

Appendix 3
Rural Centres

Rural Centres

Public Participation Report

3. The Strategic Development Context

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

3. The Strategic Development Context

RC1 Rural Centres Objectives - Preferred Approach

5890 - Barker Parry Town Planning	Comment	With reference to paragraph 2.14-2.16: The concept of Rural Centres is welcomed and supported. What is not supported is the size and content of the preferred short list. Please see comments in respect of RURAL CENTRES.	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 focuses 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. It would be contrary to the development strategy set out in the structure plan to provide for additional developments in the villages that were identified as Rural Growth settlements.	
1285 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Object	Support as far as it goes but please amend RC1 2nd bullet point to read "...developer contributions for the improvement of public transport, educational, sporting, public rights of way and other community facilities;"	Agree.	Amend 2nd bullet to read "...developer contributions for the improvement of public transport, educational, sporting, public rights of way and other community facilities;"

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1822 - Cambridgeshire ACRE	Object	There is no mention that the infrastructure such as the roads will be examined to see if they could cope with an increased amount of traffic. Even if the public transport network is improved people will still use their cars so there is likely to be a rise in road users in the rural centres and along roads towards nearby towns.	It is acknowledged that infrastructure capacity is a significant issue in determining whether new developments should go ahead. Issues of infrastructure capacity and the availability of services for new development would be 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 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.	
1800 - CLIFF WALSINGHAM & COMPANY	Object	The policy should not be aimed only at promoting growth in villages that already meet the selection criteria, but instead it should be promoting in smaller settlements the modest growth that will result in all villages securing or aspiring to those facilities and services that can make them sustainable.	A revised approach to Rural Centres policy is proposed as set out in the Recommendations section. This will allow for developments up to small estate level (25 dwellings) in Minor Rural Centres. In Group Villages and Infill Villages, modest levels of housing growth will be permitted as set out in CS7 and CS8.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5680 - Willingham Parish Council	Object	With reference to paragraph 5.1: The LDF defines Rural Centres, Rural Growth and Limited Rural Growth Villages but does not appear to quantify what might be expected from these locations over the plan period. In the case of Willingham, there has already been a huge expansion in the population with very little new investment in infrastructure. The plan should address village growth targets and investment and ensure the two are properly balanced. Further details are attached overleaf.	It is not considered appropriate to set village growth targets as this would imply that extensive growth in the villages would be acceptable. It is not practicable to give more precise targets for the appropriate numbers of housing growth in the village as this would lead to inflexibility and reduce the capability to respond to changing circumstances. Given the very limited amount of growth that is proposed in villages other than Cambourne, the issue of balance between investment and growth in villages will be assessed at the planning application stage. Willingham would not be proposed for designation as a Minor Rural Centre or Rural Centre given its proximity to Northstowe.	
3128	Object	Whilst the vision is admirable the policy should be more realistic to reflect the failures of recent years where developer contributions have rarely kept pace with the demand for facilities within rural settlements. A new system of facility provision or enhancement needs to be devised.	Reform of the legal and policy basis for an improved system of securing developer contributions to provide the facilities and infrastructure for new development to be acceptable can only be progressed at the national level. At present, the Council is required to use the approach set out in section 46 of The Town and Country Planning Act 2004.	

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

2772 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	<p>1. Additional development should be allowed in rural areas to support the local community and its services.</p> <p>2. A further category rural centres should be introduced, for settlements below the 3,000 threshold.</p>	<p>The strategy for development reflects RPG14, Draft RSS14, and the Structure Plan. 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. The approach set out in the Core Strategy provides for limited development in Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centres, Group Villages and Infill Villages up to a scale appropriate to their sustainability as locations for development. Structure Plan paragraph 1.17 sets out the general requirement that Rural Centres will generally have a population of more than 3,000 people. In view of this it is not appropriate to identify a separate category of Rural Centres with a population of less than 3,000, as this would be contrary to the guidance set out in 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>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

3337

Object

The Objection relates to the failure of the LDD to take steps to remedy the delay in the delivery of Northstowe. It is submitted that Northstowe will not deliver 6000 dwellings prior to 2016. The shortfall is foreseeable. The LDD should make compensatory arrangements in the identification of other land for housing. Land west of Cambourne would fulfil this purpose where there are no technical difficulties to the supply of land for housing

The Cambridgeshire Structure Plan policy proposes that Northstowe will deliver 6,000 homes before 2016. At present it is not envisaged that there will be any shortfall from this figure.

In the event of any major strategic sites failing to come forward, the LDF strategy will be reviewed. The revised strategy would be subject to the policies of the Adopted Structure Plan, and the preferred locations for development would be identified by applying the search sequence set out in Policy P1/1.

Proposals to allocate land west of Cambourne were received during the Structure Plan process. If this proposals were allowed to go forward it would completely alter the character of Cambourne, changing it from a village concept as set out in the Masterplan and Design Guide to one of a market town. This cannot be done successfully given the way in which Cambourne has been and continues to be developed. It would cause significant problems in the provision of services. For example, a significantly larger settlement might be of sufficient scale to warrant its own secondary school, but this would be a substantial investment from developers and present difficulties for Comberton Village College which has been extended through developer contributions to serve Cambourne.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
989 2137 - DLP Consultants Ltd	Object	<p>Representations argue for the inclusion of Cottenham as a Rural Centre. The village has a wide range of facilities that were not adequately taken into account in the Rural Centres analysis. The employment analysis which is used is simplistic, ignoring consideration of potential, skills, and sustainability issues such as mode and distance of travel to work. One representation states that Cottenham should be a Rural Centre as it would be a logical settlement in which to provide a good-sized development. It is also argued that two previous South Cambs reports have identified Cottenham as a sustainable village, and the Guided Bus Link will run close to Cottenham, providing access to employment opportunities in the north of Cambridge. It is also argued that the Structure Plan criteria have been applied too rigidly.</p>	<p>Agree that the village facilities Key Criterion was insufficiently sensitive to the role that smaller, specialised food shops play in complementing small supermarkets. Consider that the food shopping provision in Cottenham is probably sufficient for the village to meet the convenience shopping element of the Village Facilities criterion.</p> <p>The approach to the designation of Rural Centres will be revised to take greater account of the role that villages play in serving a local hinterland and of the distribution of Rural Centres through the District. It is accepted that Cottenham currently plays a role in providing services and facilities for a local hinterland, and it is therefore proposed as a Minor Rural Centre. The close proximity of Cottenham to Northstowe means that designating the village as a Rural Centre would not be a prudent strategy, as it could lead to the duplication of the provision of facilities in the two settlements. As the LDF period progresses, Northstowe will to a some extent supplant Cottenham's role in providing services and facilities for the smaller villages to the north-west of Cambridge.</p> <p>The methodology for the analysis of local employment opportunities that the Rural Centres Preferred Options report adopts is endorsed by the Structure Plan Examination in Public Panel Report.</p>	Designate Cottenham as a Proposed Minor Rural Centre.
2790	Object	<p>There should be an emphasis on improving public rights of way, particularly bridleways, which allow people to walk, cycle, and ride.</p>	<p>This is addressed in the 5th bullet point "enhanced access to the countryside".</p>	

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

2833 - RAVE	Object	The final phrase of the fourth bullet point viz ".....or in coalescence with the built-up area of Cambridge." should be deleted. The designation of the larger villages around Cambridge is contrary to the intention of the Panel Report (para. 2.31) on Rural Centres.	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 super tanker 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, and it is therefore considered that they would be playing a "significant role" in meeting wider development needs.	
2557 - FPDSavills	Object	There is some degree of over reliance on major strategic sites coming forward for development. We consider that Rural Centres have a role to play and those with a good level of services and facilities such as village colleges can perform such a function.	The major strategic sites identified in the Core Strategy have been identified and endorsed through the Structure Plan process. At present it is anticipated that all the major strategic sites will come forward in the period up to 2016. 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. In view of this, it would not be appropriate to allocate further land for housing development in Rural Centres.	

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

3857 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)	Object	We object to the approach as it assumes that other smaller locations which compare less favourably in terms of existing sustainability are incapable of becoming more sustainable through balanced development which involves improvements to local facilities and services. The residential led redevelopment of our site would contribute positively to the sustainability of Duxford.	The approach to development in villages smaller than Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, as set out at paragraph 2.19 of the Core Strategy, is that modest levels of development which are of a scale appropriate to the size and availability of services will help to sustain local services without adding unduly to the need to travel. Duxford was designated a Group Village in Local Plan 2004. The village does not possess a range of services and facilities that would merit this designation being changed. The District Council has for many years implemented policies which permit groups of up to a maximum of 8 houses in villages with a primary school and infilling in villages without a primary school. The preferred approach is to include the policy for Group Villages which was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.	
3827 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We object to the option that limits/prevents previously developed sites which form part of a village settlement being brought forward for development as promoted by Government in PPG1, PPS1, PPG3, PPG4 and PPG13.	The strategy as proposed would provide for Previously Developed Land to come forward. Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan 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. This sequence of preference is reflected in CS5 and CS6 of the Core Strategy. In Group villages, developments of up to 15 dwellings would be permitted if the proposal would make the best use of a redundant brownfield site. In Infill villages, which have no primary school and where development on any scale is likely to generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys, development of a scale above 2 dwellings would be unacceptable.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4689 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	Failure to revisit existing commitments and consider alternative options for accommodating growth in the Rural Areas - UCS has re-examined existing residential commitments to see whether they are "still valid" but does not at any point set out a clear assessment of the alternatives of not taking forward, or redirecting development to more sustainable locations – for example, a greater concentration at the District's premier Rural Centre at Cambourne.	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 focuses 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. The outstanding housing requirement for development can be met sustainably at Cambourne as suggested by the Structure Plan EIP panel by increasing development densities to just 30 dph without taking any more land for development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5230 5249 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 5274 5275 5297 5319 5381 5382 5383 5384 5420 5421 5361	Object	Para 3.2 It does not automatically follow that ideally no housing should be allowed in rural settlements. Structure Plan Policy P5/5 allows for small scale housing in villages where appropriate, recognising the contribution to vitality of rural communities. There is a continuing need and role for housing in villages of all sizes which the Council should acknowledge.	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." 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 (Group and Infill) villages. The importance of allowing limited development in Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centres, Group and Infill villages is acknowledged. In Rural Centres, infill developments of 25 dwellings or more would be permitted subject to the provisions of CS5. In Minor Rural Centres schemes of up to 25 dwellings would be permitted subject to existing facilities being improved. 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 (maximum development size of 8 dwellings, or exceptionally 15 dwellings where the development would make the best use of a redundant brownfield site). The approach for Group and Infill Villages was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of Local Plan 2004.	Update Rural Centres strategy and designate Minor Rural Centres.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5145 - Ramblers' Association Cambridge Group	Object	Explicit consideration is needed, of the effects of rural development on public rights of way and access to the countryside. Existing rights of way should be adequately protected, and access from settlements to the wider countryside should be enhanced through rights of way, and additional strategic open space. Effects on water and drainage resources in the surrounding countryside should also be considered.	Rights of way are managed by Cambridgeshire County Council. It is considered the fifth bullet point of RC1 adequately covers the need for enhanced access to the countryside. As stated at para 8.10 of the Core Strategy, Cambridgeshire County Council, in partnership with the District Councils, has carried out a study of the nature and distribution of Strategic Open Space (SOS) in Cambridgeshire, mapping its accessibility, and evaluating provision across the County. This is to be used to carry out a needs assessment, in order to develop a strategic open space standard for the county. Standards will be used to suggest how much space is required to serve the needs of the population and the quality of space that should be provided. When a standard has been developed, it is proposed in CS54 that this could be used to require developers to contribute towards provision to meet the needs of new developments, which would include rural centres.	

