

**Planning Policy & Localism Portfolio Holder Meeting
11 February 2014**

**South Cambridgeshire Local Plan –
Consultation Responses and Consideration on
Whether to Submit for Examination**

Appendix C: Key Issues and Assessment (Part 1B)

Comprising:

**Local Plan Chapters 5 to 10 and Appendices
Sustainability Appraisal**

Note: See contents page included in Appendix C Part 1A

Chapter 5: Delivering High Quality Places

Policy HQ/1: Design Principles (and paragraphs 5.1 – 5.9)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 33 Support: 17 (including 2 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 16 (including 2 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Support this policy. • Fulbourn PC – Support as protects intrinsic character of the village and surrounding countryside. • Great Abington PC – Fully support. Completely in harmony with our ambitions for developments in Great Abington. • Natural England – Pleased includes reference to high quality landscaping and public spaces with various functions. • Every new development must make the site and its environment, as well as the surrounding area, better to live in. • Proposals will help create good quality new developments. • New developments should be attractive and traditional to be in keeping with rural village settings. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council - Strengthen to ensure needs of ageing population addressed by future development and provide for supported living and other facilities to meet adult social care needs. Suggest Building for Life standards. • Caldecote & Cambourne PCs – Should include reference to the requirement for Lifetime Homes in Criterion k. • English Heritage – Welcome policy subject to minor change to criteria 1b and 1e, and paragraph 5.6 to strengthen policy in relation to heritage assets and improve clarity. • Swavesey and District Bridleways Association and 6 others - Criterion f - add horse riding. • Much concern with conserving. Should be greater acceptance of new ways of doing things. Criteria c, d and e contradict. • Policy needs more emphasis on the positive contribution high quality design can have on vibrant communities. • Sad to see how badly made new developments around Cambridge are. Not in keeping / unattractive.
Assessment	Policy based on policies from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, found sound through the examination. Policy HQ/1 outlines a number of criteria to ensure high quality development which meets the needs of everyone, including those with particular

	<p>needs - criteria j and k ensure flexibility that allows for future changes in needs and lifestyles of the whole community. As it relates to all new development, not just residential, it is not appropriate to include reference to Lifetime Homes - addressed in Policy H/8: Housing Mix.</p> <p>Whilst the Building for Life standard is a useful tool for gaining an indication of the quality of new developments, it has certain limitations that may not give a true impression of the quality of the scheme. This is because the scoring system is not a sophisticated tool and can potentially score schemes down where evidence is not available at the time of the assessment. Therefore it should not be relied upon as a measure of good quality design, although it is used as an indicator of the quality of new development through the Annual Monitoring Report.</p> <p>The recently introduced BREEAM Communities assessment provides another helpful means of assessing the sustainability of new developments, and could appropriately be used by developers to help them with their sustainability statements, particularly for large developments. A change is also proposed to the supporting text to Policies HQ/1 and CC/1 to recommend the use of the BREEAM Communities assessment.</p> <p>It is important to preserve and enhance aspects of the built and natural environment, but this can be achieved in a number of ways and the policy allows flexibility that should not stifle innovative new approaches. Criteria c, d and e complement each other, seeking to ensure development that is place-responsive, respects its surroundings and is compatible with its location.</p> <p>Minor changes are proposed in response to representations from English Heritage in relation to heritage assets; from Swavesey and District Bridleways Association to include reference to horse riding; and a change to highlight the importance of good design on the vibrancy of communities. Additional guidance is to be added to paragraph 5.9, in response to representations made to Policy CC/6 in Chapter 4.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend last sentence of paragraph 5.2 to read: ‘...whilst using the opportunities presented by development to enhance the built and natural environment, <u>and create vibrant communities.</u>’</p> <p>Amend criterion 1b to read:</p>

‘Conserve or enhance important natural and historic assets of the site **and their setting**.’

Amend criterion 1e to read:

‘...interesting vistas, skylines, focal points and **appropriately scaled** landmarks along routes and around spaces;’

Amend Criterion 1f to read:

‘...conveniently accessible ~~streets~~ **routes** both within the development...delivering attractive and safe opportunities for walking, cycling, **horse riding** and public transport;’

Amend last sentence of paragraph 5.6 to read:

‘...whilst protecting and enhancing the natural **and historic** environment, and conserving the countryside...’

Add the following text to the end of paragraph 5.6:

‘Applicants will be required to demonstrate how their proposals meet the principles of sustainability, by submitting a Sustainability Statement, under policy CC/1 in Chapter 4 Climate Change.’

Amend last sentence of paragraph 5.9:

‘~~and~~ Car parking what works where (English Partnerships)-; **and RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2012).**’

Add a new paragraph after paragraph 4.11 to read:

‘The policy requires applicants to submit a Sustainability Statement to demonstrate how the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation have been embedded within the development proposal. The Council would recommend that in the case of larger-scale developments (100 or more dwellings or exceeding 5,000m² of other floorspace) that a BREEAM Communities assessment is undertaken as part of demonstrating how they have integrated sustainable design into the masterplanning process.’

Add to the list of documents in Appendix A:

RECAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2012)

Policy HQ/2: Public Art and New Development (paragraphs 5.10 - 5.13)

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 11 Support: 6 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 5 (including 2 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn PC – Support policy - led to major public art projects being incorporated into developments – e.g. The Swifts. • Think about public art in widest form, not just installations and street art – e.g. funding a workshop, project or performance. • Community must be seen in widest sense not just council and school. Vital that it is ‘owned’ by the community. • Use should be made of design competitions and allow local people to choose from wide variety of types and styles. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote & Cambourne PCs – Policy should foster local artists in conjunction with community and where possible be integrated into buildings, landscape or street furniture. Essential to strengthen community buy in and ‘ownership’. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Agree in principle as highly desirable, but should allow pooling of funds from small developments to deliver fewer more significant pieces. • Criterion 3 – Unsure if this just relates to art as in sculptures and material installations.
Assessment	<p>The policy has been largely carried forward from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The policy is flexible to allow pooling of monies from smaller schemes towards larger projects. The Public Art Supplementary Planning Document outlines where a developer is willing to make a contribution but unable to achieve an appropriate scheme on site the Council will encourage financial contributions.</p> <p>Criterion 2 requires local involvement and allows projects to be community-led, which should develop local ‘buy-in’ and ‘ownership’ and provides flexibility for communities to choose an appropriate project - it would be up to them whether they foster local artists.</p> <p>Criterion 3 applies equally to material installations and wider performing arts.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Chapter 6: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment

Key Facts (and paragraphs 6.1- 6.4)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 3 Support: 0 Object: 3
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Wildlife Trust – include mention of ecological networks, County Wildlife Sites and SSSIs. Improve consistency across document in referring to target areas in Green Infrastructure Strategy. Suggest additional wording to key facts. • Great Ouse AONB Working Group – Welcome objectives of chapter 6 and should mention ‘The Great Ouse Valley’ in plan and its key values identified. Urge the Council to support recognition and inclusion of proposed Great Ouse AONB within Strategic Green Infrastructure of Local Plan. Evidence submitted to put forward case for AONB and suggested wording.
Assessment	<p>The AONB project is at a very early stage and has as yet an uncertain future. If in the future an AONB is designated it would be addressed in a future review of the plan.</p> <p>A minor change is proposed to the list of key facts for this chapter to provide more detail about the wildlife and ecological networks within the district.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Replace the third key facts bullet with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>‘South Cambridgeshire has a diverse range of wildlife sites many of which are officially recognised for protection. These include 39 nationally important Sites of Special Scientific Interest and over 100 County Wildlife Sites. Development pressures can threaten the future of some habitats.’</u> <p>Replace sixth key facts bullet with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>‘The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy provides an overarching strategy for Cambridgeshire which highlights existing natural green space and opportunities for creating, linking, and improving it. It shows two major ecological networks: the Gog Magogs</u>

