However, it is considered that it would be more appropriate to mention the beneficial role that flooding can play, and the ecological importance of the flood plain, in the Biodiversity Action Plan than in the Core Strategy DPD. The role of the floodplain in sustaining life in times of drought is not of direct relevance to the district.	Include reference to the role of flooding and floodplains in fostering biodiversity in the Biodiversity Action Plan.
3592 - GO-East	Object	The wording of this preferred approach ('Planning permission would not be granted where the site is liable to flooding...') does not appear to be consistent with policy in PPG25, which requires a more detailed sequential approach to assessment of flood risk and the degree to which different types of development might be acceptable.  The final submission DPD should better reflect national policy in PPG25.	Agree that policy should be constructed to be more consistent with PPG25, which requires a sequential approach to development utilising flood zones. Paragraph 30 states that, "When allocating land in development plans or deciding applications for development at any particular location, those responsible for the decision would be expected to demonstrate that there are no reasonable options available in a lower-risk category, consistent with other sustainable development objectives."	Revise policy to include reference to a risk based approach, based on a sequential approach to development, utilising flood zones information.
3680 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Land identified by the Environment Agency as being at moderate risk (or higher) of flooding should be excluded from development in order to reduce vulnerability to climate change, and unpredictable implications downstream and in the vicinity. The precautionary principle should apply.	Whilst it is agreed that a risk based approach to flood risk is required, as put forward in PPG25, a sequential approach to development must be utilised based on the flood zones. This does not go so far as excluding land at moderate risk or higher from any development.	
3855 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)	Object	The preferred approach needs clarification that mitigation relates to sites that are liable to flooding.	A site might not itself be liable to flooding, but if its development would increase flood risk elsewhere, it should still be required to mitigate those effects.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4290 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Chapters 9 &amp; 11</p> <p>Suggest that Flooding and Sustainable Drainage sit more naturally in Chapter 9 Natural Environment rather than Chapter 11.</p> <p>Both chapters 9 &amp; 11 cover biodiversity - the latter contains specific Preferred Approaches - perhaps better to entitle 'Protecting South Cambridgeshire's Landscapes AND BIODIVERSITY'</p>	<p>Agree partly. Agree that Chapter 11 Protecting South Cambridgeshire's Landscapes should be retitled Protecting South Cambridgeshire's Landscapes and Biodiversity. The brief Natural Environment Chapter has a broad scope and objectives (addresses climate change) and serves partly as an introduction to the 3 chapters that follow it (Energy, Landscapes, and the Cultural Heritage) which contain more specific policies. Flooding and Sustainable Drainage have strong linkages to both landscape and biodiversity therefore in view of purpose of Chapter 9 consider that Chapter 11 is an appropriate place for policies addressing these issues.</p>	<p>Amend title of Chapter 11 to  <input type="checkbox"/> Protecting South Cambridgeshire's Landscapes and Biodiversity<input type="checkbox"/>.</p>
4296 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Para 11.13</p> <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should be adopted as a supplementary planning document.</p>	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will form part of the evidence base for the LDF. Advice will be sought as to whether it should become a supplementary planning document.</p>	
4667 - Environment Agency	Object	<p>Policy should be included in core strategy to cover issues of flood risk and surface water drainage. Should stipulate requirement for flood risk assessments to be undertaken for proposed development sites and appropriate drainage strategies be drawn up.</p>	<p>The requirement for a flood risk assessment as part of planning applications is detailed in paragraph 60 of PPG25. It is the intention of Local Development Frameworks to avoid repetition of policy where possible, and not unnecessarily repeat content of national guidance.</p>	
5282 - Swavesey IDB	Object	<p>Policy generally meets boards approval but implies: Flooding generally a result of failure of main river defences; The EA will be consulted on proposals in or adjacent to the floodplain; the catchment approach promoted in PPG25 is not being adopted.</p> <p>It fails to recognise the management of land drainage / surface water disposal / flood defences is not just limited to EA, but includes other operating authorities such as IDBs and the Council. Policy should be applied on a catchment basis as flooding can be caused by many factors, and can occur in any area and not just floodplain.</p>	<p>Agree that flooding must be considered on a river catchment area basis, and it is not simply a concern in known flood risk areas. The Environment Agency may be consulted on applications not in or adjacent to the floodplain, if flooding issues may arise.</p>	<p>Ensure the LDF reflects the river catchment area approach detailed in PPG25.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5669 - Gallagher Waterbeach Limited	Object	The LDF should incorporate the most up to date information available in relation to indicative floodplains. Where there are sites that are situated in the indicative floodplain development should not be automatically precluded unless it is demonstrated that there would be a negative consequential impact. Therefore, any site within the indicative floodplain should be subject to detailed investigation as part of any planning application to examine actual flood risks and impacts.	Agree that the most up to date flooding information available should be used in the LDF. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is currently being prepared by the Council. The policy will utilise the sequential approach to flooding, and the risk based approach, as detailed in PPG25.	
3147	Support	The second bullet needs to be expanded to include areas within the catchment (upstream also) where discharge volume and run off rate may have the effect of extending flooded area on watercourses with low gradient. The last paragraph should be expanded ensure thorough scrutiny of any alleviation measures by all consultant agencies and authorities.	Agree that there is logic to amending the second bullet point of the preferred option. The second point is not suitable for a planning policy.	Amend second bullet point to state 'Increase of flood risk in other areas due to additional water run-off.'
6497 - The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards 5594 3309 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust 2679 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 5497 - The Fairfield Partnership 5704 - Freshwater Estates Ltd. (Land at 41 Mill Lane, Sawston)	Support	General support for this approach.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS68 Flood Risk - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified. In particular revise policy to include reference to a risk based approach, based on a sequential approach to development, utilising flood zones information, to better reflect PPG25.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS69 Sustainable Drainage Systems - Preferred Approach*

3691 - House Builders Federation 4614 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The implementation of SUDS and their adoption are processes which involve separate bodies. If the Planning Authority imposes conditions which require developers to provide SUDS, and Local Building Control, Highway Authority and or the Water Company are reluctant to adopt SUDS. It is clear that this will leave developers in a situation where although Planning requirements have been satisfied, the SUDS will not be adopted by water companies and local authorities. The encouragement of SUDS is acceptable but compulsion is not yet endorsed by government policy so the wording should be changed accordingly.	PPG25 does require Local Authorities to encourage the use of sustainable drainage systems. The best way for the Council to achieve this is to require their implementation where ever practicable. Where there are problems restricting their development that can not be overcome, this would mean implementation of a sustainable drainage scheme is not 'practicable' , and should not be required. The preferred option is therefore reasonable.	
4292 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Chapters 9 &amp; 11</p> <p>Suggest that Flooding and Sustainable Drainage sit more naturally in Chapter 9 Natural Environment rather than Chapter 11.</p> <p>Both chapters 9 &amp; 11 cover biodiversity - the latter contains specific Preferred Approaches - perhaps better to entitle 'Protecting South Cambridgeshire's Landscapes AND BIODIVERSITY'</p>	<p>Agree partly. Agree that Chapter 11 Protecting South Cambridgeshire's Landscapes should be retitled Protecting South Cambridgeshire's Landscapes and Biodiversity. The brief Natural Environment Chapter has a broad scope and objectives (addresses climate change) and serves partly as an introduction to the 3 chapters that follow it (Energy, Landscapes, and the Cultural Heritage) which contain more specific policies. Flooding and Sustainable Drainage have strong linkages to both landscape and biodiversity therefore in view of purpose of Chapter 9 consider that Chapter 11 is an appropriate place for policies addressing these issues.</p>	Amend title of Chapter 11 to "Protecting South Cambridgeshire's Landscapes and Biodiversity".