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

6136 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. Object	<p>The Council appear to believe there are no appropriate alternative options. This represents a constrained approach to identifying the most appropriate approach to creating sustainable patterns of development. Vision is for Rural Centres to only make a modest contribution to the housing requirement. Council should reconsider their approach to Rural Centres, with specific reference to Histon. Amend approach to deal with strategies of the emerging RSS14 and the requirement to provide an additional 5,875 dwellings in the period 2016-2021. Additional provision should be made at suitable sustainable urban areas, including at Histon, an identified Rural Centre.</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. It is considered that the additional development at Cambourne that is proposed is the most sustainable approach to providing new development in Rural Centres, as it requires the least additional Greenfield land-take and directs development into a Rural Centre which will have a good range of services. Options for expanding Cambourne north of the A428 were considered during the Structure Plan process. Proposals to allocate land west of Cambourne were received during the Structure Plan process. If this proposal were allowed to go forward it would completely alter the character of Cambourne, changing it from a village concept as set out in the Masterplan and Design Guide to one of a market town. This cannot be done successfully given the way in which Cambourne has been and continues to be developed. It would cause significant problems in the provision of services. For example, a significantly larger settlement might be of sufficient scale to warrant its own secondary school, but this would be a substantial investment from developers and present difficulties for Comberton Village College which has been extended through developer contributions to serve Cambourne.</p>	
--	---	---	--

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

5773 - Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd	Object	Whilst the principle of the identification of Rural Centres is supported, it is considered that the restrictive approach to housing allocations will result in their identification not matching the policy objectives for these settlements of supporting rural communities, their facilities and services and sustainability aims. Requiring all new development within tightly defined boundaries of Rural Centres will result in a negative impact on the character and amenities of the rural village.	Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan 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 proposed approach is thus in conformity with the Structure Plan strategy. 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." 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 (Group and Infill) villages.	
--	--------	---	---	--

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

1587 - Weston Colville Parish Council 4915 - Cambridgeshire Recycling 5239 5313 5379 5758 - The English Courtyard Association	Object	Objections focus on absence of new allocations in Rural Centres. Disagree with statement that Rural Centres are 'at the margins of sustainability as the lowest stage in the sequence of development.' All villages need to be sustained otherwise they will lose the remaining services which they currently have causing the problems which your policy is trying to avoid. It does not automatically follow that ideally no housing should be allocated in rural settlements, given the policies set out in the Structure Plan allows for local plans to provide a limited proportion of the overall development provision at Rural Centres, on a scale appropriate to the size, location and function of such centres. The restrictive approach	The reference to the villages being on the "margins of sustainability" does not imply that the Council do not support improving the sustainability of all villages, and maintaining rural services is an important aim of the LDF. This is evidenced by many of the policies in the Core Strategy, in particular those in the Services and Facilities chapter. The villages are at the margins of sustainability in terms of their ability to be a sustainable location for further housing development, relative to the more sustainable locations (Cambridge, the market towns, and the new town of Northstowe) higher up the search sequence of development set out in RPG 9. The development strategy set out in the Preferred Options report sets out provision for further development in Rural Centres, Minor Rural Centres, Group Villages, and Infill Villages at a scale appropriate to their role and function. 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 focuses 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. It would be contrary to the development strategy set out in the structure plan to provide for additional developments in the villages that were identified as Rural Growth settlements.	
--	--------	---	---	--

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

6156 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6130 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd	Object	The Council appear to believe there are no appropriate alternative options. This represents a constrained approach to identifying the most appropriate approach to creating sustainable patterns of development. Vision is for Rural Centres to only make a modest contribution to the housing requirement. Council should reconsider their approach to Rural Centres, with specific reference to Cambourne. Amend approach to deal with strategies of the emerging RSS14 and the requirement to provide an additional 5,875 dwellings in the period 2016-2021. Additional provision should be made at Cambourne, to the north of the A428.	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. It is considered that the additional development at Cambourne that is proposed is the most sustainable approach to providing new development in Rural Centres, as it requires the least additional Greenfield land-take and directs development into a Rural Centre which will have a good range of services. Options for expanding Cambourne north of the A428 were considered during the Structure Plan process. Proposals to allocate land west of Cambourne were received during the Structure Plan process. If this proposal were allowed to go forward it would completely alter the character of Cambourne, changing it from a village concept as set out in the Masterplan and Design Guide to one of a market town. This cannot be done successfully given the way in which Cambourne has been and continues to be developed. It would cause significant problems in the provision of services. For example, a significantly larger settlement might be of sufficient scale to warrant its own secondary school, but this would be a substantial investment from developers and present difficulties for Comberton Village College which has been extended through developer contributions to serve Cambourne.	
--	--------	---	--	--

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

5836 5853 5869 5872 5822 - P B Moore & Sons 5793 - Stamford Homes Ltd 5798 - Westbury Homes Ltd	Object	The principle of the policy is supported. However, it is considered that there is potential conflict between objectives of RC1, RC3 and the small windfall assessment projection of the UCS.	There is no evidence to suggest that the small windfall rate should be reduced below the predicted rate for the remaining years of the plan period. The study already takes a conservative view based on examination of past rates. Based on the variety of sources of capacity, and high land values, it is likely that small windfalls will continue to be completed. A plan monitor and manage approach will be taken, to monitor completion rates, to ensure sufficient numbers are coming forward. The designation of rural centres will not impact on the small windfall rate, as such sites will be permitted in all types of village, on varying scales.	
---	--------	--	--	--

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

6157 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. Object

The Council appear to believe there are no appropriate alternative options. This represents a constrained approach to identifying the most appropriate approach to creating sustainable patterns of development. Vision is for Rural Centres to only make a modest contribution to the housing requirement. Council should reconsider their approach to Rural Centres, with specific reference to Cambourne. Amend approach to deal with strategies of the emerging RSS14 and the requirement to provide an additional 5,875 dwellings in the period 2016-2021. Additional provision should be made at Cambourne, to the north of the A428.

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. It is considered that the additional development at Cambourne that is proposed is the most sustainable approach to providing new development in Rural Centres, as it requires the least additional Greenfield land-take and directs development into a Rural Centre which will have a good range of services. Options for expanding Cambourne north of the A428 were considered during the Structure Plan process. Proposals to allocate land west of Cambourne were received during the Structure Plan process. If this proposal were allowed to go forward it would completely alter the character of Cambourne, changing it from a village concept as set out in the Masterplan and Design Guide to one of a market town. This cannot be done successfully given the way in which Cambourne has been and continues to be developed. It would cause significant problems in the provision of services. For example, a significantly larger settlement might be of sufficient scale to warrant its own secondary school, but this would be a substantial investment from developers and present difficulties for Comberton Village College which has been extended through developer contributions to serve Cambourne.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
6490 - The Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards	Object	<p>P.13. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough structure plan</p> <p>3.4 'the great majority of land for new development will be located ... Ely'.</p> <p>The boards receive surface water from much of Ely. Run-off from developments in this area must be strictly controlled to protect the district and the IDB must be consulted on all development matters in and around this area.</p>	Acknowledge need to consult Ely Internal Drainage Board on all developments any proposed development in Rural areas.	
3835 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)	Support	Support the promotion of sustainable development, particularly the need to make best and most efficient use of land and buildings, and through mixed use development. We therefore consider our site should be included as a residential-led allocation.	<p>The approach to development in villages smaller than Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, as set out at paragraph 2.19 of the Core Strategy, is that modest levels of development which are of a scale appropriate to the size and availability of services will help to sustain local services without adding unduly to the need to travel. Duxford was designated a Group Village in Local Plan 2004. The village does not possess a range of services and facilities that would merit this designation being changed. The District Council has for many years implemented policies which permit groups of up to a maximum of 8 houses in villages with a primary school and infilling in villages without a primary school. The preferred approach is to include the policy for Group Villages which was scrutinised and updated during the preparation of South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004.</p>	

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

3965 - English Nature,
Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire
Team

Support

English Nature supports bullet point 5 of these objectives, as it sets out the key principle of biodiversity that development should result in an overall gain of biodiversity. This follows the Government's objective of rural renewal i.e. ensuring that developments in rural areas take account of the role and value of biodiversity in supporting economic diversification and contributing to a high quality environment. However, enhanced access to the countryside must be managed in order to avoid environmental degradation, such as erosion through excessive trampling of fragile habitats and loss of species that are sensitive to disturbance.

Support noted. The need to ensure that providing for enhanced access to the countryside does not conflict with biodiversity and habitat considerations is acknowledged.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3633 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Support	The Councils would stress in the objectives: - Sustainability - ensuring that growth does not result in the merging of individual villages or in coalescence with the built-up area of Cambridge - protection of the built and natural heritage Rural centre development should not be at the expense of local employment opportunities - which are key to the sustainability of communities.	It is considered that sustainability, ensuring that growth does not result in the merging of individual villages or in coalescence with the built-up area of Cambridge, and protection of the built and natural heritage are already stressed sufficiently by virtue of their inclusion in the Rural Centres Objectives. The Rural Centres proposed for designation are those where it is considered that there is presently a sufficient level of local employment opportunities to support limited additional development where that development would not compromise the objectives for Rural Centres set out in RC1. CS5, which sets out the approach to proposed developments in Rural Centres, makes clear that limited development or redevelopment in Rural Centres only where it can be accommodated without causing harm to amenity. Consideration of the acceptability of the development in terms of the local employment situation would be considered under this policy. In addition, proposals for new developments would be required by CS15 to be accompanied by a sustainability appraisal which would assess the development in terms of its effect on social, economic and environmental issues. The effect of a new development on local employment opportunities should be addressed by the sustainability appraisal.	
4323 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The approach is supported, in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P1/1 and other policies of the Plan.	Support noted.	
5661 - Gallagher Waterbeach Limited	Support	The objectives for Rural Centres will assist in developing sustainable settlements that will provide a range of facilities to serve the local population.	Support noted.	
5898 - Barker Parry Town Planning	Support	South Cambs is a rural district and the settlements therein are intrinsic to its form and character and ought to be allowed to accommodate further additional development in a controlled fashion.	Support noted.	

Representations

Nature Representation Summary

District Council's Assessment

Approach to Draft DPD

Decision on RC1 Rural Centres Objectives - Preferred Approach

Develop preferred approach into policy in the Rural Centres DPD, as modified.