	<u>Countryside Area and the West Cambridgeshire Hundreds project.</u>
--	--

Policy NH/1: Conservation Area and Green Separation at Longstanton (and paragraph 6.5)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 11 Support: 1 Object: 10
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England - General support for all policies in the environment chapter. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage – Historic importance of this land and remnants of early ridge and furrow. Policy refers to playing fields being potentially acceptable. Disagree – will damage archaeological remains when land levelled. Need to clarify that they are not appropriate. • Swavesey & District Bridleways Association – Green separation should include bridleways – valuable to community. Supported by number of individuals. • Separation important – should be designated as green belt. • Request from owners that Melrose House and associated land to be excluded from policy.
Assessment	<p>The policy has been carried forward from the Adopted Site Specific Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. Melrose House and associated land were included within the existing policy and form part of the separation between Longstanton and Northstowe and therefore it remains appropriate that this area is covered by Policy NH/1.</p> <p>The inspector of the Northstowe Area Action Plan rejected the idea of extending the Cambridge Green Belt northwards to include land around the new settlement of Northstowe. Bridleways linking Northstowe with the wider countryside could form part of informal recreation proposals as the new settlement develops.</p> <p>English Heritage are concerned that playing field uses would not be appropriate uses and could cause damage to historic elements of the land. However, the endorsed Development Framework Document for Northstowe does not indicate playing fields within</p>

	this area. It would therefore not conflict with the ongoing work on Northstowe and therefore no change is proposed. The sports hub within the green separation between Longstanton and Northstowe is located further to the north within the approved Phase 1 area.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character (and paragraphs 6.6 - 6.11)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 6 Support: 4 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 2 (including 1 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elsworth PC – Character and distinctiveness of rural landscape in South Cambs important. New development must reflect and enhance character. Need to protect existing assets. • Fulbourn PC – Policy protects intrinsic character of village and surroundings. • Gamlingay PC – Bedfordshire Greensand Ridge has particular impact on parish – specific character very noticeable. • Natural England – General support for all policies in environment chapter. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Past Present and Future – Object to National Character Area assessments as too broad brush. Local authority should commission an up-to-date local Landscape Character assessment to replace current one dated 2003. Policy should specifically refer to historic landscape character. • Great Shelford PC – East Anglian Chalk local landscape character but waterways significant within parish – Hobson’s Brook. Would like to see policy for waterways.
Assessment	The policy has been updated from a similar one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. Natural England has revised how it categorises natural landscapes and these revised definitions have been used in the new policy. Further details on the character areas are provided in related Supplementary Planning Documents which are to be revised in the lifetime of the plan to include the more detailed East of England Landscape Typology. This more

	<p>detailed classification will ensure that the distinctive landscape characters within the district are protected and enhanced.</p> <p>Within the Local Plan there are policies relating to biodiversity, water quality, sustainable drainage, and green infrastructure that will protect the waterways in the district without the need for a specific policy.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy NH/3: Protecting Agricultural Land (and paragraphs 6.12 - 6.14)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 22 Support: 19 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 3 (including 1 from PC)</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Past Present and Future - Recognise importance of using good quality agricultural land for food production rather than for development. • Elsworth PC – Essential for national food security. Should be robustly protected. • Fulbourn PC – Protects intrinsic quality of village and surrounding area. • Ickleton PC – Support policy. • Natural England – General support for all policies in environment chapter. • General support for policy. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Support policy but concerned that not following NPPF guidance because insufficient weight to economic value of agricultural land. • Small areas of grade 2 and 3a farmland are uneconomic and areas below 2 hectares should be exempt from policy. Introduce lower threshold limit of 2 hectares. to policy • Should never allocate high grade farmland for development.
Assessment	<p>The policy has been carried forward from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. Representations are generally supportive of the policy. The need to identify and maintain an adequate supply of land for development to meet identified needs means</p>

	there is pressure for development of agricultural land in such a rural district although the plan focuses development on brownfield land where appropriate. The NPPF states where it is necessary to use agricultural land for development local planning authorities should seek to use poorer quality land and in South Cambridgeshire this option has not been always possible.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy NH/4: Biodiversity (and paragraphs 6.15 - 6.18)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 12 Support: 7 (including 2 from Parish Council) Object: 5 (including 1 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency – Support policy – wholly compatible with requirements of EU Water Framework Directive. • Elsworth PC – Support and agree Biodiversity SPD should be updated. • Fulbourn PC – Fully support. • Natural England – General support for all policies in environment chapter. • The Wildlife Trust – Support – pleased to see recognition of national guidance, specific mention of brownfield sites. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Past Present and Future – Policy too weak. Suggest amending wording of policy to strengthen. Replace ‘clearly’ with ‘demonstrably and significantly’ so similar to wording in Policy NH/5. • Dry Drayton PC – Request recognition of Dry Drayton’s biodiversity survey in policy. • The Wildlife Trust – Support but suggest mention is made of the importance of wider ecological networks that need to be considered when planning the green infrastructure – will help species adapt to climate change. • Policy should not just protect protected species etc but also the ‘ordinary’ non-threatened biodiversity. Development should be refused where negative impact on biodiversity.
Assessment	The policy has been updated from a similar one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found

	<p>sound through the examination. The updates are to reflect the new national guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>Representations are mainly supportive. General protection of the district's biodiversity is provided by the policy. Specific detail about a local parish area is not appropriate for inclusion in the district wide plan. The policy allows for local evidence to be taken into account when planning applications are considered by the Council.</p> <p>Cambridge Past, Present and Future has suggested Policy NH/4 be amended so that it uses the same wording relating to the balance between allowing development and protecting biodiversity as Policy NH/5. However the NPPF uses the term 'clearly' and in order for both policies to comply with national guidance a minor change is proposed to Policy NH/5 so both policies use the same term.</p> <p>Agree to include an amendment suggested by the Wildlife Trust to recognise wider ecological networks.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Add to end of paragraph 6.16, '<u>... thereby contributing to wider ecological networks.</u>'</p> <p>Amend Policy NH/5 paragraph 1 to read: '1. ...Exceptions will only be made where the benefits of the development clearly demonstrably and significantly outweigh any adverse impact.'</p>

<p>Policy NH/5: Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance (and paragraphs 6.19 – 6.26)</p>	
<p>Proposed Submission Representations Received</p>	<p>Total: 9 Support: 6 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 3</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Past Present and Future – Support policy. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Support policy. • Elsworth PC – Support policy and should update Biodiversity SPD. • Environment Agency – Support policy – compatible with requirements of EU Water Framework Directive.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – General support for policies in environment chapter. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) – Support but recommend wording at 2a makes a clearer distinction between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, as set out in paragraph of 113 of NPPF. • The Wildlife Trust – Need to clarify wording in 2e since remaining features would not need to be recreated! • No development should be granted that impacts biodiversity therefore delete ‘not normally be permitted.’
Assessment	<p>The policy has been updated from a similar one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The updates are to reflect the new national guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>A suggestion had been made to remove the term ‘<i>not normally be permitted</i>’ from the policy however this is the term used in the NPPF and therefore no change is proposed.</p> <p>A minor change to section 2a of the policy is proposed to meet the comments made by the RSPB to clarify that the hierarchy includes international sites within the district.</p> <p>A minor change to the policy clarifies the compensatory measures outlined in section 2e of the policy which is not clearly worded at present</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend Policy NH/5 paragraph 2a to read: ‘The international, national or local status and designation of the site.’</p> <p>Amend Policy NH/5 2e to read: ‘The need for compensatory measures in order to re-create on or off the site remaining features or habitats on or off the site. that would be lost to development’</p> <p>See also change to NH/5 (1) arising at Policy NH/4.</p>

Policy NH/6: Green Infrastructure (and paragraphs 6.27 - 6.31)