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4297 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Para 11.19</p> <p>Water recycling and biodiversity</p> <p>Balancing of water recycling so there is no adverse impact on biodiversity should not impose unnecessary limits on water recycling.</p> <p>Requirements for water conservation should be included in the policy on sustainable development proposed in CS14</p>	<p>Whilst requirements of biodiversity may not unduly limit potential for water recycling, the issue must still be addressed to ensure this is the case. Agree that requirements for water conservation should be cross referred to in the policy on sustainable development.</p>	<p>Cross refer to policy on water conservation in the Sustainable Development policy.</p>
4668 - Environment Agency	Object	<p>'Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems' should be replaced by 'Sustainable Drainage Systems'.</p>	<p>Agree. PPG 25 refers to Sustainable Drainage Systems.</p>	<p>Amend references to "Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems" to "Sustainable Drainage Systems".</p>
4672 - Environment Agency	Object	<p>Include a water conservation policy, similar to CE81 of the Cambridge East AAP.</p>	<p>CS69 and CS81 are both seeking appropriate water conservation measures from new development. It is agreed that a policy is required in the Core Policies, building on the preferred option.</p>	
<p>3903 - English Nature, Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Team</p> <p>3409 - English Partnerships</p> <p>2681 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire &amp; Peterborough</p> <p>5495 - The Fairfield Partnership</p>	Object	<p>Support for this approach, and incorporation of sustainable drainage systems at the earliest possible stage of a development.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6219 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>Gallagher believes that CS69 is premature and unrealistic in apparently seeking funding commitments for schemes whose technical and financial viability remains to be determined. Full account needs to be taken of technology, maintenance, viability and commercial and consumer considerations</p> <p>It is suggested that a greater degree of flexibility is required to allow water conservation measures to be encouraged as part of an overall strategy for land drainage and water management within which scope for water recycling is determined and fully explored.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to predetermine the most effective drainage and water management strategy by requiring particular water conservation measures and developer funding for such measures at the outset. A revised wording is proposed (see main text).</p>	<p>The preferred option makes clear that the first choice for drainage will be through a sustainable drainage system. There will be occasions where water conservation measures and sustainable drainage systems are not practicable, possibly for reasons suggested in the representation. Where it is shown that a system is not practicable, alternatives can be sought.</p>	
6498 - The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards	Object	<p>The boards are concerned that such systems are maintained in perpetuity by a competent authority at the expense of the developer.</p>	<p>Whilst policy can require appropriate future maintenance agreements, the exact requirements are an issue for the implementation stage at the time of a planning application.</p>	
3144	Support	<p>Support is qualified by the need to re-word this section to clearly specify the need to investigate ground water migration and percolation properties particularly for large developments and the overriding condition applied to all permissions for ongoing adoption and maintenance of porous areas and piped systems.</p>	<p>Sustainable drainage systems would be developed in consultation with the Environment Agency where appropriate, to determine allowable rates of run-off. Appropriate maintenance of systems would be secured through section 46 agreements.</p>	
2899 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Support	<p>A quantifiable assessment of the likely impact of a development on existing drainage systems should be adopted.</p>	<p>Where required such considerations would be made through a flood risk assessment.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4391 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Para 11.17 &amp; CS69 The District's proposed approach is generally supported. The negative comments on SUDS in the SA/SEA are unjustified. The Environment Agency is developing policy which includes objectives of SUDS in managing surface and groundwater regimes sustainably. It would be appropriate for these objectives to be included in the Core Strategy, expanding on those objectives already identified in the supporting text for CS69. The complete list of objectives in the Environment Agency's revised draft policy (EAS/0102/1/3) is:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reducing flood risk from development within a river catchment;</li> <li>- Minimising diffuse pollution arising from surface water runoff;</li> <li>- Minimising environmental damage, e.g. bank erosion and damage to habitats</li> <li>- Maintaining or restoring the natural flow regime of the receiving watercourse;</li> <li>- Maintaining recharge to groundwater subject to minimising the risk of pollution to groundwater;</li> <li>- Achieving environmental enhancements, including improvement to wildlife habitats, amenity and landscape quality;</li> <li>- Minimising the amount of surface water runoff and infiltration entering foul and surface water sewerage systems.</li> </ul>	<p>General support noted. Agree it is appropriate to cross refer to the Environment Agency's policy of sustainable drainage systems, as a source of further information on their implementation. However, it is unnecessary to repeat the objectives in the LDF.</p>	<p>Cross refer to Environment Agency policy on sustainable drainage systems.</p>
5246 - Swavesey IDB	Support	<p>The board would support the use of SuDS where possible, but care needs to be taken concerning the system being used. It is noted that developers will be required to fund such schemes, control run off and provide adequate maintenance procedures by entering an agreement with your council. This attitude would be encouraged but may be difficult to achieve in the longterm.</p>	<p>Support noted. Concerns over maintenance must be addressed through implementation.</p>	



---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*District Council's Assessment*

*Approach to Draft DPD*

---

**Decision on CS69 Sustainable Drainage Systems - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

*CS70 Lighting Proposals - Preferred Approach*

2684 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Object	The Wildlife Trust generally supports the preferred approach, however, we believe that biodiversity should be specifically mentioned in the third bullet point after countryside	Specific reference to biodiversity is unnecessary given the other criteria of the preferred option.	
3681 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Should include: -minimise light pollution (e.g. by requiring minimal impact outside of the curtilage of the individual properties etc.) -should require usage of energy efficient lighting technologies	By virtue of the first two bullet points in the preferred option, light pollution will effectively be minimised. It would be superfluous to refer to this requirement in a specific bullet point. Energy efficiency policies detailed elsewhere in the Core Policies will apply to development proposals, therefore including lighting schemes.	
5638 - Arrington Parish Council	Object	The guideline that speaks of no light spillage above the horizontal fails to take account of the local topography. The s cambs area has relatively light tree cover which means that horizontal light spillage travels further than in areas with denser tree cover. High level floodlighting of sports areas can cause particular problems.	This issue is covered by the requirement to avoid adverse impact on surrounding properties and the countryside. Appropriate measures may include use of planning conditions to limit the hours of use.	
4709 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Objection is raised to the wording of the fourth bullet point. This should preclude unacceptable distraction because "no distraction" is probably impossible.	Disagree, it is important that lighting schemes do not cause danger to road users, therefore no distraction is appropriate.	
6220 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Given the major developments proposed within South Cambridgeshire it is unrealistic to expect that external lighting will have no adverse impact on neighbouring properties or on the surrounding countryside.  It is suggested that CS70 should refer to a requirement that new developments demonstrate that any light spillage above the horizontal and any impacts on surrounding properties and the countryside are minimised rather than avoided totally.	Whilst it may be true that impact is unavoidable, the policy should retain the requirement to avoid adverse impact. As part of new external lighting schemes, appropriate measures should be taken to avoid adverse impact. For example these measures could include planning conditions limiting time of use of flood lighting.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5595 2901 - Steeple Morden Parish Council 6464 - The Countryside Agency	Support	Support noted.	
--	---------	----------------	--

---

**Decision on CS70 Lighting Proposals - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

## *Chapter 12. The Cultural Heritage*

### *CS71 Cultural Heritage Objectives - Preferred Approach*

4298 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	"To protect, preserve and enhance the archaeological heritage" - this would be more appropriate wording and would be in accordance with the current Local Plan.	Agree.	Amend wording of second bullet point to read "to protect, preserve and enhance the archaeological heritage".
2764 1499 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	The value of public rights of way has been overlooked	Agree.	Amend the first bullet point of CS71 to read "to protect historic landscapes and rights of way"
5596 2902 - Steeple Morden Parish Council 4615 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS71 Cultural Heritage Objectives - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD***CS72 Historic Landscapes - Preferred Approach*