Representations***Nature Representation Summary******District Council's Assessment******Approach to Draft DPD******5. Identifying the Rural Centres******RC2 Selection of Rural Centres - Preferred Approach***

1019	Object	Assessing rural village centres based on transport links to Cambridge is not a valid approach to assessing accessibility for residents in outlying villages. Inter-village public transport in South Cambs is extremely poor, except on direct routes to Cambridge. Therefore residents of outlying villages who do not have access to a car will be unable to utilise facilities provided at rural village centres.	Paragraph 1.17 of the Structure Plan requires that "Rural Centres must be accessible from surrounding rural areas to help improve quality of life in rural areas. The role of Rural Centres will vary across the plan area according to local circumstances. Within the Cambridge Sub-Region the availability of good public transport access to Cambridge will be a particularly important consideration in identifying such centres." Whilst the accessibility of Rural Centres by public transport is certainly desirable, it is not a specific requirement of the Structure Plan, and it is unfortunately not realistic at present for outlying villages to be connected to Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres by public transport links. This is one reason why Rural Centres are the least preferred option for accommodating development in the Structure Plan sequence. Rural Centres play a role in providing services and facilities for their rural hinterlands even if the public transport linkages are not particularly good. The availability of good public transport access to Cambridge as it allows residents of rural centres and their hinterlands to access higher order facilities in Cambridge in the most sustainable way.
------	--------	--	--