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 73 Support:6 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 67 (including 2 from PCs)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Support policy. • Gamlingay PC – Support targets identified in Strategy relating to West Cambridgeshire Woodlands. • Natural England – General support for all policies in environment chapter. • Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) – Support policy and Green Infrastructure Strategy. • The Wildlife Trust – Support policy. • Excellent partnership of different organisations. Strategy should not be allowed to languish. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne and Caldecote PCs – Support policy but should include proposals for woodland creation to enhance countryside and help mitigate greenhouse emissions. • Cambridge Past Present and Future – Support policy but would like more specific reference to role of River Cam and its corridor in Green Infrastructure Policy. Need for specific Cam Corridor enhancement guidance as SPD or specific policy for River Cam and corridor in plan. • Great Ouse AONB Working Group – Should include whole of Great Ouse Valley which will be important area for quiet enjoyment in County in future. • Shelford and District Bridleways Group; Swavesey and District Bridleways Association; Sawston Riding School; Brampton Bridleway Group - Introduce an additional paragraph to Policy NH/6 which secures access for horse riders, pedestrians and cycles. Rights of way should be for all non motorised users. Need to update Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy to comply with NPPF which encourages providing opportunities for <u>all</u> to access open space – includes horse riders. • The National Trust – Lack of joined up thinking between Green Infrastructure and how people arrive at these sites via sustainable transport promoted in Policy TI/2. Wimpole Cycle route should be mentioned in paragraph 6.31 to enable it to be taken forward as scheme in Local Transport Plan. • The Wildlife Trust – Map should show locations of key ecological networks (Gog Magogs Countryside Area and West Cambridgeshire Hundreds) and target areas from Strategy

	mentioned in paragraph 6.31.
Assessment	<p>New policy to assist in the implementation of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>The term green infrastructure has a wide definition that could take into account the issues raised by objectors such as consideration of the rivers and bridleways through the district. A minor change to the supporting text is proposed to clarify this.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Strategy includes a number of target areas and projects, which have been drawn together in the strategy. These projects include ones that encourage tree planting within the district. By addressing Green Infrastructure within the plan it is expected that this will assist project delivery.</p> <p>The National Trust is concerned about how the community will access the green spaces within the district. The Council in future planning for the strategic sites and other housing sites identified in the plan will be looking for opportunities for these new communities to link into green infrastructure within their areas. The County Council is preparing a Transport Strategy alongside the plan and in drafting this strategy is taking into account the policies in the plan which includes access to the wider green infrastructure of the district.</p> <p>The concerns of the AONB working group are already met as the Green Infrastructure Strategy already includes consideration of the Great Ouse Valley and therefore no change is proposed within the plan.</p> <p>A River Cam Corridor Strategy is being prepared by local stakeholders. This is an example of a Green Infrastructure project coming forward after the Green Infrastructure Strategy was completed, and this can be referenced in the supporting text.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend second sentence of paragraph 6.27 to read: ‘... It includes a wide range of elements such as country parks, wildlife habitats, rights of way, bridleways commons and greens, nature reserves, waterways and bodies of water, and historic landscapes and monuments.’</p> <p>Add the following to end of paragraph 6.31: <u>‘An example of a Green Infrastructure project coming forward is a River Cam Corridor Strategy which is being prepared by</u></p>

	<u>local stakeholders.'</u>
--	-----------------------------

Policy NH/7: Ancient Woodlands and Veteran Trees (and paragraph 6.32 – 6.33)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 7 Support: 3 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 4 (including 2 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Support policy. • Elsworth PC – Support. • Natural England – General support for policies in environment chapter. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne and Caldecote PCs – Support policy but should include proposals contributing to woodland creation to mitigate effects of loss of ancient woodlands or veteran trees. • Cambridge Past Present and Future – Support policy but object to weak wording – replace clearly with demonstrably and significantly as in Policy NH/5. • Great Ouse AONB Working Group – Request to include floodplain / carr woodland as an additional category of woodland to be protected in the policy as they are rare and need to be conserved.
Assessment	<p>New policy included in plan following representations by The Woodland Trust at earlier consultation of the issues and options of the plan. NPPF specifically requires such woodlands and trees to be protected. Currently considered within Council's Biodiversity SPD.</p> <p>The policy is primarily to protect such woodland and trees and other policies within the plan seek to encourage the creation of woodlands such as the policies for green infrastructure and biodiversity.</p> <p>Specific types of woodland, if not meeting the criteria needed for being 'ancient woodland', would be protected under the biodiversity policies.</p> <p>Cambridge Past Present and Future has suggested an amendment to the wording of the policy. However the NPPF uses the term 'clearly' and therefore for consistency with this national</p>

	guidance no change is proposed.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining the Green Belt (and paragraph 6.34 – 6.35)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 10 Support: 3 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 7 (including 1 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn PC – Support policy • Natural England – General support for policies in environment chapter <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Past Present and Future – Object on basis that development in green belt is inappropriate unless can demonstrate exceptional circumstances according to NPPF. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Propose change of wording to strengthen policy. • Great Shelford PC – Landscaping could be used as excuse to permit development in green belt. Policy should include wording stating development is inappropriate unless exceptional circumstances. • No exceptional circumstances to warrant encroachment on Green Belt. • If exceptional circumstances proven then exceptional landscape enhancement must form part of development – area equal in size to area released from Green Belt must be added within same geographical zone. • Any development will conflict with wording of policy.
Assessment	The policy has been updated from similar ones included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, which were found sound through the examination. Previous policies dealt separately with mitigation in and adjoining the Green Belt. The policy does comply with guidance in the NPPF however a minor change to the supporting text is proposed to spell out more clearly that the approach to Green Belt in the NPPF is the starting point for the policy as many representations sought this clarification. The NPPF test for development in the green belt is that there must be

	‘very special circumstances’.....The ‘exceptional circumstances’ test relates specifically to whether the green belt should be reviewed through the plan making process.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend paragraphs 6.34 and 6.35 to read the following: ‘6.34. The area of Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire comprises 23,000 hectares covering over 25% of the district. This means much of the district is affected by Green Belt policies particularly those villages surrounding Cambridge and <u>the NPPF gives strong protection to the Green Belt.</u>’</p> <p>‘6.35 Green Belt is a key designation in the district, designed to protect the setting and special character of Cambridge. Even where exceptional circumstances warrant changes to the Green Belt or a <u>Inappropriate development will not be approved except in very special circumstances.</u> All development proposals is <u>including those</u> considered appropriate form of development in the Green Belt, it will need to be designed and landscaped to ensure they do not have an adverse impact on wider rural character and openness.’</p>

Policy NH/9: Redevelopment of Previously Developed Sites and Infilling in the Green Belt (and paragraph 6.36)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 4 (including 1 Parish Council (PC)) Object: 4
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn PC - Support • Natural England – General support for policies in environment chapter. • Support for second part of policy as complies with NPPF. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Past Present and Future + other – NPPF (paragraph 89) allows ‘limited infilling in villages and limited affordable housing for local community needs...’ but no definition of ‘limited’. Policy should specify limit on number of homes that can be built. Suggest five homes as a maximum? Brownfield land to be used first. Detailed wording suggested for change to policy. • Girton College – seek amendments to policy and supporting

	<p>text -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policy to recognise special nature of site as established development site within Green Belt where development brief will be prepared. ○ Criteria in part 1 of policy go beyond NPPF - should be removed. ○ Amendment to paragraph 6.36 to comply with NPPF – The NPPF (para 89 last bullet point) refers to the 'partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites' whereas paragraph 6.36 only refers to 'complete redevelopment'. ○ Remove phrase in 6.36 'to rural character' of Green Belt as not consistent with NPPF.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>The NPPF now enables limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt. This new guidance made an existing policy about specific identified major developed sites in the Green Belt out of date. This policy was in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD and identified four sites including Girton College within South Cambs. Policy NH/9 is new as it takes into account the changes found in the NPPF. Girton College no longer is to be treated as a special case. The college has requested that it be given a special designation. This is not considered to be necessary. Future development proposals by Girton College will be treated on their merits recognising the special nature of the site within the Green Belt. The Green Belt policies only allow such development if it does not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. No amendment is therefore proposed to the policy.</p> <p>Minor changes are proposed to Policy NH/9 and to paragraph 6.36 so that they reflect more fully the wording within the NPPF regarding partial or complete redevelopment. Also the term rural character is to be removed from 6.36 and additional wording included to replicate the NPPF.</p> <p>A number of respondents including CPPF have found the wording of the infill section of the policy unclear, requesting the specific level of infilling that would be allowed should be stated in the policy. The Green Belt does not extend over whole villages within South Cambs but may cover groups of dwellings separate from the main nucleus of a settlement. As these areas are likely to be small only limited infilling could be allowed that would not cause harm to the open nature of the Green Belt. The policy also applies to large developed sites within the green belt where a large scale of infill may be appropriate. It is not appropriate to define the scale of infill</p>