3792 - English Heritage	Object	Historic landscapes, paras 12.3 and 12.4, and policy CS72. The text should be expanded to refer to the Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database held by the county, and its value in defining the evolution of the landscape. This provides an important tool for enhancement of areas where landscape features have been lost, and can help new development reflect local distinctiveness and past patterns of development. Policy CS72 should also be expanded to promote the use of HLC.	Agree that reference should be made to Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Characterisation database in this section.	Add the following sentence to paragraph 12.4 "The Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape database, developed by the County Council, provides a valuable tool in defining the evolution of landscape and in identifying historic landscapes. Regard will be had to the database in determining whether proposals would have an adverse impact on historic landscapes."
3863 - The Woodland Trust	Object	The Trust welcomes and supports the identification of woodlands as part of the historic landscape and the need to protect both designated and non-designated sites and features.  The Trust also supports the need to identify and protect "parkland as an is an important landscape feature", which may or may not be included in English Heritage's Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Interest. We also support the creation of a new Supplementary Planning Document which will identify locally important parks and gardens. The Trust would, however, strongly recommend including ancient trees within this new Supplementary Planning Document. This is based on both the significant value of ancient trees and will conform to Consultation draft Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.	Agree.	Include guidance on ancient trees and woodlands in the Supplementary Planning Document addressing parks and gardens.
872 - The National Trust 5597 4616 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support		Support noted.	

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*District Council's Assessment*

*Approach to Draft DPD*

---

**Decision on CS72 Historic Landscapes - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Policies, as modified.

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD***CS73 Areas of Archaeological Heritage - Preferred Approach*

3793 - English Heritage	Object	<p>Archaeology, paras 12.6-12.9, and policy CS73 The last sentence of para 12.6 is rather confused, and implies it is sufficient to demonstrate that preservation in situ is not feasible. However, this depends on the merits of the remains. We suggest the following amended wording: `Only where the benefit of development clearly outweighs the case for in-situ preservation, and it is clearly demonstrated that in-situ preservation is not feasible, would it be acceptable to preserve by excavation and recording of finds'. Para 12.9 should refer to desk top assessment as the first stage of assessment. Policy CS73 The policy should be broadened to cover strong protection of nationally important archaeological sites and their settings, and protection of other sites depending on the nature of development and the merits of the remains.</p>	<p>Agree that wording of paragraph 12.6 could be clearer and agree to the proposed changes. Consider that SC73 does not need to be broadened to include the strong protection of nationally important archaeological sites, as their importance is acknowledged in paragraphs 12.7 and 12.8. Do not consider it necessary to include desk-top based assessment as the first stage of assessment in paragraph 12.9, as it is considered that developers will carry this out as a matter of course. PPG 16 emphasises the need for early need for consultation between developers and planning authorities and states that the first step in an assessment carried out by developers should be to contact the County Archaeological Officer.</p>	<p>Reword the last sentence of paragraph 12.6 to read "Only where the development clearly outweighs the need for in-situ preservation, and it is clearly demonstrated that in-situ preservation is not feasible, would it be acceptable to preserve by excavation and recording of finds."</p>
4300 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Para 12.6</p> <p>There are two concerns with the wording of this paragraph:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Feasibility of preservation in situ as part of a development proposal should not be a consideration if archaeological remains of sufficient importance as to require preservation in situ have been identified.</li> <li>- Requirements for preservation by record should include provision for analysis and dissemination of results, not just recording of finds.</li> </ul>	<p>Agree. Amend wording to that proposed by representation 3793.</p>	<p>Reword the last sentence of paragraph 12.6 to read "Only where the development clearly outweighs the need for in-situ preservation, and it is clearly demonstrated that in-situ preservation would not be feasible, would it be acceptable to preserve by excavation and recording of finds."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4302 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	More appropriate wording would be as follows: - "Where it is deemed that there is archaeological potential, the developer would be required to commission an archaeological evaluation to define the locations, extent, character, condition, significance and quality of any remains. This would include an assessment of the impact of the development on the resource and enable an informed judgement to be made on appropriate mitigation strategies".	Agree. Amend wording as suggested.	Amend wording of CS73 to read "Where it is deemed that there is archaeological potential, the developer would be required to commission in an archaeological evaluation to define the locations, extent, character, condition, significance and quality of any remains. This would include an assessment of the impact of the development on the resource and enable an informed judgement to be made on appropriate mitigation strategies."



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5494 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Object to CS73 which is too onerous and should be amended to accord with PPG16.	The developer is only expected to carry out an assessment once the likely archaeological potential on the site has been determined in consultations with the County Archaeological Officer. The archaeological evaluation required by CS73 is also a requirement of the Adopted Local Plan 2004 Policy EN15. The supporting text to this policy states that "Where it is considered by the District Council, following consultation with the County Development Control Archaeological Officer, that there may be archaeological potential in a site, the developer will be required to commission an archaeological evaluation to define the character and condition of any archaeological remains. Such an evaluation will include information on the character and depth of the deposits, and the impact of development upon those remains together with any mitigation measures to avoid unnecessary damage to archaeological remains." (para 10.47, Local Plan 2004). The approach taken in para 10.47 is almost identical to that set out in the CS73. Policy EN15 and paragraph 10.47 of the Adopted Plan have been subject to scrutiny by an independent inspector, during the course of the Local Plan Review, and were found to be reasonable policies. PPG16 has not been revised since the Inspector reached his conclusions, therefore the approach taken in both Policy EN15 and para 10.47 of the Adopted Plan and in CS73 remains valid.	
6221 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The second sentence of CS73 in setting out the archaeological evaluation should take appears to represent a level of detail that is best addressed in discussions with the County Council Archaeological Unit.	Whilst it is agreed that early discussion should take place with the County's Archaeological Officer (CAO), it is important that requirements of developers are made clear in a policy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1839 - Boxworth Parish Meeting	Support	Recent archaeology in our village , SE of Church Farm leads us to conclude that the old settlement site in the small fields adjoining need formal protection. We strongly support this policy.	Support noted. Scheduled Ancient Monuments are designated by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport with English Heritage providing an advisory role.	
2670	Support	The words in paragraph 12.9: "Prospective developers should contact the County Council's Archaeological Unit..." should be replaced by: "Prospective developers should contact the County Council's Archaeological Officer..." - The County's Field Unit is a trading arm of the Council - Directing prospective developers to the County's Field Unit is unfair to independent archaeological units - The County's Archaeological Officer (CAO) should be the first point of contact for prospective developers (PPG16, paragraph 19)	Support noted. Agree that text should refer to the County Council's Archaeological Officer and not to the "County Council's Archaeological Unit".	In paragraph 12.9 replace "Prospective developers should contact the County Council's Archaeological Unit" with "Prospective developers should contact the County Council's Archaeological Officer".
5598 4617 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support		Support noted.	
4301 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Para 12.9  The County Sites and Monuments Record has been renamed as the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record and holds information on finds, sites and landscapes of importance to the historic environment.	Noted.	Replace first sentence of paragraph 12.9 to read "The Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record, held by the County Council, gives information on archaeological sites and monuments".