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1349	Object	Sawston, Stapleford and Great Shelford have essentially a single road access to Cambridge (via Trumpington). This route is already very busy. Traffic diverted via new Addenbrookes Rd will simply disgorge onto Hills Road and the Inner Ring Road. All these routes around Cambridge are highly congested and cannot support further development.	No new allocations are proposed for Great Shelford/Stapleford or Sawston. It is not intended that there will be significant growth in these villages. 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 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. Traffic-related issues would be taken into account in assessing whether suitable infrastructure was available to serve the development.	
1286 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Object	Omitted leisure and recreation 5% of households have a person who rides Bridleway network continually fragmented PROW valuable community facility for all Assess Rural Centres on existing PROW for travel and recreation; if insufficient develop plans to provide circular facilities (i.e. Cambourne)	Paragraph 1.17 of the Structure Plan sets out the factors that should be considered in determining which villages should be designated as Rural Centres. Leisure and recreation facilities are not included as factors that should be taken into account.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1637	Object	<p>Cambourne has been selected as a Rural Centre. However it meets only one of the requirements: Local Employment.</p> <p>Very few residents currently work in Cambourne, where is all this available employment? Most of the employers in Cambourne bring their own employees with them, including South Cambridgeshire District Council.</p> <p>Planners in Cambourne have already allowed increased numbers of homes, particularly in Lower Cambourne, and it looks like there are more to come.</p> <p>Cambourne does not meet the accessibility requirements, no suitable site has been found for the third primary school, and there has been no thought for provision of transport to secondary schools (20 double decker buses for 2 hours a day).</p>	<p>After Northstowe, Cambourne will be the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire. A very thorough assessment has been undertaken of the services and facilities that are available in the villages and Cambourne scores well. There is a planned strategy for securing the services, facilities and infrastructure at Cambourne which will be enhanced by requiring the additional development to contribute towards the additional needs of the larger community. The approach to determining the level of local employment opportunities was endorsed by the Inspector in the Inquiry into the Local Plan 2004.</p>	
1940 1941	Object	<p>Linton has not been classified as a Rural Centre, but could make a contribution to rural housing needs. Land is available for building on Horseheath Road Linton, i.e. land adjacent to 'the Wheatsheaf'.</p> <p>It is illogical to ignore the potential plots like this, while building on Greenfield land elsewhere.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Include Linton on the list of proposed Minor Rural Centres, as detailed in the Recommendations section.</p>
1975	Object	<p>I live in Gamlingay, but cannot get to Cambourne (including the Council Offices, Morrisons, or my friend in Lower Cambourne). It is not a good rural centre in this respect.</p>	<p>It is possible to get from Gamlingay to Cambourne on public transport via St Neots and via Cambridge. However, acknowledge that Cambourne does not presently meet public transport Key Criterion as it was set out in the Preferred Options Report, however. Any analysis of Rural Centres must take into commitments that will come forward between now and 2006.</p> <p>Cambourne will be one of the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire and the range of facilities available in the village will reflect this. For this reason Cambourne has been identified as a proposed Rural Centre.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
933	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No Rural Centre identified East of A11 - Viability of rural communities to be maintained - central Rural Centre needed east of A11 - RTP1 not addressing RURAL issues - Villages cannot meet new sustainability rules. - Villages must not die 	<p>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, which lies to the east of the A11. The maximum size of development permitted will be up to 25 dwellings on sites within the Village Framework of the village. See Recommendations section. 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 (maximum development size of 8 dwellings, or exceptionally 15 dwellings where the development would make the best use of a redundant brownfield site). 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>
5672 - St John's College	Object	Girton has been unfairly judged as failing to meet the criteria to become a Rural Centre. Its proximity to Cambridge should count in its favour in terms of sustainability. The report doesn't give full detail of how villages were compared. Also the windfall assumption of 120 dwellings per year is optimistic, such opportunities will become scarce. Another 1200 dwellings will need to be built assuming the a windfall rate of half that given.	<p>Girton lacks adequate employment opportunities (having only 0.63 jobs per economically active resident) and does not have a convenience shopping provision on a significant scale. There are only a total six shops in the village. The village also does not have good access to a secondary school - whilst the distance to Impington Village College is less than 3 miles this is not along a route which can be considered safe for children to cycle along. It is considered that the village does not fulfil a purpose in terms of providing services for a rural hinterland.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that the small windfall rate should be reduced below the predicted rate for the remaining years of the plan period. The study already takes a conservative view based on examination of past rates. Based on the variety of sources of capacity, and high land values, it is likely that small windfalls will continue to be completed. A plan monitor and manage approach will be taken, to monitor completion rates, to ensure sufficient numbers are coming forward. The designation of rural centres will not impact on the small windfall rate, as such sites will be permitted in all types of village, on varying scales.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5679 - Ely Diocesan Board	Object	Waterbeach has been unfairly excluded as a Rural Centre eligible to accommodate additional housing requirement. The railway station represents a significant attribute in terms of sustainability. Also their is no evidence offered in the report as to the inadequacy of village facilities, Waterbeach has a number of shops and local employment opportunities linked to nearby business parks, the barracks and the school.	<p>The railway services to Cambridge were assessed as part of the assessment to determine which villages should be designated as Rural Centres. It was found that even with the railway services Waterbeach narrowly failed to meet the public transport accessibility criteria. The level of convenience retail provision in Waterbeach was not sufficient for it to pass the Village Facilities test.</p> <p>It is proposed that Waterbeach should be designated as a Minor Rural Centre, to take into account the role that the village plays in providing services and facilities for a local hinterland.</p>	Include Waterbeach as a proposed Minor Rural Centre, 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>
1614 1615 1579 1588 2055 2057	Object	Representations objecting to the designation of Fulbourn as a Rural Centre. Objections focus on time the buses from Fulbourn take to get to Cambridge, the lack of accessibility of secondary education, the doctors surgery only being a branch surgery, the lack of facilities for young people, and the fact that the library in the village is a volunteer library served by a mobile library. It is also argued that there is a lack of infrastructure capacity in terms of sewerage and in terms of traffic volumes on the road into Cambridge. Objections also emphasise the need for Fulbourn to remain its separate identity from Cambridge.	<p>It is proposed that Fulbourn should be removed from the list of Rural Centres and designated as a Minor Rural Centre, for the following reasons: the Fulbourn Tesco store should not have been taken into account as within the retail floorspace calculation for the Village Facilities criterion, as it does not function as part of the village. In addition, the doctor's surgery in Fulbourn is a branch surgery with limited opening hours. 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 good 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.</p> <p>As a Minor Rural Centre, housing development would be limited to windfall developments of to 25 dwellings within the existing Village Framework. No additional housing allocations would be made. The acceptability of any new development above Group level (8 dwellings) will be dependent on existing facilities being improved.</p>	Remove Fulbourn from list of proposed Rural Centres and add to list of proposed Minor Rural Centres.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2466	Object	<p>The criteria chosen in the report to determine whether a village should be designated as a Rural Centre are not complete and do not comply with para 1.17 of the Structure Plan. As a result at least one of the villages proposed to be so designated is manifestly not suitable for such designation.</p> <p>Great Shelford/Stapleford should not be designated as a Rural Centre.</p>	<p>Great Shelford and Stapleford meet three of the criteria used to determine which Rural Centres should be designated, and it is therefore considered that together they constitute one of the more sustainable settlements in the district. It is not proposed that there should be a significant increase in the number of homes in these villages, and all development will be subject to the requirement that it should. 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 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. Traffic-related issues would be taken into account in assessing whether suitable infrastructure was available to serve the development. Considerations such as the availability of off-street parking would thus be considered in determining the acceptability 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>
1952	Object	Original plan for 3000 homes +/- 10%. Facilities not implemented to timescales for this. Allocating more homes without addressing this would lead to the original agreement not being worth the paper it was written (the developers appear to ignore it anyway. And this rewards them for doing so). => implement what was planned originally and consider position at an appropriate time. Making a decision now would be premature.	After Northstowe, Cambourne will be the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire. A very thorough assessment has been undertaken of the services and facilities that are available in the villages and Cambourne scores well. There is a planned strategy for securing the services, facilities and infrastructure at Cambourne which will be enhanced by requiring the additional development to contribute towards the additional needs of the larger community. The approach to determining the level of local employment opportunities was endorsed by the Inspector in the Inquiry into the Local Plan 2004.	
3428	Object	Cambourne will not or ever meet the criteria of a Rural Centre, Papworth would appear to be more of an ideal Rural Centre. SCDC figures are based on presumption and not the facts.	The Rural Centres are being designated with a view to the period that the forthcoming LDF covers - this period runs from 2006-2016. Therefore any analysis of Rural Centres must take into account commitments that will come forward between now and 2006. There are existing commitments in both Papworth Everard and Cambourne, but Cambourne will be a much larger village with a wider range of services and facilities. In view of this it is appropriate that Cambourne should be designated as a Rural Centre.	Continue with the approach of identifying Cambourne as a proposed Rural Centre
3361 - W A Fairhurst & Partners	Object	It is therefore recommended that at RC2, the Rural Centres identified include Waterbeach as well as Cambourne.	Waterbeach is identified as a Minor Rural Centre to take account of the role it plays in providing services and facilities for a Rural hinterland.	Identify Waterbeach as a proposed Minor Rural Centre.
3385	Object	The Objection relates to the assessment of Cambourne in the provision of urban facilities. A proper and reasonable assessment of Cambourne, with its planned provision for urban facilities would result in the conclusion that Cambourne meets all the criteria.	Noted. During the Local Development Framework period, Cambourne will become one of the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire and the range of facilities available will reflect this. It is for this reason that it would be designated as a Rural Centre.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2248	Object	Projections optimistic based on Cambourne history. Some facilities used to sell property (and mentioned here) are overdue/not planned. Public transport appalling. Timetable might be OK reality is service has lost credibility. Emphasis on transport to Cambridge wrong, many avoid because of traffic, choosing St Neots as a destination. Employment opportunities overstated...many on business park (majority?) commute to Cambourne! Workforce mobility and property prices mean few move to Cambourne simply because of job here. Traffic not thought through. Residents do not expect to be crowded in by more homes which were not included in the sales prospectus.	After Northstowe, Cambourne will be the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire. A very thorough assessment has been undertaken of the services and facilities that are available in the villages and Cambourne scores well. There is a planned strategy for securing the services, facilities and infrastructure at Cambourne which will be enhanced by requiring the additional development to contribute towards the additional needs of the larger community. National Planning Policy guidance has altered significantly since the original master plan for Cambourne was approved, with Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 (2001) emphasising the re-use of previously developed land, and the prevention of inefficient use of land by avoiding densities which result in a net density of less than 30 dwellings/ha.	Continue with the approach of identifying Cambourne as a proposed Rural Centre
2455	Object	I can't believe that Cambourne has been designated as a Rural Centre. It looks like the Council only takes into account the future size of the village, ignoring completely the actual residents, which have been betrayed by the developers and the Council itself. No secondary education in the village, no reliable public transport and no facilities are unacceptable!	After Northstowe, Cambourne will be the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire. A very thorough assessment has been undertaken of the services and facilities that are available in the villages and Cambourne scores well. There is a planned strategy for securing the services, facilities and infrastructure at Cambourne which will be enhanced by requiring the additional development to contribute towards the additional needs of the larger community. The approach to determining the level of local employment opportunities was endorsed by the Inspector in the Inquiry into the Local Plan 2004.	
2793	Object	Does not address poor rights of way, particularly bridleways	This is not an issue for the selection of Rural Centres. Rights of Way issues will be addressed within the Core Strategy policies.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3867	Object	<p>We wish to lodge objections to the proposal in the LDF to make Fulbourn a Rural Centre. Our objections are based on the following:-</p> <p>(a)Fulbourn needs to keep its identity as a village and not be just an extension of Cambridge – designation as a Rural Centre will make this more difficult.</p> <p>(b)Fulbourn does not have the infrastructure (schools, health services, bus services) to support a Rural Centre.</p> <p>(c)There is no specified limit to expansion for a Rural Centre and thus Fulbourn could be subject to a level of growth that would destroy its current village character.</p> <p>We believe that Fulbourn should be designated as a Group Centre (rather than a Rural Centre) as this would be more consistent with the realities of this village. We also fully support the objections submitted by Fulbourn Parish Council and RAVE on the current LDF proposals concerning Fulbourn.</p>	<p>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, the library facility is very limited and 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>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3868	Object	<p>We wish to lodge objections to the proposal in the LDF to make Fulbourn a Rural Centre. Our objections are based on the following:-</p> <p>(a)Fulbourn needs to keep its identity as a village and not be just an extension of Cambridge - designation as a Rural Centre will make this more difficult.</p> <p>(b)Fulbourn does not have the infrastructure (schools, health services, bus services) to support a Rural Centre.</p> <p>(c)There is no specified limit to expansion for a Rural Centre and thus Fulbourn could be subject to a level of growth that would destroy its current village character.</p> <p>We believe that Fulbourn should be designated as a Group Centre (rather than a Rural Centre) as this would be more consistent with the realities of this village. We also fully support the objections submitted by Fulbourn Parish Council and RAVE on the current LDF proposals concerning Fulbourn.</p>	<p>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, the library facility is very limited and 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.</p> <p>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. 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.</p>	Remove Fulbourn from list of proposed Rural Centres and add the village to the 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>
2804 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	<p>1. More development in rural areas to support rural communities.</p> <p>2. An additional category of rural centres should be added to allow for, and encourage development in settlements of below 3,000 people.</p> <p>3. An increased allowance should be made for windfall and infill sites in rural areas.</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. 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. There is no evidence to suggest that the small windfall rate should be reduced below the predicted rate for the remaining years of the plan period. The study already takes a conservative view based on examination of past rates. Based on the variety of sources of capacity, and high land values, it is likely that small windfalls will continue to be completed. A plan monitor and manage approach will be taken, to monitor completion rates, to ensure sufficient numbers are coming forward. The designation of rural centres will not impact on the small windfall rate, as such sites will be permitted in all types of village, on varying scales.</p>	
2787 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	<p>Section 4 and 5 of the document explains the process for identifying which villages qualify as Rural Centres. Paragraph 4.19 explains that the Structure Plan states that rural centres will need to include a surgery. The SCDC document is inconsistent in that Health Centres are mentioned in some potential rural centres and not in others. The approach should be consistent.</p>	<p>Agree that medical provision in each of the Rural Centres should be detailed in full.</p>	<p>Include in para 5.9-5.11 of the Rural Centres DPD reference to Sawston Health Centre.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2855 - RAVE	Object	<p>RAVE objects to "necklace villages " being included on the list of Rural Centres. This is contrary to the Panel Report on the Structure Plan on this topic.</p> <p>An alternative method of selection needs to be used which is much less prescriptive with regard to the basis of the choice and recognises that Rural Centres must fulfil that role for their own " hinterland " .</p>	<p>The reference to the villages being on the □ margins of sustainability does not imply that the Council do not support improving the sustainability of all villages, and maintaining rural services is an important aim of the LDF. This is evidenced by many of the policies in the Core Strategy, in particular those in the Services and Facilities chapter. The villages are at □ the margins of sustainability in terms of their ability to be a sustainable location for further housing development, relative to the more sustainable locations (Cambridge, the market towns, and the new town of Northstowe) higher up the search sequence of development set out in RPG 9.</p>	
2561 - FPDSavills (Land South of School Lane Swavesey)	Object	<p>We do not support the selection process of Rural Centres which the Council has adopted. The population threshold of 3,000 should not be the first criterion for selection but rather the assessment of the existing level of services and facilities. The settlement of Swavesey should be a Rural Centre and land at School Lane is capable of accommodating growing development pressures. The villages existing and potential employment base together with the proximity of the new Guided Busway are additional factors in supporting growth at Swavesey.</p>	<p>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 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.</p>	<p>Assess those villages which 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, against the Rural Centres criteria.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4171 - Westbury Homes	Object	<p>The application of 4 criteria to select Rural Centres is to effectively relegate a number of large settlements (Rural Growth Settlements). This effectively closes the door to development within a number of larger settlements, previously recognised as suitable for growth.</p> <p>The criteria for defining Rural Centres should include reference to villages in which there is the greatest potential for improved public transport accessibility and which also provide an important function as a local centre.</p>	<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 focuses 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. It would be contrary to the development strategy set out in the structure plan to provide for additional developments in the villages that were identified as Rural Growth settlements.</p>	
4172 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Para 4.10-4.24</p> <p>The 2001 Census shows that the following South Cambs parishes, with a population of 3,000 or more, have more workplace population than employed residents:</p> <p>Bar Hill, Fulbourn, Histon, Melbourn, Milton and Waterbeach</p> <p>Parishes with a population of more than 3,000, where the number of economically active residents exceeds the workplace population are:</p> <p>Bassingbourn, Cottenham, Gamlingay, Girton, Great Shelford, Impington, Linton (with Bartlow), and Sawston.</p>	<p>Noted. The use of parish level as opposed to ward level figures does not affect which villages were identified as Rural Centres. However, consider that it is appropriate to refer to parish level figures in the Rural Centres DPD.</p>	<p>In Rural Centres DPD, refer to parish-level figures and not to ward-level figures in paras relating to assessment of local employment opportunities.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4173 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>Para 4.14-4.16</p> <p>School capacity</p> <p>Part of the accessibility to secondary school assumptions made about rural centres is that there is capacity in the existing schools. The presence of a secondary school does not necessarily mean there will be high levels of surplus places available for future development. However, appropriate rural growth may provide the opportunity to both modernise unsatisfactory accommodation and expand capacity through developer contributions</p>	<p>Acknowledged that school capacity is important in determining whether new development can take place in Rural Centres. Consider that the issue of school capacity would be covered at the application stage 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 available or can be made available as part of the development."</p>	