	<p>development in the policy which will be best assessed on a case by case basis. There is a separate policy for exception sites (Policy H/10) where affordable housing could be allowed outside of a village framework and these sites could be within the Green Belt. Policy H/10 would be the relevant policy for considering the level of affordable housing that would be allowed in these circumstances. A minor change is proposed to make clear the meaning of section 2 of Policy NH/9 and its supporting text.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend part 1 of Policy NH/9 to read: 'The Council will seek to ensure that <u>the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt</u> will be limited to that which would not result in:...'</p> <p>Amend the first sentence of part 2 of Policy NH/9 to read: 'Infilling is defined as the filling of small gaps between built developments <u>development in the Green Belt.</u>'</p> <p>Amend paragraph 6.36 to read: 'The NPPF now enables limited infilling or <u>the partial or</u> complete redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt. Planning applications will be assessed to ensure that such infilling or redevelopment does not have <u>a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.</u></p>

<p>Policy NH/10: Recreation in the Green Belt (and paragraphs 6.37 – 6.38)</p>	
<p>Proposed Submission Representations Received</p>	<p>Total: 7 Support: 4 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 3</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn PC – Support policy for providing sport and recreation in villages within Green Belt such as Fulbourn. • Natural England – Support general policies in environment chapter. • Trumpington Residents Association – Support increased access to green belt but concerned at development of sports pitches. • Green Belt is an asset for benefit of local community – should allow for improved public access. Council should promote schemes such as those promoted in Quarter to Six Quadrant

	<p>document. Green Infrastructure Strategy provides framework to implement.</p> <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grosvenor Development and Anglian Ruskin University – NPPF para 81 states local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance beneficial use of Green Belt – opportunities to provide access to outdoor sports and recreation. NPPF identifies outdoor sport as appropriate green belt use. Suggest change of wording to paragraph 6.38 to say plan will seek to positively bring forward land in green belt for outdoor sport. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Support intention of policy but has sought provision of school playing fields outside development footprints including in Green Belt as means of supporting overall development viability. Will need balance in application of this policy. Should allow for scope to expand schools to provide additional education provision as required.
Assessment	<p>The first section of this policy has been carried forward from one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, which was found sound through the examination.</p> <p>The policy conforms to the NPPF as it encourages access to the Green Belt for outdoor sport and recreation. However with the proposed growth around Cambridge it is likely that land will become more intensively used, which could result in uses such as playing fields being relocated to, or developed on, Green Belt land. The design of these areas must protect the rural character of the Cambridge Green Belt. The NPPF allows for the provision of ‘appropriate facilities’ for outdoor sport and recreation where it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with Green Belt purposes. The intention of the second part of the policy is to clarify what would be considered appropriate in the Cambridge Green Belt.</p> <p>The policy cannot be amended to imply where exceptions will be made to Green Belt policy as has been requested by the County Council. Each such proposal needs to be looked at on its merits and taking cumulative impacts into account. Factors to consider will include the nature of such facilities and the impact of a concentration of recreation uses on the openness of the Green Belt.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

--	--

Policy NH/11: Protected Village Amenity Areas	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 12 Support: 7 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 5
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Support retention as allows protection of areas that would not qualify for Local Green Space. • Fowlmere and Fulbourn PCs – Support policy. • Natural England – general support all policies within environment chapter. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Need to allow greater flexibility in policy to allow schools to be able to provide new buildings on existing playing fields. Should allow re-provision of open space as integral part of overall development. • Objection to having both PVAA and LGS designations within plan - two similar designations. If PVAA's are to remain in plan should review each designated site to reflect changed circumstances. • Residents should have more say in which green spaces to protect – parish councils should consult local community and forward to district council. <p>Representations relating to village sites (Note: same 2 sites registered against Policy NH/12: Local Green Space.)</p> <p>Great Shelford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Land south of 26 Church St and Rectory Farm</i> Jesus College objecting to designation as PVAA. Area covered by range of designations which offer protection and prevent inappropriate development. PVAA not required. <p>Little Abington</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Meadow surrounded by residential development and Bancroft Farm</i> Committee for Abington Housing object to former farm site being protected as green space. Adjacent meadow is rightly designated but this site is brownfield land with no public access, derelict farm buildings - does not meet criteria for

	PVAA.
Assessment	<p>The policy has been carried forward from one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, which was found sound through the examination. It was recognised during the drafting of the plan that this policy and the new one for Local Green Space (LGS) introduced in the NPPF would have similarities. It was not considered appropriate to simply reallocate PVAAs as LGS given there are some differences between the designations.. The draft plan has therefore included policies for both PVAAs and LGSs. It is the intention of the Council to consider whether the PVAA policy should be merged with the new LGS policy and the implications for individual sites when next the Local Plan is reviewed.</p> <p>The Council during the summer 2012 Issues and Options 1 consultation did ask if any PVAAs should be considered against the tests for LGS and as a result some designations were changed. Any new sites were consulted upon in January 2013 in the Issues and Options 2 consultation and during the Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation in summer 2013. Parish Councils have been specifically asked to suggest suitable sites within their parish for consideration as LGS. Through these consultations the local community have been made aware of the opportunity to not only suggest new sites but to support ones proposed within the draft plan.</p> <p>PVAAs are identified on some school playing fields where these sites have a role fulfilling the criteria for PVAAs. In very special circumstances development could be allowed on PVAAs in order to provide for room for expansion of a school if demonstrated to be necessary for educational purposes. The needs of the community would have to be weighed between the value of the PVAA to that of the proposed development. This has been achieved under the existing policy.</p> <p>There are two existing PVAA sites carried forward from the adopted plans that have been objected to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Shelford - Land south of 26 Church St and Rectory Farm The objection to this site was not raised earlier in the consultation on the plan and therefore has not been recently assessed. The Council considers that the PVAA designation remains appropriate to protect the character of this entrance to the village and setting of the listed buildings that are located within the PVAA. • Little Abington - Meadow surrounded by residential

	development and Bancroft Farm - This site was allocated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as a LGS so it is considered at Policy NH/12.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy NH/12: Local Green Space	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 424 Support: 395 (Including 2 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 29 (including 5 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Representations on general issues on Local Green Space. Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency – Consider LGS can also be used to help provide resilience to climate change through making and protecting spaces that can flood with minimal effect compared to occupied property. Cambs Surface Water Management Plan sets out known hot spots. EA specifically supports LGS in Bar Hill; Bassingbourn; Bourn; Cottenham; Elsworth; Great and Little Abington; Ickleton; Orwell; Papworth. • Fowlmere PC – Support protection given by LGS • Fulbourn PC – Support for policy • General support for policy from 215 respondents. • Natural England – General support for all policies in environment chapter. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – support policy but should clarify in policy what changes of land use would be permitted after area has been designated LGS. • Cambridgeshire County Council –Current policy would prevent overall redevelopment of school provision across a school site with new buildings being provided on existing playing fields and re-provision of playing fields in place of existing buildings. Policy should allow for re-provision of green space as integral part of overall development proposals as means of promoting flexible school place planning. • General objections to policy from 8 respondents • Residents should have more say in which green spaces to protect – parish councils should consult local community and forward to district council. Insufficient consultation on current

proposed sites.

Representations on LGSs included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan

Bassingbourn

- **Bassingbourn PC** - Support all sites in village.
- The Rouses
Support LGS from 71 respondents. Open access including informal paths leading to Ford Wood, Willmott playing field and South End. Setting for listed buildings. Undisturbed meadow area. Rich in wildlife. Development of site would harm character and appearance of historic part of village. Surviving relic of village's manorial / field system. Site of Rowses manor house, recorded as vacant 1589. Valuable village amenity – used by many for informal recreation / meeting place / dog walkers. Green space near centre of village. Additional recreational land needed by Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth.