#### **Decision on CS73 Areas of Archaeological Heritage - Preferred Approach**

Develop preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*District Council's Assessment*

*Approach to Draft DPD*

---

*CS74 Listed Buildings - Preferred Approach*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1840 - Boxworth Parish Meeting	Support	It would be interesting to define the broader setting of some Listed Buildings. For instance in our village the Golden Ball, Cuckoo Pastures and the Church and Church farm all enjoy some degree of protection from close development, notably to rural frontages, but the idea of wind turbines rotating outside their windows is apparently acceptable to some planners.	No precise definition of what constitutes the broader setting of a Listed Building is set out in PPG 15 Planning and The Historic Environment. However, paragraph 2.17 of the PPG states: "Local planning authorities are required under section 67 of the Act to publish a notice of all applications they receive for planning permission for any development which, in their opinion, affects the setting of a listed building. This provision should not be interpreted too narrowly: the setting of a building may be limited to obviously ancillary land, but may often include land some distance from it. Even where a building has no ancillary land - for example in a crowded urban street - the setting may encompass a number of other properties. The setting of individual listed buildings very often owes its character to the harmony produced by a particular grouping of buildings (not necessarily all of great individual merit) and to the quality of the spaces created between them. Such areas require careful appraisal when proposals for development are under consideration, even if the redevelopment would only replace a building which is neither itself listed nor immediately adjacent to a listed building. Where a listed building forms an important visual element in a street, it would probably be right to regard any development in the street as being within the setting of the building. A proposed high or bulky building might also affect the setting of a listed building some distance away, or alter views of a historic skyline. In some cases, setting can only be defined by a historical assessment of a building's surroundings. If there is doubt about the precise extent of a building's setting, it is better to publish a notice." It is clear from this that the wider setting of the listed building can include land which is some distance from the building which is listed. It is not practical to define the broader setting of Listed Buildings in the LDF,	

***Representations******Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD***

as the physical extent of the setting of a listed building is, as PPG 15 makes clear, a facet that varies from site to site according to local circumstance.

2903 - Steeple Morden Parish Council

Support

Good. The scale of any extension in relation to the original building is also important, of course.

Agree that the scale of the extension is an important factor in determining the overall effect that the extension has upon the building. However consider that there is no need for the policy to specifically mention the scale of the extensions as being a factor.

3794 - English Heritage  
5599

Support

4618 - Bayer CropScience Ltd

Support noted.

**Decision on CS74 Listed Buildings - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

***Representations******Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD******CS75 Conservation Areas - Preferred Approach***

3879 - Network Rail (Town Planning Team)

Object

Whilst Network Rail appreciates the intentions of this policy, there are concerns over potential conflict with the general maintenance, renewal and improvement of the operational railway. Network Rail make every effort to locate its development appropriately but there are sometimes circumstances when, in the interest of a safe and efficient rail network, it will be necessary to site development in sensitive locations. This policy is stricter than that which deals with Listed Buildings. The listed building policy at least allows the merits of an alternative scheme to be taken into account. This flexibility should be mirrored in this policy as well.

Network Rail requests that the rail corridors are removed from the designation or the policy should acknowledge that development in these locations for essential infrastructure can be appropriate if it is shown that there are no alternative locations and the development has a wider benefit that outweighs the impact on the immediate area.

The requirements of infrastructure providers are acknowledged.

PPG15 paragraph 4.19 states'...planning decisions in respect of development proposed to be carried out in a conservation area must give a high priority to the objective of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. If any proposed development would conflict with that objective, there will be a strong presumption against the grant of planning permission, though in exceptional cases the presumption may be overridden in favour of development which is desirable on the ground of some other public interest.'

It is unnecessary to incorporate such an exception in the policy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3604 - GO-East	Object	If the detailed appraisals of Conservation Areas referred to here are to be prepared under the provisions of section 71 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 then we consider that it may be unnecessary to adopt them as SPD as proposed. As matters required by planning legislation it is not necessary to adopt such appraisals in another format provided for by other statutory planning powers, unless specific and clear justification is provided for doing so (through the process of preparing a Local Development Scheme). It would, however, be appropriate to cross-refer to them within a submission DPD and to indicate their status and function, if appropriate, for development control purposes.	Noted. The Council will consider as to whether the detailed appraisals of Conservation Areas should be adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents.	Consider whether it is necessary to adopt detailed appraisals of Conservation Areas as SPD.
3795 - English Heritage	Object	Conservation Areas, Paras 12.16-12.18, and policy CS75. The policy framework should cover proposals resulting in demolition of buildings in conservation areas, and the presumption in favour of retaining buildings which contribute to their character and appearance. This would be consistent with the coverage of listed buildings in the preceding section. The first sentence of CS75 should probably be in the text rather than policy, since it is largely administrative.	The issues of demolition of buildings in Conservation Areas, and the presumption in favour of retaining buildings which contribute to their character and appearance, will be addressed in the Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document. In legal terms the act of demolition is included within the definition of development as set out in the Town and Country Planning Act 2004, thus any demolition proposals in Conservation Areas would be subject to the provisions of CS75.	
5062 - Whittlesford Parish Council (Proposed changes to Whittlesford Conservation Area)	Object	Amend Whittlesford Conservation Area to that shown.	Conservation Areas are not designated through the LDF process. The proposed change to Whittlesford Conservation Area will be referred to the District Council's conservation section.	Refer proposed change to Whittlesford Conservation Area to Conservation section.
6339 - Boxworth Parish Meeting (Proposed Conservation area, Boxworth)	Object	The area indicated should be designated a conservation area.	Conservation Areas are not designated through the LDF process. The proposed change to Boxworth Conservation Area will be referred to the District Council's conservation section.	Refer representation to the Conservation Section.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1841 - Boxworth Parish Meeting	Support	There is an existing Conservation Area in our village around the Church and church farm. In our view this needs to be extended to include the old settlement site. This policy OUGHT to protect our conservation area from the construction of a massive windfarm 600 metres distant!	The impact of a windfarm upon the Conservation Area in Boxworth will be taken into account at the planning application stage. At present the Conservation Area in Boxworth does not cover the Church and Church Farm, both of which lie outside the Village Framework.	
2904 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Support	Perhaps add traffic movements?	Traffic movements are one of many factors that can have an effect on the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. To detail all these factors is beyond the scope of the Core Strategy Document. However, the SPD on development in Conservation Areas should contain guidance concerning the impact that change in traffic movements can have Conservation Areas.	Include guidance in SPD relating to traffic movements in Conservation Areas.
5600 4619 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support		Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS75 Conservation Areas - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

*CS76 Protected Village Amenity Areas - Preferred Approach*

2486	Object	Existing PVAA in Mill Lane (Mill Lane recreation ground) should be extended to protect the orchard bordering it on the East. Reason: Although this land is in private ownership it makes an important contribution to the setting of Mill Lane recreation ground including a belt of well established trees along the Eastern Boundary of the recreation ground.	Whilst the tree belt contributes to the setting of the recreation ground, the site itself does not meet the requirements of a PVAA.	
5075 - Whittlesford Parish Council (Proposed PVAA, Scotts Gardens, Whittlesford)	Object	Create new PVAA as shown, to prevent development on this site.	This site does not sufficiently meet the definition of a PVAA, given its dimensions and character.	
3140 4620 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Policy will lead to confusion as details of how the environmental qualities will be measured are not elaborated and so the weight to be attached to the policies is entirely unclear. Wording should be strengthened.	The PVAAs are designated because of their contribution to character, amenity, tranquillity or functioning of the village. The weight to be attached to the policy, in protecting them from development that would have an adverse impact on those qualities, is strong and clear.	
4891 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Land in Litlington PVAA)	Object	Policy CS76 is too inflexible and does not adequately allow for developments which can positively enhance these amenity areas. In this site in Litlington a small scale development could help frame the Green while ensuring its amenity is preserved and enhanced.	The openness of the site contributes significantly to the character and amenity of the village, reflecting its designation as a PVAA. Development on the site could diminish the amenity provided by the site. It would be inappropriate to build in additional flexibility to the policy, as by definition this would imply permitting development that would have an adverse impact.	
5231 - Great Abington Parish Council (Grassed area at Magna Close, Great Abington) 5291	Object	The grassed area at Magna Close, Great Abington should be designated a PVAA.	Agree, the site provides sufficient amenity to the village to warrant designation.	Include land at Magna Close Great Abington as a PVAA.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5899 - D H Barford & Co	Object	POlicy in Local Plan 2004 specifically refers to protection of identified are itself. Proposal seeks to extend the protection to include the development of land adjacent to identified areas and introduces uncertainty with regard to adjoining land that may or may not be capable of development. For clarity and certainty the PVAA's should be enlarged to incorporate all the land the Council is seeking to protect.	Protected Village Amenity Areas should only cover the open area they are intending to protect. It is important however, that the potential impact of surrounding development proposals on a PVAA is considered, in order that they are provided appropriate protection.	
-------------------------	--------	--	---	--