4916 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	<p>Essentially the approach adopted is to reduce the number of villages of more than 3000 population that can be identified as Rural Centres to the absolute minimum, by applying criteria that can only be met by villages that function as suburbs to Cambridge already or by the new village of Cambourne, once it is fully developed. This results in 5 RCs, 4 of which are very close to Cambridge and do not function as centres for a rural hinterland. A more balanced approach would be to identify a better geographical spread, by using a broader interpretation of the main criteria. Gamlingay meets the population size and has a good range of shops and other facilities etc. and should be identified as a RC.</p>	<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 more attention needs to be given to the geographical spread of Rural Centres and their role 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.</p>	<p>Identify Minor Rural Centres as proposed in Recommendations section.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5314 (Land at Preist Lane, Willingham)	Object	The selection criteria result in 5 Rural Centres, 4 close to Cambridge, and therefore do not function as centres for a rural hinterland. It is not simply an issue of settlement size and level of services. What is needed is a balanced approach that takes account the particular function of each larger village, how it relates to its surrounding rural area and to market towns and urban areas outside the district. Essentially the approach adopted reduces the number of villages of more than 3,000 population that can be identified as a Rural Centre to a minimum, by applying criteria that can only be met by villages that function as suburbs to Cambridge, or by Cambourne. Willingham should be a Rural Centre.	The consideration which should be taken 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 more attention needs to be given to the geographical spread of Rural Centres and their role 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. 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.	Identify Minor Rural Centres as proposed in Recommendations section.
5621 - Carter Jonas 4390 - Hallam Land Management Ltd 4814 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department	Object	Melbourn should be included as a Rural Centre, given that it has a Village College, good employment opportunities, a wide variety of facilities and good public transport access to Cambridge and Royston.	Noted. Melbourn 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.	Include Melbourn as a proposed 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>
5657 - Gallagher Waterbeach Limited	Object	While not object to the criteria themselves, we do object to how they have been applied. Arguably all the settlements assessed have the capacity to accommodate additional growth which would enhance the compliance of the settlements with the criteria. Waterbeach has a good range of employment opportunities and good public transport. It would perhaps be more appropriate to focus additional development on those villages that have not scored as highly as the selected rural centres, but which have the real potential to mature as sustainable settlements during the LDF period.	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. Waterbeach would be proposed for designation as a Minor Rural Centre to take into account the role it plays in providing for its local hinterland. The 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 would be contrary to the principles of sustainability and to the policies of the Structure Plan.	Propose Waterbeach for inclusion as a Minor Rural Centre.
4402 - Hallam Land Management Ltd	Object	Object to interpretation of criteria for selection of rural centres detailed in the Structure Plan. In particular, Public Transport services (doesn't take account of planned improvements) and Village Facilities (takes no account of multiple smaller stores).	Noted. Agree that planned improvements to public transport, such as the Guided Bus scheme, should be taken into account. Agree that Village Facilities guidelines set out in para 1.17 of the may have been applied over prescriptively. 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.	Identify Minor Rural Centres as proposed 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>
4324 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Consider other candidates should also be considered for selection - principally Linton, Melbourn and possibly Gamlingay - see the comment made on Core Strategy CS4 approach	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.
4641 - Westbury Homes	Object	Criteria for defining rural centres should include reference to villages in which there is greatest potential for improved public transport accessibility and which also provide an important function as a local centre. If additional criteria were applied Cottenham and Melbourn should be included in list of rural centres.	Noted. Agree that planned improvements to public transport, such as the Guided Bus scheme, should be taken into account. Agree that Village Facilities guidelines set out in para 1.17 of the may have been applied over prescriptively. 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.	Identify Minor Rural Centres to include Cottenham and Melbourn as proposed 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>
4452 - RLW Estates	Object	The proposal to identify Cambourne as a Rural Centre is inconsistent with the Council's own criteria-based approach as set out in para. 5.24. As matters stand, Cambourne does not qualify for designation as a Rural Centre and, consistent with the Council's wish to resist any major expansion of the settlement (which we support) it should not be designated as a Rural Centre.	After Northstowe, Cambourne will be the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire. A very thorough assessment has been undertaken of the services and facilities that are available in the villages and Cambourne scores well. There is a planned strategy for securing the services, facilities and infrastructure at Cambourne which will be enhanced by requiring the additional development to contribute towards the additional needs of the larger community.	Continue with the approach of identifying Cambourne as a proposed Rural Centre
3634 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 1029 1111 3125 5118 5121	Object	Object to designation of Histon and Impington as a Rural Centre, on the grounds of lack of infrastructure capacity. Existing traffic problems likely to worsen, school/village college capacity in the villages is very limited, doctor's surgery running at full capacity, and there is inadequate surface and foul drainage.	The designation of Histon and Impington as a Rural Centre will not result in significant housing growth, either within or outside of the existing Village Framework boundary. No new housing allocations are proposed either within or outside of the Village Framework boundary. The designation of a settlement as a Rural Centre does not necessarily entail that any housing growth occurs; as the Structure Plan states, the role Rural Centres will vary across the plan area according to local circumstances. At present it is considered that Histon and Impington together are one of the most sustainable settlements in the district and have the facilities to merit inclusion as a Rural Centre. The Structure Plan provides for a limited proportion of the overall development provision to take place at identified Rural Centres on 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 to groups of communities. The constraints on the existing infrastructure, facilities, and schools of the villages would be borne in mind in considering the appropriateness of new developments in Histon and Impington.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5126 5128	Object	Histon & Impington needs a bypass, between Cottenham, joining the A14 mid way between Histon & Milton.	Proposed road improvements are identified in the Adopted Structure Plan 2003. It is outside of the scope of the LDF to identify proposed improvements.	
4805	Object	I am not suggesting that Bassingbourn should be made a Rural Centre as it would not appear to meet other criteria for this purpose, but evidence suggests that the qualifying population exceeds 3000, rather than the 2600 indicated in the report.	The source for the data is the 2001 Census. It is considered unlikely that the population of Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth excluding those resident at the barracks currently exceeds 3,000. However, will investigate this issue further with regard to Cambridgeshire County Council mid-2002 population estimates. It is agreed that the village is not suitable for designation as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre.	Seek confirmation that the current population of Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth (excluding the population resident at Bassingbourn Barracks) does not exceed 3,000.
4815 - Arrington Parish Council	Object	Using the criteria, Arrington is well outside the range for selection as a Rural Centre. However, Arrington could face the influence from growth at Cambourne, in terms of traffic growth or even desirability of the village as a preferred place of residence rather than Cambourne or Cambridge putting pressure on housing stock. It could also place pressure on other amenities, e.g. Wimpole Park, which causes problems of overspill parking.	It is considered unlikely that the additional homes at Cambourne would result in significant development pressure at Arrington. Any traffic growth resulting from the increased number of homes would be mainly focused on the A428 which connects Cambourne with Cambridge and St Neots. It is considered that there would be sufficient capacity at Wimpole Park to accommodate any increase in visitor numbers resulting from housing growth in Cambourne.	
5005 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	Cambourne does not qualify as a rural centre, as it falls short of qualifying criteria.	After Northstowe, Cambourne will be the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire. A very thorough assessment has been undertaken of the services and facilities that are available in the villages and Cambourne scores well. There is a planned strategy for securing the services, facilities and infrastructure at Cambourne which will be enhanced by requiring the additional development to contribute towards the additional needs of the larger community.	Continue with the approach of identifying Cambourne 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>
5188 - 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.	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.	
5419 - Home Owners / Residents of Long Tree Avenue	Object	Concerned about noise and air pollution from A14 at Impington. Residents endure an environment that is heavily polluted. We are not protected from volumes of traffic and their pollution, which have for a long time exceeded expectations. Install a noise and air pollution barrier alongside the road where homes are nearby. (Accompanied by a petition including 63 names and addresses supporting the representation).	Representation and petition noted. This issue will be considered in due course.	
5244	Object	The selection criteria result in 5 Rural Centres, 4 close to Cambridge, and therefore do not function as centres for a rural hinterland. It is not simply an issue of settlement size and level of services. What is needed is a balanced approach that takes account the particular function of each larger village, how it relates to its surrounding rural area and to market towns and urban areas outside the district. Essentially the approach adopted reduces the number of villages of more than 3,000 population that can be identified as a Rural Centre to a minimum, by applying criteria that can only be met by villages that function as suburbs to Cambridge, or by Cambourne.	Noted. 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. Waterbeach would be proposed for designation as a Minor Rural Centre to take into account the role it plays in providing for its local hinterland. The 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 would be contrary to the principles of sustainability and to the policies of the Structure Plan.	Identify Minor Rural Centres as proposed 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>
4852 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	Waterbeach has been unfairly excluded as a Rural Centre eligible to accommodate housing requirement beyond its current settlement boundaries as prescribed in the adopted SCLP. This view is taken on the basis that the existence of a main railway line station must represent a significant attribute in terms of sustainable credentials. Also there is no evidence in the Report as to the inadequacy of village facilities, Waterbeach has a number of shops and local employment opportunities. Waterbeach should be reassessed as a Rural Centre.	Response: 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.
5113 5115	Object	Not against development, but must take account of the level of the water table in Histon & Impington. Particularly the brook through Histon No.1 main drain.	Noted. It is not proposed that a significant level of growth should take place in Histon & Impington. The level of the water table in Histon & Impington would be taken into account in determining proposals for new development in the villages under Policy CS5.	
5795 - Stamford Homes Ltd 5799 - Westbury Homes Ltd	Object	Key criteria assessment contains subjectivity which could lead to other settlements also being identified as Rural Centres. Rural Centres have been identified to play a role in their wider rural hinterland but none are identified in the A14 corridor. No account is taken of identified improvements in public transport provision in the A14 corridor despite the proposed Guided Bus.	Agree that more attention needs to be given to the geographical spread of Rural Centres and their role 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.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5699 - The Masters and Fellows of Pembroke College	Object	Object to the exclusion of Linton from the list of Rural Centres. the Councils application of key criteria is fundamentally flawed; the village benefits from a surgery, food stores primary and junior school provision and a post office. Moreover the previous Local Plan Inquiry Inspector recognised Linton as a village with good a public transport network and local employment opportunities.	Linton, the largest village in the part of the district to the east of the A11 was assessed as part of the Rural Centres exercise and met only one of the Key Criteria (that of Accessibility of Secondary Education by virtue of the Village College in the village). However, 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, and also to take account of the distribution of Rural Centres through the District. The maximum size of development permitted will be up to 25 dwellings on sites within the Village Framework of the village.	Include Linton as a proposed Minor Rural Centre.
5730 - Dixon International Group Ltd (Land North of Brewery Raod, Pampisford)	Object	We support the identification of Sawston as a Rural Centre, and would like to see Pampisford included in the Sawston Policy area, and the Brewery Road site allocated for housing. Pampisford while a separate and distinct settlement, by reason of distance alone has all the facilities and services on offer in Sawston. The site is previously developed land and falls within category (iv) of PDG Policy 22. The site is clearly sustainable as it is within 3 miles of a secondary school, services and employment with good transport links.	Pampisford and Sawston are separate villages and have been treated as separate planning units for some time. Pampisford is designated in the Local Plan 2004 as an Infill-Only village. It is therefore not an appropriate location for development on the scale proposed.	
6172 - The Papworth Trust	Object	RC2 puts forward the list of selected Rural Centres. Elsewhere in the document, the planned and eventual size of Cambourne is put forward as a reason to consider its candidacy. The same argument holds true for Papworth Everard which is but part way only through a planned expansion programme first established by the 1989 Structure Plan. Papworth Everard should be elevated to Rural Centre status, with all that that entails.	Agree that Papworth Everard should be considered for inclusion on the basis that it will attain a population of more than 3,000 early in the LDF period. It would be inconsistent not to apply this approach given that existing commitments in Cambourne are taken into account. However, given the proximity of Papworth Everard to Cambourne it is not considered appropriate to designate Papworth Everard as a Rural Centre or Minor Rural Centre. Cambourne will have a greater range of facilities than will be available in Papworth Everard and will more effectively serve rural hinterland.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5937 6004 - H C Moss (Builders) Ltd (Land at East Farm, Melbourn)	Object	Objection to the omission of Melbourn from the Rural Centre classification. The table shows Melbourn met more criteria than Cambourne, which is recommended as a Rural Centre. On the issue of Public Transport which Melbourn is deemed to have failed, the determining factor should have been potential of the settlement in this regard. Further development might encourage provision of improved services. Counter to the aim of sustainability to permit only up to groups of 8 dwellings in the fourth largest settlement in the district.	Melbourn would 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.	
5739 6002 - The Fairey Family	Object	Linton complies with the selection criteria for designation as a rural centre so should be designated.	Linton, was assessed as part of the Rural Centres exercise and met only one of the Key Criteria (that of Accessibility of Secondary Education by virtue of the Village College in the village). However, 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, and also to take account of the distribution of Rural Centres through the District. The maximum size of development permitted will be up to 25 dwellings on sites within the Village Framework of the village.	Include Linton as a proposed Minor Rural Centre.
5837 5825 - P B Moore & Sons	Object	Object to the subjectivity of the key criteria in assessing individual settlements and the absence of any reference to the wider rural context of settlements. Lack of any reference to likely improvements in bus and rail accessibility and the fact that, despite the availability of existing public transport accessibility in the A10 corridor and significant planned improvements in the A14 corridor, no Rural Centre has been identified in this part of the District.	Agree that more attention needs to be given to the geographical spread of Rural Centres and their role 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. No Rural Centre is identified in the A14 corridor on account of the role that Northstowe will play in providing services and facilities in this area.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5844 - Barker Parry Town Planning 5774 - Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd	Object	Subjectivity affects how the criteria are assessed against individual settlements. If a different weighting were used this would result in other more sustainable settlements being considered favourably as Rural Centres. No account of the Structure Plan reference (para 1.17) as to how the individual settlements relate to a rural hinterland and other small villages. In view of the role of Rural Centres, the absence of any in the A14 and A10 corridors is inappropriate. Waterbeach should be identified in view of its excellent public transport links and location within the A10 corridor.	Agree that more attention needs to be given to the geographical spread of Rural Centres and their role 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. Waterbeach is identified as a Minor Rural Centre to take account of the role it plays in providing services and facilities for a Rural hinterland.	Identify Waterbeach as a proposed Minor Rural Centre.
5889 - Barker Parry Town Planning	Object	With reference to paragraphs 4.4-4.9: This shortlist more or less accords with the adopted Local Plan Rural Growth Settlements (RGS) which were scrutinised and endorsed for inclusion in the 2004 plan. There is no obvious reason for opting to exclude most of the shortlist.	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 focuses 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. It would be contrary to the development strategy set out in the structure plan to provide for additional developments in the villages that were identified as Rural Growth settlements.	
5891 - D H Barford & Co	Object	Object to key criteria and failure to acknowledge Gamlingay as rural centre. Gamlingay has; regular bus service to market town, accessibility to secondary school at Biggleswade, local facilities and employment. Employment criteria is unnecessarily restrictive and not a good indicator of sustainability. Having a post office not necessarily a reflection of sustainability. Does not take account of geographical importance of some larger villages. Makes no consideration of distribution of proposed rural centres.	Noted. Consider that whilst Gamlingay does not meet Rural Centres Key Criteria it should be designated as a Minor Rural Centre to take account of the role that the village has in providing services and facilities for a rural hinterland.	Include Gamlingay as a proposed 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>
5854	Object	Key criteria assessment contains subjectivity which could lead to other settlements also being identified as Rural Centres. Identified Rural Centres are not accepted as appropriate and it is put that Willingham should be identified. Rural Centres have been not been identified to play a role in their wider rural hinterland but none are identified in the A14 corridor despite the proposed Guided Bus.	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.	
5932	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.	Melbourn would 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.	
5876 5877	Object	Fails to acknowledge Swavesey as a Rural Centre. Although it has a population less than 3000, Structure Plan clarifies this will only be a general requirement. Swavesey is a sustainable location enjoying public transport availability, local facilities, secondary school and local employment opportunities.	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>
5962 (Land North of Kneesworth)	Object	Paras 4.6 and 5.1 Strong objection to the omission of Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth from the table considering Rural Centres Key Criteria. Although the population is stated to be under 3,000 persons following the exclusion of the population at Bassingbourn Barracks, the fact still remains that the village facilities are good, and that the village is conveniently located for easy access into Royston. These villages could support further growth in excess of the very limited growth proposed in Group villages. Either it should be selected as a Rural Growth Centre, or a further category of settlement should be designated.	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. It is considered that Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth does not play a significant role in providing for a rural hinterland in view of its close proximity to Royston.	
5238 5681 - Banner Homes 4517 - Christ's College 4904 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department 4809 6521 - Henry H Bletsoe & Son	Object	Representations argue for the inclusion of Cottenham as a Rural Centre. The village has a wide range of facilities that were not adequately taken into account in the Rural Centres analysis. The employment analysis which is used is simplistic, ignoring consideration of potential, skills, and sustainability issues such as mode and distance of travel to work. One representation states that Cottenham should be a Rural Centre as it would be a logical settlement in which to provide a good-sized development. It is also argued that two previous South Cambs reports have identified Cottenham as a sustainable village, and the Guided Bus Link will run close to Cottenham, providing access to employment opportunities in the north of Cambridge. It is also argued that the Structure Plan criteria have been applied too rigidly.	Agree that the village facilities Key Criterion was insufficiently sensitive to the role that smaller, specialised food shops play in complementing small supermarkets. Consider that the food shopping provision in Cottenham is probably sufficient for the village to meet the convenience shopping element of the Village Facilities criterion as was set out in the Preferred Options Report. The approach to the designation of Rural Centres is to be revised to take greater account of the role that villages play in serving a local hinterland and of the distribution of Rural Centres through the District. It is accepted that Cottenham currently plays a role in providing services and facilities for a local hinterland, and it is therefore proposed as a Minor Rural Centre. The close proximity of Cottenham to Northstowe means that designating the village as a Rural Centre would not be a prudent strategy, as it could lead to the duplication of the provision of facilities in the two settlements. As the LDF period progresses, Northstowe will to a some extent supplant Cottenham's role in providing services and facilities for the smaller villages to the north-west of Cambridge.	Include Cottenham on 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>
2266 - Fulbourn Parish Council 985 3504 4550 6514 6515 6519 6537	Object	Representations objecting to the designation of Fulbourn as a Rural Centre. Objections focus on time the buses from Fulbourn take to get to Cambridge, the lack of accessibility of secondary education, the doctor's surgery only being a branch surgery, the lack of facilities for young people, and the fact that the library in the village is a volunteer library served by a mobile library. It is also argued that there is a lack of infrastructure capacity in terms of sewerage and in terms of traffic volumes on the road into Cambridge. Objections also emphasise the need for Fulbourn to remain its separate identity from Cambridge.	<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 particular 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.</p> <p>In spite of these considerations, Fulbourn nevertheless can be said to have a good 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. 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</p>	Remove Fulbourn from list of proposed Rural Centres and add the village to the list of proposed Minor Rural Centres, as detailed in the Recommendation section.