Duxford

- End of Mangers Lane
Objection to designation by individuals - should remove designation of PVAA as no longer meets criteria. Replace with more flexible and responsive community use allocation / designation (for allotments / orchard / affordable housing) to serve local community and village.
- Greenacres
Support for LGS from 9 respondents. Village already short of green areas. Popular safe play area in cul-de-sac – can be viewed by parents. Alternative play area requires crossing busy road, blind junction. Valued by local residents – LGS preserves open, pleasing aspect to area – character noted recently by planning inspector. Venue for annual street BBQ – helps bring community together.

Fulbourn

- **Fulbourn PC** – support LGS policy as it protects intrinsic character of village and surrounding countryside.
- Field between Cox's Drove, Cow Lane and railway line + area adjacent to Horse Pond.
Support designation from Fulbourn Forum for Community Action and 24 individuals. Haven for local wildlife. Important green space for village. Field enhances setting and

	<p>appearance of this part of village – brings countryside into heart of village. Contributes to retaining rural character. As village has expanded in recent years important to preserve character and ambience of village.</p> <p>Objection that site does not meet criteria for LGS by Castlefield International Ltd. No public access / private land – therefore any public activity on land represents trespass. Need for sixth criteria for assessing sites – whether they are deliverable as LGS – this site is not. Not put forward by Parish Council even though they made comprehensive represents to S Cambs therefore not worthy of designation. If site to be secured as long term green space would need support of PC. Priority in South Cambs is for housing land, sustainable site for allocation - complies with NPPF. Remove designation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Victorian Garden associated with Old Pumping Station.</u> Support designation from Fulbourn Forum for community action and 16 individuals. Area valued by local community – has both historic and recreational value. Landscape value – where springs emerge in village. Countryside penetrating into village, contributes to rural village character. • <u>Land between Townley Hall fronting Home End</u> New site proposed by individual - Should be designated as LGS – need to preserve character of village. <p>Gamlingay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Lupin Field</u> Support for LGS designation from Gamlingay PC and 54 individuals – preserves openness, beauty, tranquillity and richness of wildlife for residents on west side of village. Valued by local community. Should not be developed. Focal point of village especially when lupins flower in summer. Limited opportunity and access to open space on this part of village. Suggest part of Merton Field should be fenced off as play area. Field marks boundary between edge of settlement and Hamlet of Dennis Green – natural boundary. <p>An objection to LGS from Merton College as site does not meet criteria for designation as LGS. Council misguided in designating it as LGS. NPPF states blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements is not appropriate + Landowner does not believe they have been properly consulted – plan fails legal compliance. No public right of</p>
--	---

	<p>access. Limited historic or wildlife value. Reaction from community to planning application on site. Designation barrier to future development.</p> <p>Great Abington</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for all LGS in village. • <u>Magna Close central grassed area</u> Support for LGS. <p>Great and Little Chishill PC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Bull Meadow and playing fields north of Hall Lane</u> Support for this site being LGS from Great and Little Chishill PC. <p>Great Shelford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Land south of 26 Church St and Rectory Farm.</u> Objection to this site being LGS from Jesus College. Area covered by range of designations which offer protection to site – prevent inappropriate development. Does not need additional designation as LGS. Landscape and Townscape assessment of criteria carried out and site does not them - no significant landscape features – only number of mature trees. <p>Harston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for all LGS in village. • <u>Recreation Ground and orchard</u> Support for inclusion by Harston PC and three individuals but boundary of LGS does not include football pitches and does include privately owned farmland – needs revising. <p>Hauxton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for all LGS in village. <p>Hinxton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for all LGS in village. <p>Ickleton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Village Green and Drivers Meadow</u> Support from Ickleton PC and Ickleton Society for these sites being LGS. • <u>Back Lane</u> Objection from Ickleton Society for this site being rejected as
--	---

	<p>LGS. Not just access to recreation ground but enjoyed in its own right for tranquillity. Enhances character of village and therefore should be designated as LGS.</p> <p>Little Abington</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Scout campsite, Church Lane</u> Support from Little Abington PC and others. Recognises importance of site. • <u>Bowling Green</u> Support for LGS designation. • <u>Meadow surrounded by residential development and Bancroft Farm</u> Bancroft Farm, Church Lane (SHLAA site 28) - Objection from both Great and Little Abington PCs and Committee for Abington Housing. Wrong designation of brownfield land and LGS should only apply to meadow. Old derelict farmyard previously not designated for protection. Reclassification would enable sensitive development within conservation area. <p>Little Shelford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for all LGS in village. <p>Melbourn</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Greengages Rise play area</u> Support from 2 respondents for this LGS. Used as area for informal recreation. Recent planning application to develop area dismissed at appeal as open space covered by plan policy protecting existing recreational areas. <p>Newton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for all LGS in village. <p>Orwell</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Chapel Orchard by Methodist Church</u> Request from Orwell PC to amend boundary as LGS extends over farmland / private land. Landowner of this land erroneously included in LGS has objected to designation – request for amendment of boundary. <p>Over</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Land to rear of The Lanes</u> Objection to LGS by individual as does not meet criteria for designation. Site bounded by 2m high fence. Limited views /
--	---

	<p>overgrown private land. No public access. No more tranquil than other nearby areas in village. No uncommon wildlife.</p> <p><u>Station Road/ Turn Lane</u> Objection to LGS from individual. Must be demonstrably special. Afforded more weight as submitted by Parish Council. Rejected by inspector in 2006 – little changed. PC not justified why site special. Site fails assessment. Long term protection important but not at expense of potential future growth of village and development that could result in better management of site.</p> <p>Pampisford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for all LGS in village. <p>Papworth Everard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papworth Everard PC strongly supports policy and its application to village. Valued by parishioners. Village characterised by housing separated by relatively large green spaces. • <u>New site</u> Papworth Everard PC request that consideration be given to designating wider landscape stripes within housing development in NW of village – valued by local community – well used. <p>Sawston</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for all LGS in village. <p>Stapleford</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for all LGS in village.
Assessment	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) introduced a new designation – Local Green Space (LGS) which is for green areas of particular importance to local communities which once designated can prevent new development. During the consultations carried out on the plan there was much support for including a policy for LGS in the new plan and sites submitted to the Council have been assessed using guidance in the NPPF.</p> <p>The Environment Agency supports the designations of all the sites but considers an additional advantage to having such open green spaces within a village is that it provides areas that can flood with minimal damage to properties within a village. Whilst recognising that this could be a reason for retaining green within a settlement</p>

	<p>this should not be a primary reason for allocating sites.</p> <p>The County Council's suggestion that the policy would not allow for them to redevelop school sites has missed the fact that under the Council's methodology LGS has not been allocated on school playing fields within the district.</p> <p>Bourn PC has requested that the policy be more explicit about what changes of land uses would be allowed on LGS. The policy has been worded to only allow development in exceptional circumstances and then in discussion with the local community. As LGS have a variety of existing uses and are located within and on the edge of settlements it would be inappropriate for the policy to include a detailed list of suitable land uses. The main aim of the policy is to retain the character and particular local significance placed on such green spaces that made them suitable candidates for LGS. The Council consider the existing wording to only allow changes for exceptional reasons is sufficient.</p> <p>The Council during the summer 2012 Issues and Options 1 consultation asked for suggestions for sites to be considered as LGS. Those put forward were tested against criteria included in the NPPF for LGS. Any new sites were consulted upon in January 2013 in the Issues and Options 2 consultation and during the Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation this summer. Parish Councils have been specifically asked to suggest suitable sites within their parish for consideration as LGS and were given an extended deadline to submit sites to the Council at the start of 2013. Through these consultations the local community have been made aware of the opportunity to not only suggest new sites but to support ones proposed within the draft plan. The NPPF states that LGS can only be proposed when a local plan is being reviewed and therefore it would not be appropriate to allow parish councils to conduct their own consultations regarding LGS. This process must be carried out as part of the local plan preparation.</p> <p>During the consultation there was support for LGS being allocated in many villages, notably in Bassingbourn - The Rouses.</p> <p>Two other sites had many representations submitted about them. These included objections from the landowners to the designation as well as lots of support from local residents -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn - Field between Cox's Drove, Cow Lane and railway line; and • Gamlingay - Lupin Field.
--	--

The new draft National Planning Policy Guidance, published in August 2013 after the Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation had started, indicates that landowners should be contacted at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as LGS. The Council publicised all the stages of consultations in preparing the Local Plan to ensure all who may have an interest in the plan could have the opportunity to make comments in respect of the draft plan.