---

5601 6465 - The Countryside Agency	Support		Support noted.	
---------------------------------------	---------	--	----------------	--

---

**Decision on CS76 Protected Village Amenity Areas - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy. Amend PVAA designations as detailed.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS77 Important Countryside Frontages - Preferred Approach*

4621 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	These options will lead to confusion as details of how the environmental qualities will be measured are not elaborated and so the weight to be attached to the policies is entirely unclear.	It is not possible to define a workable system of assessment to quantify the effect a particular countryside frontage has on a village's setting, character and appearance. Important Countryside Frontages will be designated on a site-by-site basis where it is considered that the site fulfils one or more of the purposes set out in CS77. This approach is endorsed in the Inspector's Report to the Local Plan 2004 at paragraphs 2.61-2.62.	
4885 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department	Object	CS77 (Important Countryside Frontages) is objected to as it provides unnecessary additional protection, especially given the already stringent nature of countryside policies. This designation may be used to prevent development, which would be acceptable in providing a logical connection between two parts of a village framework and which would otherwise constitute acceptable infill development.	The policy on important countryside frontages has been subject to scrutiny as part of the recent Local Plan review. With regard to potentially preventing logical connection between two parts of a village, it is logical that the character and qualities of the village are protected by keeping areas of the village separate where appropriate.	
5997 (Land NW of 11 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford)	Object	All Important Countryside Frontages proposed to be carried forward from the Local Plan should be reassessed to see if the designation remains appropriate in the light of criteria in CS77. It is considered the ICF on our client's land where it fronts Cambridge Road, Great Shelford is inappropriate.	This frontage meets the criteria proposed in the preferred option, in particular allowing the countryside to sweep into the built up area. The policy on important countryside frontages has been subject to scrutiny as part of the recent Local Plan review. There is no evidence to suggest sites no longer perform the function they were designated for.	

---

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5943	Object	All Important Countryside Frontages proposed to be carried forward from the Local Plan should be reassessed to see if the designation remains appropriate in the light of criteria in CS77. It is considered the ICF on our client's land at Home End, Fulbourn is inappropriate.	The Important Countryside Frontage was designated in the Deposit Local Plan 1999. The Inspector's Report into the Local Plan, with reference to the site in question, states as follows: □ This is a small area of neglected land between the village hall and some scout huts. The objectors request the allocation of land for development and the removal of the designation □ Important Countryside Frontage (ICF) □. However, in my view the undeveloped nature of the objection site contributes to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. The land affords views towards the recreation ground and the rural area beyond, this justifying the ICF designation. In my view there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant removal of the site from the Green Belt. □ There has been no change in circumstances with regard to the views afforded from the line of the Important Countryside Frontage to the nearby recreation ground and fields, and it is therefore considered that the ICF designation remains valid.	
1846 - Boxworth Parish Meeting (Proposed Important Countryside Frontages, Boxworth)	Support	Such frontages add enormous character to small rural communities, and avoid the predictability of endless infill development, making villages into linear ribbons of conurbation.  Boxworth Parish Meeting are most anxious to preserve our existing Countryside frontages, and would like, in the right place, to propose two new ones, at Elsworth Road and north of the village.	The sites proposed do not meet the criteria of the policy as described in the preferred option.	
2251 - Gamlingay Parish Council 1388 - Gamlingay Parish Council 5602 6466 - The Countryside Agency	Support	Support expressed for CS77.	Support noted.	

---

**Decision on CS77 Important Countryside Frontages - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

## *Chapter 13. Travel*

### *CS78 Travel Objectives - Preferred Approach*

2613 - East of England Development Agency	Object	Fifth bullet point - "adequate" should be removed. High and Good Quality Public Transport needs to be defined more adequately. Text on real time data shouldn't imply only at bus stops. No reference is made in the document to motorcycling - this should be rectified.	Agree. Remove "adequate" from 5th bullet point, as it is unnecessary. Although a definition of HQPT and GQPT was included it didn't go into too much detail as these are contained in the Structure Plan and Local Transport Plan. There are no references to motorcyclists.	Remove "adequate" from 5th bullet point. Define HQPT and GQPT in the Glossary. Add text to explain "all" at bullet 9 refers to all people, and includes motorcyclists.
3495 - Royal Mail Group	Object	RMG generally supports principles of sustainable development and sustainable modes of travel. RMG has statutory obligation as delivery service, necessitating range of travel modes. Policy needs to be flexible to reflect role of essential service providers. This is especially important for the Area Action Plans.	Noted. Encouraging modal shift to sustainable modes does not preclude the use of motor vehicles.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3881 - Network Rail (Town Planning Team)	Object	<p>Given that the guided bus will play a prominent role in serving the new town and development to the south of Cambridge, the Core Strategy should include a policy safeguarding the route, setting out its funding arrangements and addressing its impact upon Cambridge Station.</p> <p>A significant proportion of the guided bus customers will use the route to access Cambridge City Centre and Cambridge Station. Cambridge Station, features on Network Rail's 'Congestion List', meaning that capacity has been noted as an issue that warrants further investigation. As a broad approximation the new developments served by the guided bus could result in a further 500 - 1000 people using the station in the morning peak. For a station that is very near to capacity this could have serious implications for safety and the effective operation of the station. A detailed study of station capacity and impact of the guided bus is required. Network Rail has no funds to upgrade Cambridge Station. Developer contributions should be made towards any necessary upgrades to station capacity.</p>	Agree. The old railway trackbed is safeguarded in Local Plan 2004 for Rapid Transit. The LDF should include a policy safeguarding the Rapid Transit route and Chesterton sidings for a station/interchange, as well as requiring developer contributions towards both schemes. The Area Transport Plans SPG, for developments close to Cambridge, already seek developer contributions towards these schemes. District-wide contributions to transport schemes will be sought through CS81.	Roll forward Local Plan 2004 Policy TP3. Add a new policy safeguarding land for Chesterton Station/Interchange.
4369	Object	The failure to use the old railway trackbed through Trumpington for a link road contravenes the objectives in bullet points 10-13.	The old railway trackbed is safeguarded in Local Plan 2004 for Rapid Transit.	Roll forward Local Plan 2004 Policy TP3.
4392 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Would like to see express inclusion of policies to protect and improve the Public Rights of Way network, corresponding to structure plan policies, especially P8/9 Provision of Public Rights of way, but also P4/2 Informal Recreation in the Countryside. CS78 could be an appropriate place for this.	The objective of improving a Right of Way is already addressed in Bullets 4, 5, and 9. However, protection of Rights of Way is governed by other legislation and is not a matter for the LDF. Improving ROW could also be addressed in a separate policy on Walking and Cycling.	Improving Rights of Way should be addressed in a separate policy on Walking and Cycling.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4303 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 13.3  Should recognise that District has powers to divert, create or extinguish not just footpaths, but Public Rights of Way more generally.	Agree. If the references to "footpaths" were changed to "Rights of Way" it would more closely reflect the wider range of infrastructure that the Council has control over.	Change references to "footpaths" to "Rights of Way".
4304 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Third bullet point - suggest deletion of the word "particularly"; as it implies that there could be a focus on modal shift between sustainable modes of travel. Also, add, - "To promote and enhance provision of community transport services - To provide and support measures which give priority to public transport services over other motor traffic, in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P8/6."	Objectives seek to encourage the use of any sustainable mode rather than private cars. It is not considered a problem if this encourages a switch of sustainable mode, for example from bus to cycle. The objectives (bullet 4) already promote sustainable modes and, although Community Transport is not explicitly mentioned here, it is referred to in CS79 as a form of Public Transport. Agree that Community Transport could be added to bullet 4. Public transport priority is not mentioned explicitly in the objectives, but is addressed in bullets 4 and 5 through seeking to make non-car modes more attractive to use and ensuring adequate provision is made for them. This issue is also addressed in more detail in CS79.	Amend bullet 4th bullet to read "To promote the use of more sustainable modes of travel such as public transport, community transport, walking and cycling..."
4706 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Objection is raised to the assumption in bullet point 5 that new development should take place in locations which already have adequate provision for public transport. The wording should be altered to say "or where they can be provided".	Agree. Wording should be amended to recognise the possibility of providing improved public transport to support additional development.	Amend bullet 5 to read "To promote sustainable travel by ensuring new development takes place in locations with, or has the potential for good accessibility by non-car modes..."
4803	Object	Please recognise the folly of creating more commuter and shopping traffic into Cambridge.	The aims of encouraging a shift to sustainable modes of travel and policies governing the location of development should help address this issue.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6222 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The 6th bullet point may be interpreted as implying a further restriction on parking over and above that set out in the standards to be adopted. For clarity it may be helpful to reword the sixth bullet point to refer to the need to restrict the amount of parking in new developments consistent with that set out in the adopted local plan:</p> <p>"To restrict the amount of car parking provided in new developments, in line with the maximum standards proposed, to reduce over-reliance on the car."</p> <p>There would be a similar rewording of paragraph 13.13.</p>	Agree. It should be made clear that car parking should be implemented in accordance with the location and maximum standards.	Amend bullet 6 to read "To minimise the amount of car parking provided in new developments, compatible with its location AND MAXIMUM PARKING STANDARDS, to reduce the over-reliance on the car."
1352	Support	Current views of future transport plans are woefully naive. Guided bus and new Addenbrookes access will be totally insufficient to meet needs. Where is future employment to be located and how served?	Overall strategy of locating development in accessible locations and encouraging sustainable travel will help address these concerns. The Cambridge focus for employment will enable greater modal choice.	
1504 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	Equestrians, as road users, have been overlooked. Please amend 9th bullet to read "To improve personal safety and accessibility for all, including equestrians and those with disabilities"	Agree. There are no references to horse riders.	Add text to explain "all" at bullet 9 refers to all people, and includes equestrians.
1695 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall generally supports the Preferred Approach and its supporting objectives. It should be acknowledged that an urban extension offers a greater opportunity to achieve modal shift than more dispersed policy options.	The 5th bullet encourages development "in locations with good accessibility" and therefore covers this.	
2766	Support	Need to provide for horseriders.	Agree. There are no references to horse riders. References to "footpaths" should be changed to "Rights of Way", which provide a wider range of facilities, some of which horse riders can use.	Change references to "footpaths" to "Rights of Way". Add text to explain "all" at bullet 9 refers to all people, and includes equestrians.