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

and services, facilities and infrastructure are 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.

With regard to unsuitability of larger villages close to Cambridge for further development, 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.

Issues of infrastructure capacity for new development are addressed by CS5 Development within Rural Centre, 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

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			are identified 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 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.	
6539 4878 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd	Object	Disagree with selection. Bar Hill is a PENS and should also be categorised as a Rural Centre.	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.	
5989 - The W Scambler Trust 5988 (Land North of Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey) 5990 (Land West of 18 Boxworth End, Swavesey)	Object	Qualifying criteria for Rural Centres are too prescriptive and that too few settlements have been placed on existing characteristics, rather than the potential of settlements. Swavesey would have met the required standards if it had been considered. It has good facilities and services and good communications which will be further improved once the transport system along the Cambridge-St Ives railway line is operational. Swavesey only failed on account of the population being 500 under the chosen threshold. This is a factor which could be altered should the village be selected for further growth. Inappropriate for it to be classified a Group village, it should be a Rural Centre, or a further category of settlement introduced.	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. It is therefore considered that Swavesey should not be identified 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>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

5992 - Barker Parry Town Planning (Beech Tree Farm, Shepreth Road, Foxton)	Object	With reference to paragraph 3.8: It is perverse to say the least that villages which were assessed for development suitability via the 2004 adopted Local Plan are now deemed to be "at the margins of sustainability". They have not changed in the last few years and if that is truly the case it could apply to most of South Cambridgeshire. It is unrealistic and unreasonable to ignore the social and economic capital already invested in these villages in this fashion.	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 focuses 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. It would be contrary to the development strategy set out in the structure plan to provide for additional developments in the villages that were identified as Rural Growth settlements.	
6109 - 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 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>
6129 - Ashdale Land & Property Consultants	Object	The key criteria are far too simplistic and fail to acknowledge that local facilities and amenities can only be improved, if sustainable growth is encouraged. We are fundamentally concerned that insufficient villages have been identified as Rural Centres, and the quantifying criteria in Rural Centres are too stringent. This links into January's general representation regarding CS19 and CS21 in relation to the assessment of housing need within the district.	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.	
1395 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	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.	Paragraph 1.17 of the Adopted Structure states that "Rural Centres will generally have a population of at least 3,000..." This clearly implies that settlements with a population of less than 3,000 cannot be excluded from consideration as Rural Centres. 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.	
2935 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Support	We support these criteria in general. Currently the population of Papworth Everard is below 2000, however the allocated housing and further developments could increase it to 3000 before 2016. The village needs time to consolidate and develop as a community. In recognition of the exceptional rate of growth (approx 350% in 20 years) and the contribution it has made, and is continuing to make, towards the housing needs of South Cambridgeshire, Papworth Everard should be exceptionally excluded from being considered as a Rural Centre in the lifetime of this LDF.	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 given that it will reach a population of 3,000. 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.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3490	Support	Fulbourn should be designated as a Rural Centre capable of taking peripheral development to assist with the provision of community services/facilities in a strictly limited number of locations.	<p>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, the library facility is very limited and 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.</p> <p>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. 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. Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan 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. Peripheral development is therefore very unlikely to be acceptable in Fulbourn, particularly in view of the fact that the village is surrounded by Green Belt</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4896	Support	Support Fulbourn's selection as rural centre.	land. 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, the library facility is very limited and 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. 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.	
1936 5694 6516 - Histon & Impington Village Society 6134 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6137 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Support	Support the identification of Histon and Impington as a Rural Centre.	Support noted.	
5706 - Freshwater Estates Ltd. (Land at 41 Mill Lane, Sawston)	Support	Designation of Sawston as a Rural Centre is supported.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5999	Support	Identification of Sawston as a Rural Centre is supported, given its size, status and the range of existing services and facilities available. However, some peripheral expansion on the northern edge of the town should be promoted.	Sawston is one of a string of villages which extends south from Cambridge. Coalescence between Stapleford, Gt Shelford and Cambridge has already occurred and great care needs to be taken to ensure that the relatively narrow green belt between Stapleford and the A505 in which Sawston now sits is not eroded. The northern edge of Sawston is relatively exposed on its northern approaches and development would adversely affect the character of the setting of Cambridge in which Sawston sits. Furthermore changes to the green belt and development on the scale proposed is not required as there are sustainable locations outside the green belt which are able to meet the development needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region.	
5926 - The Davison Group	Support	Para 5.3 The description of Cambourne as a Rural Centre is supported on the grounds that the existing infrastructure can adequately accommodate significant additional growth.	Support noted. There is a planned strategy for securing the services, facilities and infrastructure at Cambourne which will be enhanced by requiring the additional development to contribute towards the additional needs of the larger community.	
4039 - Eltisley Parish Council 6155 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd 6154 - Harcourt Developments Ltd.	Support	Support the identification of Cambourne as a Rural Centre.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5870 5873	Support	Support Fulbourn correctly being identified as a Rural Centre particularly as it easily fulfils three of the four Key Criteria.	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, the library facility is very limited and the village is not well related to a secondary school. 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.	Remove Fulbourn from list of proposed Rural Centres and add the village to the list of proposed Minor Rural Centres, as detailed in the Recommendation section.
5791 5817 (Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Great Shelford) 5906 5818 (Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Great Shelford) 5880	Support	Identification of Great Shelford/Stapleford as a Rural Centre is supported, given its size, status and the range of services and facilities available. Peripheral expansion on the eastern side of Great Shelford and at Stapleford is warranted. This site could provide much needed further housing development, including affordable housing.	Support for Great Shelford/Stapleford's designation as a Rural Centre noted. However, it is not considered necessary to make further housing allocations in Great Shelford/Stapleford. It is considered that intensification at Cambourne is the most sustainable option for providing for homes that need to be accommodated in Rural Centres. Policy P1/1 of the Structure Plan 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. Peripheral expansion on the eastern side of Great Shelford is therefore unacceptable.	

Decision on RC2 Selection of Rural Centres - 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>
------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------