Whilst the majority of representations were supporting LGS objections were made in the following villages to specific LGS - Duxford; Ickleton; Little Abington; Over (2 sites).

All the sites where representations have been submitted were previously assessed by the Council as meeting the tests for LGS and therefore unless new issues have been raised that affect the assessment or it has been shown that circumstances have changed the Council remains of the opinion that these site designations should remain in the plan.

There is one exception to this. The site of Bancroft Farm in Little Abington is included within the Parish Councils' proposals for future housing to meet the needs of the village. The farm lies within a larger LGS, the rest of which is supported by the Parish Council. The local community has been consulted on this issue and the majority wish the farm site to be developed for housing. See proposed changes to Policy H1 in Chapter 7:Housing. The Council is therefore proposing a major modification to amend the Policies Map to delete the site of Bancroft Farm from the larger LGS site.

Minor changes are proposed to be made to the boundaries of two sites – one in Harston – the recreation ground and orchard – where part of the site is within the Green Belt and part is farmland and the other LGS in Orwell – Chapel Orchard by Methodist Church. The boundary of both these LGSs includes farmland. This does not meet the test for LGS set out in the evidence document on LGS within the Final Sustainability Appraisal Report. The Parish Councils for these villages has advised us that they wish the farmland to be removed from the LGS. These were initially parish council proposals. The Council agrees and proposes that where farmland has wrongly been included within these two LGS that minor changes are made to the Policies Map to revise the boundaries of the sites. Harston PC had also noted that some of the playing pitches were not included in the LGS however these are within Green Belt areas and therefore would not be allocated

	<p>by the Council as LGS.</p> <p>An objection was made to a site in Great Shelford being a LGS. However the site is not identified as a LGS – it does however form part of a larger PVAA and has therefore been considered at Policy NH/11.</p> <p>Two new sites have been proposed. One is in Fulbourn which was previously assessed and not identified as a LGS because it is in the Green Belt. The other new site is a large area within Papworth Everard which has not been proposed before. It is an extensive area and for this reason is unlikely to meet the test as being a suitable candidate as LGS.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend the boundaries on the Policies Map of two LGS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orwell – Chapel Orchard by the Methodist Church • Harston – Recreation Ground and orchard. <p>Major modification</p> <p>Delete Bancroft Farm Church Lane Little Abington from a larger Local Green Space (see maps attached to the schedule of major modifications).</p>

Policy NH/13: Important Countryside Frontages	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 30 Support: 24 Object: 6 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC))</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for policy. <p>Representations on village frontages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fowlmere Objection from individual to remove frontage from B1368 London Road / High Street along east boundary of SHLAA site 107. Does not meet tests for ICF. Designation outside conservation area and is not PVAA – land not considered to have any specific importance to setting of village. • Foxton Fowlmere PC – suggest new frontage south of Foxton primary school – behind southern boundary of recreation area and

	<p>school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn <u>Home End</u> Support for frontage adjacent to the Fulbourn Centre (between Townley Hall and the Scout Hut) - from 17 respondents. Penetration of countryside into Home End – helps retain strong rural village character in Conservation Area – lost if developed. Objection to frontage – not justified in this location. No assessment in draft plan that policy is appropriate and whether specific sites should be included within policy. Suitable location for development to meet objectively assessed development needs. • Great and Little Abington General support for frontages. • Great and Little Chishill Great and Little Chishill PC – Five new frontages suggested: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. B1069 leading from Barley Road, past windmill - this sweeps up to built-up area. 2. May Street - this sweeps up to built-up area. 3. New Road - this sweeps up to built-up area. 4. Heydon Road - provides an important rural break from Heydon Village. 5. Hall - this sweeps up to built-up area. • Great and Little Shelford General support for frontages. • Guilden Morden <u>Frontage to land south of 33 Dubbs Knoll Road</u> Objection from landowners to frontage. Objection to frontage as unsound, not compliant with NPPF. Land not previously designated – is bordered either side, opposite and to NE by existing housing. Countryside to west not visible through mature hedge and trees. Development of land for affordable housing would not significantly alter character of land – greater benefit to village. • Harston General support for frontages. • Hauxton
--	---

	<p>General support for frontages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heydon Heydon PC – suggesting an additional frontage – vista from Fowlmere Road looking up the avenue to Heydon. • Hinxton General support for frontages. • Newton General support for frontages. • Pampisford General support for frontages. • Sawston General support for frontages. • Stapleford General support for frontages.
Assessment	<p>The policy has been carried forward from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The Council as part of reviewing the plan had considered the adopted policy has been working well and therefore no changes were made to it. The existing frontages have not been reviewed as part of the plan making as limited comments or objections were made to them through the consultation process.</p> <p>There was general support for the policy with some suggestions for new frontages in Foxton and Heydon and a number in Great and Little Chishill which are said to help protect the special character of this village.</p> <p>Objections were received to one frontage carried forward from the adopted plan in Fowlmere and against a new one in Guilden Morden. There was much support for an existing frontage in Fulbourn at Home End as well as an objection.</p> <p>All the objectors to frontages have other representations seeking allocation of land in the vicinity of the frontages for housing. The Council considers that these frontages are important in retaining the rural character of the relevant villages and continue to meet the tests for being identified as an important frontage. No change is proposed.</p>

	All of the new frontages submitted to the Council do not meet the tests for being identified as frontages in the plan and therefore would not have been included in a revised plan.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy NH/14: Heritage Assets (and paragraphs 6.43 – 6.58)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 6 Support: 1 Object: 5 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC))
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Support as accords with NPPF. • Gamlingay PC – Support policy. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC - Polices Map does not show extent of boundary of Conservation area in village. • Cambridge Past Present and Future - Support policy but would like to see strengthening of wording relating to ‘non-designated assets’ in policy so developers are clear policy not just referring to designated assets. • Cambridgeshire County Council - Suggest change of wording to paragraph 6.56 and 6.57 to explain the County’s role with heritage assets and their Historic Environment Records. • English Heritage – Strong support for policy but suggest some changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ NPPF paragraph 126 states local planning authorities should set out positive strategy for historic environment in local plan. Recognise that plan policies refer to historic environment. Generic policy for historic environment provides opportunity to provide distinctive, positive framework and address issues relevant to overview. Consider how plan is underpinned in a positive strategy for historic environment – could be done in form of supporting SPD – include conservation area appraisals and management plans. ○ Need to consider how joint work with Cambridge City can be consolidated and updated e.g. Cambridge Green Belt

	<p>Study (LDA 2002) significant evidence base used in plan – parts no longer applicable. Inner Green Belt boundary – recent detailed work could be assimilated into this study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggest extending scope of policy to consider future maintenance of assets and ones at risk. . ○ Amend para 6.48, mentioning the use of traditional materials on vernacular buildings. ○ Re-word the last two sentences para 6.49 for clarity. ○ Replace ‘historic asset’ with ‘heritage asset’ in paragraph 6.57. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IWM Duxford - Support policy. Finding viable uses is included in policy – will require careful consideration and control. Support adoption and use of Heritage Partnership Agreements where appropriate (set out in Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013) – suggest amending paragraph 6.52. ● Policy does not clearly differentiate between designated and non-designated assets. Uses term ‘undesigned’ - contrary to NPPF. Confusing to group all assets in one policy. Implies same weight afforded to all elements – no mention of proportionality therefore at odds with NPPF. ● Definition of ‘heritage asset’ too restrictive. Council should encourage local communities through their Parish Councils to identify and list all heritage assets within parish that are of significance to that community. This register should then inform conservation area appraisal, if such actually exists, and the planning process - as set out in the 2011 Localism Act. Suggests adding 3rd clause to policy.
Assessment	<p>This is a new policy to reflect the changes in the NPPF and how heritage assets should be conserved within a district. English Heritage(EH)has highlighted the need for the plan to be underpinned by a positive strategy for the historic environment and suggests that an SPD could be prepared. The Council is to review the District Design Guide SPD within the lifetime of the plan and this could further expanded upon the strategy as suggested by EH.</p> <p>The wording within the policy should be amended to say non-designated as opposed to undesigned to comply with the NPPF.</p> <p>There was a request to clarify the weight attached to designated heritage assets as opposed to non-designated assets. The NPPF clearly states that it is the impact on the ‘significance’ of an asset that is important – such significance can vary depending on the type of asset. As heritage assets cover a range of features – from particular buildings and to larger scale parkland the policy could never comprehensively describe all types of assets and their</p>