---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

5605 2686 - Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 5493 - The Fairfield Partnership 4622 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support in so far as the objectives mirror those of PPG13.	Support noted.	
---	---------	---	----------------	--

---

**Decision on CS78 Travel Objectives - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified. Also roll forward Local Plan 2004 Policy TP3. Add a new policy safeguarding land for Chesterton Station/Interchange

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS79 Planning for more Sustainable Travel - Preferred Approach*

2658 - FPDSavills	Object	Similar to a number of comments made by FPDSavills in the context of the consultation process, we would again respectfully remind the planning authority that the wording the relevant Circular 1/97 is to encourage and not to require as seems to be the case in the above CS79 The imposition of all these obligations will have serious impacts on development coming forward throughout the District.	CS79 details what developments should be seeking to provide to ensure adequate transport provision is made, such that planning permission can be granted. One of the means of securing this is via S106 and in such instances regard will be had to Circular 1/97 and the tests within it.	
2955	Object	The aim is to encourage sustainable travel. The District Council does not subsidise buses after the initial contribution from developers has ceased. After 19.00 hours and on Sundays the number of commercial bus services in the District is minimal. This is a vague aspiration with no detail as how it is to be met and no past record of action by the District Council	Detailing how developer contributions could subsidise specific bus services would be too prescriptive for all developments. CS70 needs to remain flexible to be applicable to any development situation.	
3496 - Royal Mail Group	Object	RMG generally supports principles of sustainable development and sustainable modes of travel. RMG has statutory obligation as delivery service, necessitating range of travel modes. Policy needs to be flexible to reflect role of essential service providers. This is especially important for the Area Action Plans.	Noted. Encouraging modal shift to sustainable modes does not preclude the use of motor vehicles.	
4307 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Would be helpful to include workplace travel plans secured through the planning process (would help to reinforce CS81)	Travel Plans are already covered in CS81. Another reference to Travel Plans in CS79 would be unnecessary duplication.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5119 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Object	<p>Para 13.17-13.20</p> <p>We note the careful consideration given to cycling provision; yet even in Cambridge there are still more people walking than there are cycling. Thus it is disappointing to find no equivalent section devoted to the needs of those walking to work, or to local facilities and services. The cost of cycleways is surprisingly high: often a short length of roadside footway, with protected crossings at junctions, can provide a safe pedestrian route between centres at a far more modest cost.</p>	Agree. This could be addressed in a separate policy on Walking and Cycling.	Include a separate policy on Walking and Cycling to address these issues.
6223 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The policy refers only to the developer in relation to making adequate provision for non-car modes. Paragraph 22 of PPG13 highlights the need for a partnership response between local authorities, transport providers and operators, developers, businesses and local residents. This is essential to achieving the objectives set out in PPG13. Additional text to emphasise a partnership approach should be included.</p> <p>So as not to imply limitations on car parking over and above those proposed in CS80, CS79 should be modified as follows:</p> <p>"Car parking will be restricted in line with the maximum standards proposed, to reduce over-reliance on the car."</p>	<p>The policy seeks to ensure sustainable modes are not overlooked, whilst ensuring there is not a proliferation of car parking to the detriment of the aims of providing modal choice to enable modal shift. Agree that partnership working is essential to achieving the Travel Objectives and there should be reference to this in the text. Maximum car parking standards allow flexibility over the level of provision. Application of the standards should be in accordance with the characteristics of each location, and not as a blanket provision.</p>	Add text to highlight the importance of partnership working to achieve the Travel Objectives.
1353	Support	BUT who is going to supply the adequate public transport and community transport? On current experience, it is more likely that pigs will fly!	Developer contributions and Cambridgeshire County Council through the Local Transport Plan.	
3411 - English Partnerships	Support	This policy could usefully make reference to the use of travel plans and set out requirements for development to be within walking distance of a public transport corridor, whether its 'high quality' or 'good quality'.	Travel Plans are covered in CS81. Requirements for developments to be within walking distance of public transport corridors is dealt with by the development strategy relating to the location of new development in accessible locations and CS79.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4306 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	<p>Para 13.12</p> <p>The Council welcomes the support for cycling and walking, and for footpaths, bridleways and byways. It would be still better to see support for the footpath, bridleway and byway NETWORK, to reflect user needs for connected rather than isolated routes.</p> <p>The Council welcomes integration of soft transport mode provision, and would suggest that in addition to supporting the provision of access hardware, the LDF should also support the provision of access information, reflecting current good practice. The Council would encourage reference to the LTP constituent Walking Strategy, Cycling Strategy and Rights of Way Improvement Plan in this section.</p>	<p>Agree. This could be addressed in a separate policy on Walking and Cycling, which could include reference to the Local Transport Plan Walking Strategy, Cycling Strategy and Rights of Way Improvement Plan.</p>	<p>Include a separate policy on Walking and Cycling to address these issues.</p>
5114 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group 4086 - Sport England 5480 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 5491 - The Fairfield Partnership 4623 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	<p>Support the approach towards planning for more sustainable travel, by making sure developments take place in locations with good accessibility by non-car modes to facilities and services, and ensuring adequate provision for all transport modes.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	

#### **Decision on CS79 Planning for more Sustainable Travel - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified. Include a separate policy on Walking and Cycling.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS80 Car Parking Standards - Preferred Approach*

2661 - FPD Savills 5489 - The Fairfield Partnership 6224 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	More flexibility needs to be introduced in the application of car parking standards in areas with low and high levels of accessibility.	Maximum standards allow flexibility consistent with the approach set out in PPG13.	
4015 - Imperial War Museum 4624 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support in so far as they provide a realistic approach to parking and the objectives mirror those of PPG13.	Support noted.	