6. The Housing Requirement and the level of development in Rural Centres

RC3 Scale of Additional Development in Rural Centres - Preferred Approach

2269 - Fulbourn Parish Council	Object	Fulbourn wishes to have reassurance written in the LDF that explicitly states should the Marshalls site not become available, its development should not be forced on Rural Centres.	The redevelopment of Cambridge Airport is a firm proposal in the recently adopted Cambridgeshire Structure Plan which runs until 2016. Development at Cambridge Airport therefore has more than 10 years to commence. However, should development at Cambridge Airport not take place, the strategy in the Structure Plan and in draft RSS14 are identical and provides the same sequential search basis for identifying locations for development. Further new towns, development in the market towns and at rural centres would all have to be considered unless there are other (unforeseen) reasons to plan for a different scale of development.	
2268	Object	PPG3 was originally out of the picture, now its in. Also the council wants more homes than PPG3 requires which makes them look like they are in league with the developers, to build as much as possible for profit.	A revised Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 was adopted in 2001 with an emphasis on the re-use of previously developed land, and avoiding the inefficient use of land by avoiding densities which result in a net density of less than 30 dwellings/ha. The Council is required to take account of the guidance in planning policy guidance notes in determining applications.	
4859 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd 5193 - Laing Homes North Thames 5682 - Ely Diocesan Board	Object	Representations consider that the windfall total of 120 dwellings a year in villages for sites up to 7 dwellings is unrealistic.	South Cambridgeshire has historically achieved up to 200 houses a year by way of windfalls in villages. During the course of the Local Plan No. 2 Public Local Inquiry, the supply of housing windfalls in villages was scrutinised in some detail. The Inspector concluded that the supply of windfalls had been remarkably consistent (roughly 120 per year from sites of up to 7 dwellings and 80 per year from larger sites). 120 dwellings per year equates to about 1 dwelling per village per year and which is still considered to be justified by monitoring evidence.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1038 988 932 2476 5690 3453 4656 4655	Object	Development of Cambourne beyond 3,300 dwellings is strongly objected to. Residents feel totally let down having been given assurances that no further development would take place. The planned facilities and infrastructure were never designed to support further development.	<p>The LDF aims to provide a policy framework which will maximise the amount of development from all settlements but only in a way which is compatible with the scale, character and level of services to be found in each settlement. After Northstowe, Cambourne will be the second largest settlement in South Cambridgeshire which is planned to have a wide range of services and facilities.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Structure Plan proposes that the potential for further development at Cambourne be investigated.</p> <p>The Preferred Options Report proposes to increase development in the remaining phases of Cambourne to the Government's minimum recommended density and no more. There are no proposals to break with the masterplan concept of 3 separate villages and build on any planned green spaces. The Council has resisted all such developer proposals.</p> <p>Services and facilities which are required by a development up to 3,300 houses are covered by the existing Section 106 agreement. Planning permission for development in excess of that number will be subject to a new Section 46 agreement for the additional services and facilities which will be required by the additional population (Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act - planning obligations)</p>	Continue with the preferred approach to increase housing density at Cambourne.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
1937	Object	In addition to the site of 1.4 hectares, the gardens at 59 & 61 Cottenham Road and the land behind make no contribution to the green belt objectives for Cambridge, nor do they contribute to the setting and character of the village. The site is ideal for housing development and can contribute to the meeting of the housing targets for the Cambridge sub-area.	These houses stand on wide plots with other low density houses and undeveloped land to the east. They lie at the point where the built-up area gives way to a generally rural landscape on the north side of this part of Cottenham Road. They are appropriately included in the green belt which at this point contributes to the character of Histon which in turn contributes to the setting of Cambridge,	
2814 (Land between Stonehill Road and Westfield Road)	Object	Great Shelford is properly identified as a Rural Centre. As a result of the under-estimate in the need to allocate new sites for housing, a site at Great Shelford, at Cambridge Road, should be allocated for housing.	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 Cambridge 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.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
2831 - Cambridge Water Company (Land between Teversham Road and Cow Lane, Fulbourn)	Object	Cambridge Water Company supports the identification of Fulbourn as a Rural Centre. On the basis of an under-provision of necessary housing to achieve Structure Plan totals, an allocation for housing in Fulbourn is justified on the identified site.	Development at Cow Lane Fulbourn would have an adverse impact on the rural character of that part of the village. In addition, development at Cambourne can meet the outstanding housing requirement for the villages by increasing densities in its remaining phases to the minimum recommended in PPG3 without taking any more land for development.	
2823 - McCann Homes Limited	Object	<p>1. The plan should not rely on increasing development densities on residual sites to meet housing allocations.</p> <p>2. Instead of increasing densities in the stated settlements it would be more appropriate to allocate some limited development to the rural areas in general. Some of the better served villages, such as Guilden Morden could provide suitable sites for some of this development.</p>	<p>Guilden Morden is not a village with a better range of services. Increasing the density of development at Cambourne to the minimum density recommended in PPG3 will ensure that development occurs in a more sustainable location without taking any additional land for development.</p>	
2565 - FPDSavills	Object	We do not consider the figure of 366 additional dwellings to be found in the District is realistic given the unrealistic nature of the work undertaken in the Urban Capacity Study. In any case the Council will need to await the outcome of the Cambourne Enhanced Appeal.	There is no evidence to suggest that the small windfall rate should be reduced below the predicted rate for the remaining years of the plan period. The study already takes a conservative view based on examination of past rates. Based on the variety of sources of capacity, and high land values, it is likely that small windfalls will continue to be completed. A plan monitor and manage approach will be taken, to monitor completion rates, to ensure sufficient numbers are coming forward. The designation of rural centres will not impact on the small windfall rate, as such sites will be permitted in all types of village, on varying scales.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
3422 (Land West of Cambourne)	Object	<p>The Objection relates to the failure of the LDD;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To make an efficient use of housing land within the Master Plan 2. To promote average housing density greater than 30 dwellings per hectare 3. To identify a fourth neighbourhood to the west of the existing Master Plan to enable provision of greater range of facilities including a secondary school and improved public transport services. Cambourne would become a more sustainable settlement than is currently planned. 4. To identify a site for park and ride facility, and an enlarged employment area. 	<p>Cambourne has been planned as 3 linked villages.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Structure Plan proposes that most new development must be located in, and on the edge, of Cambridge or at Northstowe, which are all more sustainable locations for development than Cambourne. The Preferred Options Report proposes that an appropriate response to the need to reflect the sustainability objectives of PPG3 in the future development of Cambourne can be addressed by increasing the density of development to 30dph in the remaining phases which will secure substantial additional development without the need for additional greenfield sites. 2. Treating 30dph as an average will allow for greater variety in development. However, if Cambourne is to continue with the theme of 3 linked villages, densities which the Structure Plan considers more appropriate to highly accessible, well serviced town locations would not be appropriate. 3. The proposed location for a fourth neighbourhood to the west of Cambourne was rejected as allocation for development by the Secretary of State on the recommendation of his Planning Inspector as part of the process for selecting a site for Cambourne. This location was judged by the Inspector there to be "strong objections to its development", recording that is an essential part of a wide and open landscape of considerable character and was too far from Cambridge to meet its development needs. This is borne out by a residents survey undertaken in 2002 which shows that only 40% of residents work/study in Cambridge. Commuting to London in particular is made easy by the proximity of Royston and St Neots railway stations. 	<p>Investigate with the County Council the possibility of developing a rural interchange at Cambourne.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
			4. An enlarged employment site is not necessary to serve Cambourne and employment sites serving a wider area would best be developed as strategic employment sites on the edge of Cambridge or at Northstowe where substantial additional development is planned. A rural interchange may be appropriate at Cambourne provided that it could be demonstrated that it would not undermine conventional bus services serving the A428 corridor.	
3635 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils 3126	Object	Impington 1 land (rear of Impington Lane) has not come forward for development during previous plan periods. It now lies in an area identified by the Environment Agency as having a moderate risk of flooding and should be struck from the list.	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.
3734 - GO-East 3733 - GO-East	Object	There is a lack of a clear chain of conformity between documents, specifically between the Core Strategy and the Rural Centres DPD. There is a lack of clarity about how the preferred option identified in the Rural Centres DPD Preferred Options Report will be carried forward into the Local Development Framework.	Agreed. Rural Centres will be included as an integral part of the Core Strategy DPD when submitted to the Secretary of State.	Include policies on Rural Centres in the Core Strategy DPD.

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

3846 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Land South of Rectory Road, Duxford)

Object

Para 6.8 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.

The Structure Plan strategy aims to focus new development in and on the edge of Cambridge and at a new town at Northstowe. Development in villages is to be limited. Whilst some development could be permitted in Rural Centres, the Preferred Options Report proposes to focus any significant additional development at Cambourne which will be one of the most sustainable villages in South Cambridgeshire. Duxford does not have a sufficiently wide range of services and facilities to meet the Structure Plan's requirements for designation as a Rural Centre. Whilst development of the proposed site at Duxford would make use of a brownfield site, PPG3 does not make re-use of brownfield land irrespective of its location an over-riding planning objective. In this case Duxford is not a sufficiently sustainable village for the scale of development proposed.

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

4918 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	<p>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 within the Rural Centres. With regard to meeting the social or economic needs of communities which can 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, facilities and services etc, as part of a sustainable and well designed village extension.</p>	<p>The Structure Plan strategy aims to focus new development in and on the edge of Cambridge and at a new town at Northstowe. Development in villages is to be limited. Whilst some development could be permitted in Rural Centres, the Preferred Options Report proposes to focus any significant additional development at Cambourne which will be one of the most sustainable villages in South Cambridgeshire. Gamlingay does not have a sufficiently wide range of services and facilities to meet the Structure Plan's requirements for designation as a Rural Centre. Whilst development of the proposed site close to Gamlingay would make use of a brownfield site, PPG3 does not make re-use of brownfield land irrespective of its location an over-riding planning objective. In this case Duxford is not a sufficiently sustainable village for the scale of development proposed. In addition, Gamlingay is not well located to serve the development needs of Cambridge and the objection site is poorly related to Gamlingay itself, occupying a prominent location in the countryside.</p>	
---------------------------------	--------	---	--	--

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

5240
5316

Object

This matter is addressed in our comments on the Core Strategy (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. 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.)

Contrary to the views of the objector, the Structure Plan does place limitations on development at Rural Centres. Firstly, the context for the policy on Rural Centres is the over-arching Structure Plan objectives for the Cambridge Sub-Region to focus new development in and on the edge of Cambridge and at the new town of Northstowe. 10,400 houses are to be provided in those locations. 9,600 houses are to be provided in villages principally because of commitments carried forward from existing plans (which were reviewed in the context of this Structure Plan as part of Local Plan No. 2) and planning permissions as well as to allow for 'windfall' development. As a consequence the Structure Plan concludes that "Over 80% of the expected development in the category covering Market Towns, PENS, Rural Centres and elsewhere has already been committed and thus the expectation is that there will be a limited requirement for new sites." It is for the District Council to decide in its LDSF how to take these matter forward. The Preferred Options Report does allow for housing estate scale development at Rural Centres where it can make best use of previously developed land as well as by increasing densities - the same approach as at Cambourne. Rather than treating Cambourne differently, Cambourne is being treated the same as other Rural Centres where peripheral development would also not be permitted.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4670 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Hill Farm, Sawston) 2828 - Dencora/Helical Bar	Object	Sawston is properly identified as a Rural Centre. Its role can be strengthened by the allocation of land for a mixed scheme of housing, employment and open space on its northern side. That would also bring with it the opportunity to construct a local relief road, which has had some support in the past from the local community. RC3 will prevent future logical extensions coming forward. Given doubt over achieving housing numbers, site at Sawston would be a logical extension.	Sawston is one of a string of villages which extends south from Cambridge. Coalescence between Stapleford, Gt Shelford and Cambridge has already occurred and great care needs to be taken to ensure that the relatively narrow green belt between Stapleford and the A505 in which Sawston now sits is not eroded. The northern edge of Sawston is relatively exposed on its northern approaches and development would adversely affect the character of the setting of Cambridge in which Sawston sits. Furthermore changes to the green belt and development on the scale proposed is not required as there are sustainable locations outside the green belt which are able to meet the development needs of the Cambridge Sub-Region.	
4688 - Countryside Properties (Special Projects) Plc	Object	Failure to consider alternative options for accommodating the 700 units proposed within Cambourne and to consider the merits of Cambourne expansion - development within the existing masterplan area is not the only option for accommodating that new housing - for example, through additional properly planned growth.	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 focuses 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. The outstanding housing requirement for development can be met sustainably at Cambourne as suggested by the Structure Plan EIP panel by increasing development densities to just 30 dph without taking any more land for development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4760 4758 - Atkins Property Developments Ltd	Object	Disagree. The option presupposes that the settlements (including Cambourne) and housing allocations identified in the option are acceptable and sustainable in planning terms. Bar Hill is considered to be more sustainable than Cambourne. The draft policy is not worthy of policy status because it seeks to prejudice or fetter the Council's ability to consider later development control issues.	Any requirement for additional development in rural areas can be met at Cambourne by increasing development to the 30dph minimum recommended by government in PPG3 without taking additional land for development. Bar Hill does not have the services and facilities that are provided or planned to be provided as part of the Section 106 agreement at Cambourne.	
5255 - Swavesey IDB	Object	Foul water from Cambourne currently discharges into the Uttons Drove Sewage treatment works, which in turn discharges treated effluent into a tributary of the Swavesey Drain, which crosses the boards area. The board is most concerned that the 700 proposed additional dwellings at Cambourne, combined with the proposed effluent from Northstowe, will exacerbate flooding. The board is aware that Anglian Water Services Ltd are currently in discussion with the Environment Agency concerning these matters, but is concerned at the length of time that discussions have taken to achieve this and will continue to oppose any development that proposes to discharge treated effluent into the Swavesey drain system via any new or existing sewage treatment works.	Lengthy discussion/negotiations to resolve development issues are not unusual and it is encouraging that discussions between Anglian Water Services Ltd and the Environment Agency are in hand. Planning permissions will not be granted until these discussions are completed and in the full knowledge of the views of the Internal Drainage Board.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5775 - Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd	Object	Inappropriate for the residual housing requirement still to be identified in the rural area to be directed entirely at Cambourne, particularly in view of RC1. Rolling forward existing Local Plan allocations is questioned - these should be reappraised. Other Rural Centres identified or others that merit identification, such as Waterbeach, could derive greater benefit from a housing allocation in terms of promoting rural sustainability.	The Structure Plan proposed that existing housing allocations be reviewed. That review was undertaken as part of the completions of Local Plan No. 2. The few sites that remain in the Local Plan will provide for the transition to take place between the old strategy which scattered development across a number of villages to the new strategy which focuses development in and on the edge of Cambridge and at Northstowe. Identifying a large number of Rural Centres where significant residential development would be permitted would be fundamentally in conflict with the new Structure Plan strategy. Waterbeach has been assessed as part of the Rural Centre strategy and has been found to lack the necessary services and facilities as well as having no effective rural catchment area to serve. Even if Waterbeach were identified as a Rural centre, the objections does not suggest that any specific social and economic needs of the local community which would justify development.	