	<p>specific significances within the policy. Also some non-designated assets can have the same level of significance as designated ones according to the NPPF – for example archaeological sites and scheduled monuments. No changes are therefore to be made to the policy wording. A minor change is proposed to the wording of the supporting text on this issue (paragraph 6.49) as suggested by English Heritage to clarify.</p> <p>The policy is inclusive to all features and landscapes that contribute to creating the historic environment of the district. This also includes local assets. The suggestion has been made for the Council with the assistance of parish councils to keep a register of heritage assets of local importance. Resources to create and maintain such a register are limited. The protection of local assets will be considered as development proposals come forward that may impact them.</p> <p>English Heritage suggested extending scope of policy by adding about development not prejudicing future maintenance or beneficial use of asset. However within the policy there is recognition of the need to look after such assets into the future by ‘sustaining and enhancing’ them and such sustaining would look after assets at risk. It is proposed that amendments to the supporting text to the policy (paragraph 6.51) could further emphasis this issue.</p> <p>The IWM Duxford has suggested including specific mention of Heritage Partnership Agreements. The plan already highlights the need for a flexible approach to secure the future of heritage assets. A Conservation Area was designated at Duxford Airfield in 2007 and an appraisal document produced of the area which would assist future planning. The Council does not consider that it is appropriate / necessary to mention specific legal agreements in the plan.</p> <p>Boundary of Bourn Conservation Area is correctly shown on the Policies Map.</p> <p>Some minor changes have been suggested by Cambridgeshire County Council to clarify the role of the County in keeping records of heritage assets. English Heritage has suggested changes to highlight the use of traditional materials in vernacular buildings and the need to replace the term historic asset with heritage. It is proposed by the Council to modify the supporting text to clarify these issues.</p>
Approach in	Minor change

<p>Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Replace word in section 2(d) in Policy NH/14: ‘Undesignated heritage asset’ replaced with ‘<u>non-designated heritage asset</u>’.</p> <p>Amend the last sentence of paragraph 6.48 to read: A full understanding of the historic environment, <u>including traditional materials as used in vernacular buildings</u>, is needed to inform plans...’</p> <p>Replace the last two sentences para 6.49 with the following: <u>‘The NPPF states harm to heritage assets should be avoided, but where proposals would result in wider public benefits then those benefits need to be weighed against the harm to significance’.</u></p> <p>Add to end of paragraph 6.51: <u>‘The Council is committed to ensuring the future viable uses of assets within the district.’</u></p> <p>Amend the first sentence of paragraph 6.56 to read: ‘The Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record, held by <u>maintained by</u> the County Council gives information on archaeological sites and monuments <u>provides information on heritage assets, including non-designated and designated heritage assets with archaeological interest.</u>’</p> <p>Replace paragraph 6.57 with the following: <u>‘Where development resulting in the loss of a heritage asset is permitted, the developer will be required to record and advance the understanding of the heritage asset to be lost. The results of assessments and investigations which are required and collected as part of development management are of public interest and will be made accessible, normally through the County’s Historic Environment Record.’</u></p>
-------------------------------------	--

<p>Policy NH/15: Heritage Assets and Adapting to Climate Change (and paragraphs 6.59 – 6.63)</p>	
<p>Proposed Submission Representations Received</p>	<p>Total: 9 Support: 1 Object: 8</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Past Present and Future - Support policy but object to weak wording in bullet 2 which talks only about 'adequate' safeguarding. Should refer to heritage character. Suggest amending policy to read: <i>'effectively safeguards heritage significance and character...'</i> • English Heritage – Suggest re-wording part 2 of policy to reflect approach of NPPF more closely: <i>'Proposals for energy efficient and renewable energy measures for historic buildings will be supported where they are individually tailored to the historic building and are developed with the benefit of a full understanding of the historic and architectural significance of the building such that the proposals will not result in harm to heritage significance.'</i> • Policy welcomed but section 2 is too broad. Suggest adding following words: <i>'...will be permitted, provided the proposal does not impact on, or detract from, the heritage value of the historic building.'</i> • Do not consider policy usefully addresses how balance heritage significance and environmental adaption. Need for clearer guidance. Need for clarity on how to reach a balance in paras 6.61 - 6.62. • Wording in part 1 of policy weak - 'encourage and support' should be replaced with 'destruction of these buildings will not be permitted'. • Need for stricter definition of what allowable re-use is. Suggest that where possible should be a community asset. Should specify priorities.
Assessment	<p>This is a new policy to provide guidance on the balance between heritage and climate change. The Council recognises the importance of protecting the heritage assets within the district and at the same time allowing appropriate adaptations to respond to the challenges of climate change. The policy cannot totally prevent change to historic buildings as was proposed by one respondent. The Council considers that the policy provides an appropriate balance to protecting heritage assets, whilst providing for adaptation to climate change.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Chapter 7 High Quality Homes

<p>Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages (and paragraphs 7.5 and 7.6) (Excluding allocations H/1a to H/1h)</p> <p>This assessment covers general points in policy H/1 and new or alternative sites proposed in representations. To look at the representations on housing allocations included in the Local Plan see the separate assessment tables that follow for each allocated site.</p>	
<p>Proposed Submission Representations Received</p>	<p>Total: 381 Support: 266 Object: 115</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England - welcome specific reference to landscape, biodiversity and GI protection and enhancement requirements for relevant developments. • Bassingbourn cum Kneesworth Parish Council support rejection of Bassingbourn SHLAA Sites 059, 066, 078, 085, 219, 220, 291 and Land north of High Street Bassingbourn (SHLAA Site 324) • Fen Ditton Parish Council - Support for rejection of Land between 12 and 28 Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton (SC254) • 3 Support for rejection (including Histon and Impington Parish Council, Oakington and Westwick Parish Council): Land at Buxhall Farm Histon (SHLAA site 133) • Madingley Parish Council – Note no development proposed in the Parish. • Stapleford Parish Council – Support rejection of SHLAA sites in Stapleford. • Shepreth Parish Council – Support rejection of Barrington Cemex site • Oakington Parish Council Supports rejection of sites in Great Shelford (SHLAA site 5), Cottenham (SHLAA sites 3, 129, 260), Gamlingay (SHLAA sites 93 and 171), Girton SHLAA site 143, Bassingbourn (SHLAA sites 78 and 219), Comberton SHLAA site 110, and Waterbeach (SHLAA sites 1 and 202). • 7 general supports for Policy H/1. • 7 supports for no sites being allocated at Fulbourn • 2 Support for development at Sawston to help local residents stay in the village. • 1 Support for rejection of Barrington Quarry site. • Support for rejection of Sawston, Babraham, Hinxton,