---

**Decision on CS80 Car Parking Standards - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS81 Mitigating Travel Impact - Preferred Approach</i>				
2665 - FPDSavills	Object	Circular advice is clear about encouragement rather than requirement and this should be followed in the Council's approach.	CS79 details what developments should be seeking to provide to ensure adequate transport provision is made, such that planning permission can be granted. One of the means of securing this is via S106 and in such instances regard will be had to Circular 1/97 and the tests within it.	
4308 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 13.16  Second sentence - remove "Wherever possible,". Travel plans should have measurable outputs, target and aims as well as monitoring and enforcement arrangements.	Agree. Travel Plans should always have measurable outputs.	Delete "wherever possible".
6225 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	PPG13 outlines the possible utilisation of planning obligations in securing contributions towards improvements to sustainable transport modes as a means of influencing travel patterns to the site involved. CS81 must stipulate that any planning contribution sought would be in accordance with the 5 tests as set out in Circular 1/97 Planning Obligations.  A minor clarification of CS81 should refer to the need to make provision for improvements in transport infrastructure "where this is a direct consequence of development".	Agree. For clarity, refer to the tests within Circular 1/97.	Add text referring to the tests contained in Circular 1/97.
5895 - D H Barford & Co	Object	This is a means to secure financial contributions from developments in respect of matters that are not directly related to the development or its impact. This policy is unreasonable and contrary to advice in circular 1/97. The aim should be to secure improved transport infrastructure or contributions where this is necessary in order to meet the needs of new development.	Area Transport Plans (SPG) covering the area close to Cambridge set out the principles for securing contributions, and have been tested for reasonableness. CS81 proposes a similar approach for the wider district, in accordance with Circular 1/97.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3412 - English Partnerships	Support	The policy proposal overlaps and largely repeats draft policy CS79, possible opportunity therefore for combining the two into a more effective statement.	Combining CS81 with CS79 would create a long policy and lose clarity. Retention of separate policies on Planning for More Sustainable Travel and Mitigating Travel Impacts is preferable as they have different purposes.	
2906 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Support	Perhaps add to last sentence: "prepared in consultation with local public transport operators." This would ensure it had at least a nodding acquaintance with reality.	Transport Assessments should not be required to involve public transport operators as they detail the likely travel impact of development proposals and Travel Plans may not always include public transport outputs.	
4625 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support in so far as the objectives mirror those of PPG13	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS81 Mitigating Travel Impact - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, as modified.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS82 Cycle Provision Prioritisation - Preferred Option</i>				
873 - The National Trust	Object	Support but would like to see reference to strategic open space in sub-para 1. (changed following phone call 15.11.04)	Access to strategic open space is covered by leisure and recreation.	
3139	Object	I suggest the wording on priorities could be amended to include safe cycling provision within the larger settlements subject to heavy vehicle traffic. Links between settlements should preferably be specified as "segregated" rather than shared with pedestrians where land is available. The emphasis should be on quality rather quantity.	Agree that cycle paths should be a high quality. Traffic calming in villages, for example through the Jointly Funded Minor Highway Improvement Schemes, could reduce traffic speeds and make conditions safer for cycling, particularly in the larger villages. Requirement for segregated paths is too inflexible. This is a design issue for which Cambridgeshire County Council is responsible.	
5603	Object	Providing links between villages and safer routes to school are equally important. Since safer routes to school money comes from Government, funding safer routes does not compromise the Council's ability to support providing links between villages. I would support a compromise CS82 / CS83 giving equal priority to links between villages and safer routes to school.	Noted. CS82 refers to the hierarchy for the delivery of cycle provision through the planning process, for example through Section 106. Safer Routes to School, whilst contributing to the overall aims of improving cycle infrastructure, is already delivered from a separate pot of money. Given that SRtS already has funding from an alternative source, it is considered that prioritising the connection of villages with wider facilities and services (which may also include schools) would supplement SRtS and benefit a wider population.	
4529 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	Should be reference to providing cycle links to and within the new urban extensions, including North West Cambridge. The plan should also contain a policy setting out the standards for cycle parking provision.	Large developments will be required to make adequate provision under CS79 and through detailed Area Action Plans. It is proposed to roll forward Cycle Parking Standards from Local Plan 2004.	Roll forward Local Plan 2004 Cycle Parking Standards.
4311 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Para 13.17  Suggest 'cycleway provision' is changed to 'cycle provision'. This would reflect the wording in CS82/3/4, and be inclusive of possible bridleway provision (with cycle rights) which might otherwise be excluded.	Agree. Change references to "cycleway provision" to "cycle provision" as this reflects the wider infrastructure, including cycle stands/lockers.	Change references to "cycleway provision" to "cycle provision".



<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4312 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Para 13.18</p> <p>Noted that the hierarchy considers utility, safety and recreation, but not healthy exercise. The Council sees this as a significant omission here AND ELSEWHERE WITHIN THE LDF, and would suggest that reference to exercise be included where appropriate.</p>	<p>CS79 Bullet 7 includes reference to promoting a healthy lifestyle through travel choice. By implication, the rest of the Travel Chapter will, by seeking to provide travel choice, address the issue of healthy exercise. Ensure such references are included in the Recreation Chapter, with reference to sports provision.</p>	<p>Ensure there are references to healthy lifestyle in the Recreation Chapter.</p>
2949 6226 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	<p>The alternative option seems to be better value as funds are limited. Preference should be given to the movement of younger people.</p>	<p>Noted. CS82 refers to the hierarchy for the delivery of cycle provision through the planning process, for example through Section 106. Safer Routes to Schools, whilst contributing to the overall aims of improving cycle infrastructure, is already delivered from a separate pot of money. Given that SRTS already has funding from an alternative source, it is considered that prioritising the connection of villages with wider facilities and services (which may also include schools) would supplement SRTS and benefit a wider population.</p>	
1354	Support	<p>BUT current cycle routes are frequently inadequate: sides of roads are uneven with deep depressions around drains; routes along pavements bordering dwellings are dangerous due to possibility of cars exiting; many routes are uneven - sometimes due to lack of maintenance. An example of future problems: cycling across Trumpington to and from the Monsanto and Showground development sites will be highly problematic unless ways are found to avoid the current main road through. More and/or longer traffic lights would help but would also cause even further motor transport congestion.</p>	<p>Noted. This is a design and maintenance issue for which Cambridgeshire County Council is responsible. Large developments will be required to make adequate provision under CS79 and through detailed Area Action Plans.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3416 - English Partnerships	Support	<p>English Partnerships supports the proposed hierarchy of cycle provision and requests that the policy states that large-scale development should offer an appropriate level of cycle facilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>The Local Authority should seek to achieve a balanced provision of external links between large-scale developments and good quality intra settlement links.</p>	Noted. Large developments will be required to make adequate provision under CS79 and through detailed Area Action Plans.	
6451 - The Countryside Agency	Support	On balance we support the preferred option for Cycle Provision Prioritisation, with highest place in the hierarchy being accorded to links between villages. A strong case could also be made for the alternative option CS83 - safer routes to schools - although as paragraph 13.18 notes, provision under the preferred option will in most cases be available for school journeys.	Support noted.	
4314 - Cambridgeshire County Council 4393 - Cambridgeshire County Council 3178 - Addenbrooke's Hospital 4626 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support this approach, as the priorities for provision best accord with Structure Plan Policy P8/8 and the LTP and the objectives mirror those of PPG13.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS82 Cycle Provision Prioritisation - Preferred Option**

Develop preferred option into a policy in the Core Strategy, as amended. Also roll forward Local Plan 2004 Cycle Parking Standards.