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

5705 - The Masters and Fellows of Pembroke College Object

Object to the lack of housing allocations in the Rural Centres. This is based on inaccurate assumptions through the lack of proper scrutiny of previously developed land through the UCS, over reliance of Local Plan 2004 allocations and an overestimate of housing likely to come forward from other sources. Linton in particular is capable of accommodating peripheral growth; College land interests abutting the NE of the village could satisfy any shortfall in housing land supply.

The Structure Plan proposed that existing housing allocations be reviewed. That review was undertaken as part of the completions of Local Plan No. 2. The few sites that remain in the Local Plan will provide for the transition to take place between the old strategy which scattered development across a number of villages to the new strategy which focusses development in and on the edge of Cambridge and at Northstowe. Identifying a large number of Rural Centres where significant residential development would be permitted would be fundamentally in conflict with the new Structure Plan strategy. Linton has been assessed as part of the Rural Centre strategy and has been found to lack the necessary services and facilities. Even if Linton were identified as a Rural centre, the objections does not suggest that any specific social and economic needs of the local community which would justify development. Linton may have a role as a service centre which because of the limited range of services that are available is being proposed as a Minor Rural Centre where service providers would be encouraged to provide or maintain their services to serve surrounding villages, but that significant development would not be encouraged.

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

5731 - Dixon International Group Ltd (Land North of Brewery Raod, Pampisford)	Object	<p>Our site at Brewery Road, Pampisford, as previously developed land, has qualities suitable to promote it as a housing allocation. Its proximity and close association with Sawston, the largest village identified as a Rural Centre renders it appropriate for consideration. Previously developed land should take precedence over greenfield allocations. The services and facilities of Sawston are within easy walking/cycling distance.</p>	<p>Whilst Sawston is proposed as a Rural Centre where the redevelopment of significant brownfield sites would be permitted, Dixons International is located in Pampisford which is a small village. The firm provides a valuable source of local employment which is within close proximity of much of its workforce. Whilst the preferred approach to development in small villages such as Pampisford would permit development which makes best use of a previously developed site, this site is of such a scale that it is greater than the flexibility intended by the policy. The use of the site for employment will have relatively little impact on the village compared to a substantial new housing estate. With the exception of the proposed medical centre at London Road, the services and facilities in Sawston are focussed in or north of the village centre which is located over 1 kilometre from Dixons International and is not within easy walking distance.</p>	
5800 - Westbury Homes Ltd	Object	<p>Residual housing should not be directed entirely to Cambourne at the expense of other established rural settlements. Appropriate levels of new housing development should be directed to other Rural Centres to deliver early benefits. Policy conflicts with CS1 which seeks to bring about improvements in the relative sustainability of individual villages or groups of villages;</p>	<p>The objective of the Structure Plan is to turn around a policy of developing in villages to focussing development in and on the edge of Cambridge, and in a new town at Northstowe. Any requirement for additional development in rural areas can be met at Cambourne by increasing development to the 30dph minimum recommended by government in PPG3 without taking additional land for development.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5928 - The Davison Group (Land between Cambourne and Papworth Everard) 6139 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd (Land between Cambourne and Knapwell) 6140 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. (Land between Cambourne and Knapwell)	Object	Object to the scale of additional development at the Rural Centres. Omission of reference to additional development at Cambourne to the north of the A428. Cambourne represents a sustainable location for additional development in accordance with the sequential approach to development in PPG3, on a principle public transport route into Cambridge and will provide an element of self containment. Need for additional flexibility in the Council's approach e.g. in identifying certain Rural Centres as suitable for additional peripheral development is evident from the deliverability issues arising from the high level development required to 2016 and 2021 and issues around implementation of Northstowe.	1. Cambourne has been planned as 3 linked villages. The Structure Plan proposes that most new development must be located in and on the edge of Cambridge or at Northstowe which are all more sustainable locations for development than Cambourne. The Preferred Options Report proposes that an appropriate response to the need to reflect the sustainability objectives of PPG3 in the future development of Cambourne can be addressed by increasing the density of development to 30dph in remaining phases which will secure substantial additional development without the need for additional greenfield sites. 2. The proposed location for development north of the A428 was rejected as allocation for development by the Secretary of State on the recommendation of his planning inspector as part of the process for selecting a site for Cambourne. This location was judged by the Inspector there to be "overwhelming objections" to its development recording because of its impact on an area of attractive landscape and damage to wildlife habitats.	
5838 5871 5874 5828 - P B Moore & Sons	Object	Residual housing should not be directed entirely to Cambourne. Inappropriate, particularly in view of the first objective of RC1. The direction of appropriate levels of development to other settlements in the District, in particular, Graveley, is considered to be capable of delivering suitable successes, in preference to further development at Cambourne only.	After Northstowe, Cambourne will be the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire. A very thorough assessment has been undertaken of the services and facilities that are available in the villages and Cambourne scores well. There is a planned strategy for securing the services, facilities and infrastructure at Cambourne which will be enhanced by requiring the additional development to contribute towards the additional needs of the larger community. Villages such as Cottenham do not have the capacity in their services to accommodate significant additional development and the scale of development for example to deliver a second primary school would be very significant indeed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5907 (Land East of Hinton Way, Great Shelford)	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 off Mingle Lane/Hinton Way, Great Shelford - is considered ideal for further growth, which could be achieved with detriment to village amenity.	The Structure Plan proposed that existing housing allocations be reviewed. That review was undertaken as part of the completions of Local Plan No. 2. The few sites that remain in the Local Plan will provide for the transition to take place between the old strategy which scattered development across a number of villages to the new strategy which focuses development in and on the edge of Cambridge and at Northstowe. Additional development of any significance in villages is not necessary and would make the strategy less sustainable than the Structure Plan proposes. The objection site is currently designated as green belt and its role is to limit development at Gt Shelford/Stapleford in order to protect the character of the villages and countryside as part of the setting of Cambridge.	
5927 - The Davison Group	Object	The absence of an easily accessible secondary school is a disadvantage to the sustainability of Cambourne. Given that confirmed development at Cambourne is committed, it is recommended that the final target numbers of dwellings be increased to such an extent that the centre could justify the establishment of a secondary school. It is acknowledged this would necessitate expansion beyond the planned boundaries, but the increased sustainability is considered to be of over-riding importance.	Secondary School provision for Cambourne at a size of 3,300 dwellings has been funded and provided in full at Comberton. Providing a secondary school at Cambourne would require some 6,000 additional dwellings which would make Cambourne as large as Northstowe. Such a strategic level of growth should have been identified in the Structure Plan and subjected to scrutiny as part of the wider consideration of major development in the Cambridge Sub-Region. Since the objective of the Structure Plan strategy is to focus development at the heart of the Sub-Region (in and on the edge of Cambridge or at Northstowe), there can be no support for major development some 10 miles distant from Cambridge at Cambourne in this plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
5929 - The Davison Group	Object	Annexe C Para 1.23. Given that Cambourne is recommended to be a Rural Centre with a population in excess of 3,000, then it seems unreasonable to state that the wish is to retain the character as a 'village'; rather than one of a market town. Commensurate with the proposed classification must come a proposed expansion to create a fully sustainable settlement to accord with other Rural Centres.	Cambourne has been planned as 3 linked villages and even with an increase in development as a result of increasing densities, Cambourne will still comprise 3 linked villages. Its designation as a Rural Centre and even allowing for some extra 700 dwellings by raising the density of development of remaining phases to 30dph will not cause it to have the character of a Market Town. The level of development necessary to support a secondary school to accord more fully with the Rural Centre policy would be so great that it need to have been included in the Structure Plan, would be less sustainable than the proposed locations for major growth proposed in the Structure Plan and would not be consistent with Cambourne's designation as a Rural Centre where limited additional development might be appropriate.	
6102 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd (Land NE of Impington) 6103 - Centex Strategic Land (Land NE of Impington)	Object	Omission of reference to additional development on the eastern side of Histon to the north of Impington Lane. Histon is a sustainable location for additional development in accordance with PPG3, on a principle public transport route into Cambridge and will provide an element of self containment. LDF artificially limits the number of options to meet the required number of dwellings in the Plan period, which in turn reduces the prospects of meeting the overall housing requirements of the Sub-Region. Need for additional flexibility in the Council's approach e.g. in identifying certain Rural Centres as suitable for additional peripheral development is evident from the deliverability issues arising from the high level development required to 2016 and 2021 and issues around implementation of Northstowe.	Any requirement for additional development in rural areas can be met at Cambourne by increasing development to the 30dph minimum recommended by government in PPG3 without taking additional land for development. The objection site lies within the Cambridge Green Belt and plays a role in limiting the expansion of Impington. The villages in the green belt are an important part of the present setting of Cambridge and large scale expansion would not be appropriate.	
4325 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The approach is supported as these sites will contribute to the sub-region housing total.	The County Council's support for rolling forward the housing allocations at Histon/Impington and for increasing the density of development to 30dph at Cambourne is noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>District Council's Assessment</i>	<i>Approach to Draft DPD</i>
4451 - RLW Estates	Support	Consistent with the comments set out in relation to RC2. We support the Council's view that expansion of Cambourne outside the existing urban framework would be wholly inappropriate.	Support Noted	
4652 - Toft Parish Council	Support	The Council have no objection to an enlarged Cambourne providing that the highways infrastructure in the area is developed and improved to accommodate increased traffic levels.	Support noted. Plans to further improve the A428 are well advanced and the Council will use its best endeavours to ensure that the road improvements go ahead as soon as possible.	

Decision on RC3 Scale of Additional Development in Rural Centres - Preferred Approach

Develop the preferred approach in to a policy in the Rural Centres DPD, as modified.