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

---

*CS83 Cycle Provision Prioritisation - Alternative Option*

5604	Object	Providing links between villages and safer routes to school are equally important. Since safer routes to school money comes from Government, funding safer routes does not compromise the Council's ability to support providing links between villages. I would support a compromise CS82 / CS83 giving equal priority to links between villages and safer routes to school.	Noted. CS82 refers to the hierarchy for the delivery of cycle provision through the planning process, for example through Section 106. Safer Routes to School, whilst contributing to the overall aims of improving cycle infrastructure, is already delivered from a separate pot of money. Given that SRtS already has funding from an alternative source, it is considered that prioritising the connection of villages with wider facilities and services (which may also include schools) would supplement SRtS and benefit a wider population.	
4627 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support in so far as the objectives mirror those of PPG13	Support noted.	
6227 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Gallagher believe that Policy CS83 provides a more appropriate option. Cycling has the potential to substitute for many short car journeys, particularly those under 5km. Gallagher believes that preference should be given to the movement of younger people.	Noted. CS82 refers to the hierarchy for the delivery of cycle provision through the planning process, for example through Section 106. Safer Routes to School, whilst contributing to the overall aims of improving cycle infrastructure, is already delivered from a separate pot of money. Given that SRtS already has funding from an alternative source, it is considered that prioritising the connection of villages with wider facilities and services (which may also include schools) would supplement SRtS and benefit a wider population.	

**Decision on CS83 Cycle Provision Prioritisation - Alternative Option**

This option will continue to be rejected.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

*CS84 Cycle Provision Prioritisation - Rejected Option*

4628 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support in so far as the objectives mirror those of PPG13	Support noted.	
------------------------------	---------	---	----------------	--

**Decision on CS84 Cycle Provision Prioritisation - Rejected Option**

This option will continue to be rejected.

*CS85 Road Infrastructure - Preferred Approach*

4527 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	No reference is made here to the safeguarding of land for CHUMMS related road schemes.	Agree. The old St Ives railway route is safeguarded in Local Plan 2004 for Rapid Transit. The LDF should include a policy to continue safeguarding the Rapid Transit. The A14 is the responsibility of the Highways Agency, details of the route and land required have yet to be published by the HA. The A14 village traffic calming proposals do not require safeguarded land.	Roll forward Local Plan 2004 Policy TP3.
--	--------	--	---	--

2919 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee 2614 - East of England Development Agency 4629 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support in so far as the objectives mirror those of PPG13.	Support noted.	
--	---------	--	----------------	--

**Decision on CS85 Road Infrastructure - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy. Roll forward Local Plan 2004 Policy TP3.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

*CS86 Chesterton Station and Interchange - Preferred Approach*

3515 - Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Object	If a station and interchange are required to facilitate the redevelopment of the Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) (CNF (East)) area, then the provision of these facilities should be contained within the appropriate LDF documents.	CNF East is an allocation in Local Plan 2004 and the subject of a separate Masterplan.	
2510 - Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd 6073 - Network Rail	Object	Network Rail support the development of a rail station and interchange facility at Chesterton Sidings as part of the comprehensive commercial development of our site. However, it is not clear how the Council will secure the financial contributions referred to and from whom. The Policy should refer to SPD to deal with this issue.	Support noted. CNF East developer contributions and the Local Transport Plan will secure funds and the Area Transport Plans (SPG) require developer contributions from developments within and close to Cambridge.	
3880 - Network Rail (Town Planning Team)	Support	Network Rail supports the station and interchange, subject to operational, technical and commercial viability. It should be made clear that Network Rail has no funds to pay for this facility and unless finance is forthcoming from other sources, the proposal will have to be fully financed by developer contributions. This should come from a number of developments and not just those in the immediate vicinity of the proposed new station.	Network Rail's financial position is not a matter for the LDF. CNF East developer contributions and the Local Transport Plan will secure funds and the Area Transport Plans (SPG) require developer contributions from developments within and close to Cambridge.	
2616 - East of England Development Agency 4630 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support in so far as the objectives mirror those of PPG13.	Support noted.	
5486 - The Fairfield Partnership	Support	Support CS86, but consider that this option should be widened to indicate more flexibility should be allowed for the provision of new stations in appropriate locations to satisfy the needs of new settlements like Northstowe.	No need for other stations has been identified in the Local Transport Plan. Policy would not exclude such proposals coming forward and Area Action Plans would deal with this issue for larger developments.	

**Decision on CS86 Chesterton Station and Interchange - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CS87 Aviation-Related Development Proposals - Preferred Approach</i>				
4016 - Imperial War Museum	Object	In principle the approach set out in the previous Local Plan within Policy TP8 is supported particularly where it distinguishes between the two large airfields and smaller airfields. However, there is a concern that the Policy TP8 is unduly restrictive and consider that the Policy should be re-written to be clearer.	Support noted. The Local Plan policy has been subject to considerable scrutiny at public inquiry and in its current form it is not considered that it is unduly restrictive.	Revisit Local Plan policy TP8 to clarify and ensure self-explanatory.
4526 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	This policy is not self explanatory, and it should be. It should not refer back to a policy in a previous plan.	Noted.	Revisit Local Plan policy TP8 to clarify and ensure self-explanatory.
1959 - Hatley Parish Council 4631 - Bayer CropScience Ltd 1696 - The Marshall Group	Support	Support the approach including the need to safeguard aviation from adverse effects arising from renewable energy generation, and in so far as the objectives mirror those of PPG13.	Support noted.	

#### **Decision on CS87 Aviation-Related Development Proposals - Preferred Approach**

Develop the preferred approach into a policy in the Core Strategy, but revisit Local Plan policy TP8 to clarify and ensure self-explanatory.

## **Chapter 14. Glossary of Terms**

### *Chapter 14. Glossary of Terms*

3796 - English Heritage	Object	We suggest the definitions of Conservation Areas, Listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, and Historic Landscape Characterisation should be included	Agree.	Include definitions of Conservation Areas, Listed buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, and Historic Landscape Characterisation
-------------------------	--------	---	--------	---

#### **Decision on Chapter 14. Glossary of Terms**

**Representations****Nature Representation Summary****District Council's Assessment****Approach to Draft DPD*****Annexe 1: Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report / Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report******Preferred Options***

3753 - Papworth Everard Parish  
Council Planning Committee

Comment Papworth Hospital and CS55, CS56, CS57 and  
CS58

The lack of public transport accessibility is not a key issue for patients, most of whom are too ill to use it. The majority of patients travel from across the whole of the Anglian region and are not based in Cambridge. Access by road to Papworth Everard is infinitely easier than to Cambridge for staff, patients and their visitors. This applies equally to ambulances and taxis ferrying patients to and from other National hospitals.

20% of all the hospital staff (252) live in Papworth, and are therefore able to walk to work.  
62% (782) live within a 10m radius of Papworth and their journeys (even if by car) have no impact on the Cambridge traffic congestion.

The Sustainability Appraisal aims to take a objective view of the social, environmental and economic impacts of options. It is correct that is the hospital was based in Cambridge there may be greater potential to access the site via public transport, for visitors and staff, as well as patients.

This assessment was carried out by consultants on behalf of the Council.

**Decision on Preferred Options**