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>Great Shelford & Stapleford – SHLAA Sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 213 Supports for Rejection, and 6 object to rejection of Land to East of New Road Melbourn (SHLAA site 320) and Orchard and Land at East Farm Melbourn (SHLAA site 331) • 1 Support for rejection of The Rouses Bassingbourn (SHLAA site 078) • 1 Support for rejection of Next to Walnut Tree Close, North End Bassingbourn (SHLAA site 85) • 1 Support for rejection of Land north of A428, Cambourne (SHLAA Sites 194 & 265) • Petition Signed By 22 People support rejection of land at Cockerton Road Girton (SHLAA site 143) • 5 Supports for rejection of Land off Station Road Fulbourn (SHLAA site 74) and other Fulbourn SHLAA sites <p>OBJECT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads are already a problem. • Half the sites are in the Green Belt, and exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated. • Policy should refer to sites being allocated in the Green Belt only if there are no sites available outside the Green Belt. • Bullet 2 requiring sites to make appropriate financial contributions to any necessary additional infrastructure is unnecessary as a plan policy. • Roads in Gamlingay cannot cope. • Object to further development in Melbourn. • Oakington Parish Council object that the plan does not include the following sites as housing allocations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sawston (SHLAA sites 230, 116, 23,) ○ Cottenham (SHLAA sites 123, 263) ○ Fulbourn (SHLAA site 74) ○ Linton (SHLAA site 152) ○ Swavesey (SHLAA site 83) ○ Bassingbourn (SHLAA site 85) ○ Comberton (SHLAA sites 4, 158, 255) ○ Papworth Everard (SHLAA site 151) <p>Waterbeach (SHLAA sites 89, 189, 155, and 206)</p> <p>Additional or alternative village housing sites</p> <p>90 additional or alternative village housing sites suggested, most of which have been previously submitted and reviewed through the SHLAA. These have been summarised and assessed separately, and the assessments can be read in Annex B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Centres: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Cambourne: 1 site, 56 homes (1 new site) ○ Cottenham: 5 sites, 477 homes (All SHLAA sites)
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Great Shelford & Stapleford: 7 sites, 702 homes (6 SHLAA sites, 1 new site) ○ Histon & Impington: 5 sites, 380 homes (All SHLAA sites) ○ Sawston: 4 sites, 152 homes (All SHLAA sites) ● Minor Rural Centre: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bassingbourn: 2 sites, 71 homes (1 SHLAA site, 1 new site) ○ Comberton: 2 sites, 181 homes (1 SHLAA site, 1 new site) ○ Fulbourn: 5 sites, 416 homes (All SHLAA sites) ○ Gamlingay: 4 sites, 191 homes (3 SHLAA sites, 1 new site) ○ Girton: 2 sites, 15 homes (All SHLAA sites) ○ Linton: 3 sites, 473 homes (All SHLAA sites) ○ Melbourn: 1 site, 200 homes (SHLAA site) ○ Papworth Everard: 1 site, 167 homes (SHLAA site) ○ Swavesey: 3 sites, 284 homes (All SHLAA sites) ○ Waterbeach: 4 sites, 178 homes (All SHLAA sites) ○ Willingham: 1 site, 28 homes (SHLAA site) ● Group Villages - 22 SHLAA sites, 4 new sites. Includes sites proposed by Great Abington and Little Abington Parish Councils. ● Infill Villages – 5 new sites. Includes sites proposed by Graveley Parish Council.
Assessment	<p>A large number of representations have supported the Local Plan not including SHLAA sites previously included and consulted on in the Issues and Options consultations. A lesser number object that the plan has not included such sites or propose new additional or alternative sites. Assessments of the additional or alternative village housing sites can be found at Annex B.</p> <p>To help ensure sustainable development it is considered appropriate to maintain the proposed spatial strategy for the location of new development which concentrates growth in the most sustainable settlements across the district subject to land availability and constraints. No changes are proposed in response to the great majority of village objection sites.</p> <p>The only exceptions to this approach relate to Parish Council led village housing proposals where local support has been demonstrated through local village consultations undertaken since the Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation.</p> <p><u>Parish Council Led Sites in Great Abington and Little Abington</u></p>

The Parish Councils of Great and Little Abington have promoted three small scale housing developments to meet identified local housing needs, primarily for market housing but also including some affordable homes. The objective being to allow for some natural growth and to allow older households to 'downsize' to smaller properties in the same village.

All of the selected sites have been previously considered through the SHLAA process, although in the cases of two sites (Great Abington SHLAA sites 027 and 211) the sites are much smaller than previously proposed. The Little Abington site 028 is for the same site. For all of the sites the SHLAA conclusion was that they were not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints including landscape impacts, heritage impacts (for the Bancroft Farm site 028 in Little Abington), and kennel noise for the Linton Road site 027 in Great Abington. Note that the Bancroft Farm site is currently designated as a Protected Village Amenity Area in adopted plans and proposed for designation as Local Green Space in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

Note that the Proposed Submission Local Plan in any event did not include any allocations in Group or Infill villages because development in Group Villages is less sustainable than development in locations higher in the sustainable development sequence and sufficient sites had been identified for allocation in locations higher in the sustainable development sequence.

The Parish Council did not concur with these conclusions and as an alternative to taking forward a Neighbourhood Plan consulted local people and key stakeholders by leaflet between October and December 2013 about whether the sites should or should not be allocated for housing development. 189 completed leaflets were returned as follows:

- Linton Road site (35 homes) – 72% support for development
- High Street/Pampisford Road site (12 homes) – 76% support for development
- Bancroft Farm site in Little Abington (6 homes) – 86% support for development.

Background material, including scans of the consultation leaflet, the completed leaflets and of the report of consultation have been submitted to the Council and have been added to the evidence base supporting the Local Plan.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>In the light of this clear evidence of local support for the proposals demonstrated in the consultation, which puts the proposals on a similar footing to other proposals in the Local Plan, it is proposed that major modifications be made to the Local Plan to allocate the sites for housing development to meet local needs. Development should seek to fulfil the Parish Council aspirations for each site. A consequential major modification to delete Bancroft Farm from Local Green Space is also proposed.</p> <p><u>Parish Council Led sites in Graveley</u></p> <p>Graveley Parish Council is promoting two small scale housing developments to meet identified local housing needs, primarily for market housing but also including some affordable homes. The objective is to allow for some natural growth, allow older households to 'downsize' to smaller properties in the same village, and to secure a new public green area for the benefit of the village.</p> <p>As an alternative to taking forward a Neighbourhood Plan the Parish Council consulted local people by leaflet between January and 16th February 2014 about whether the sites should or should not be allocated for housing development.</p> <p>The outcome of the consultation to be included as it becomes available.</p> <p>Scans of the consultation leaflet, the completed leaflets and of the report of consultation will be added as they become available.</p> <p>A recommendation to Council regarding the inclusion of the sites in the Local Plan will depend upon the outcome of the village consultation and whether there is clear evidence of local support.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Major modification.</p> <p>No changes are proposed to the Local Plan regarding additional or alternative village housing sites. In particular, no new housing sites are proposed for inclusion in the Local Plan, except at Great and Little Abington (both Group Villages), where these have demonstrated a majority of local residents support the proposed sites and as an alternative to them preparing Neighbourhood Plans. <u>Amend for Council if necessary regarding Graveley.</u></p>

INCLUDE a new section to policy H/1 just below the existing policy text with a new sub heading and before its supporting text.

Parish Council Led Allocations for Residential Development in Villages

H/1:i Land at Linton Road, Great Abington

Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity:

4.11 ha. 35 dwellings

Development requirements:

- **Retention of the allotments**
- **Retention of boundary trees and hedges except as required to provide for access.**
- **Creation of a community orchard on the south of the site to provide a soft green edge.**
- **This is a Parish Council led proposal which has been included in the Local Plan because it has demonstrated local support. Developments should seek to fulfil the aspirations of the Parish Council for the site.**

H/1:j Land at High Street / Pampisford Road, Great Abington

Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity:

0.55 ha. 12 dwellings

Development requirements:

- **Retention of boundary trees and hedges except as required to provide for access.**
- **Creation of a landscape buffer along the boundary of the site where it adjoins or could be seen from open countryside to provide a soft green village edge.**
- **This is a Parish Council led proposal which has been included in the Local Plan because it has demonstrated local support. Developments should seek to fulfil the aspirations of the Parish Council for the site.**

H/1: k Land at Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, Little Abington

Area (ha.) and indicative dwelling capacity:

0.42 ha. 6 dwellings

Development requirements:

- **Enhancement of the Conservation Area with a high quality development of cottages suitable for 'downsizers' with generous room sizes.**
- **Retention of the flint boundary wall either as a boundary wall or as part of built development and except as required to provide for access.**
- **Creation of a landscape buffer along the rear of the site**

	<p>to provide a soft green village edge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a Parish Council led proposal which has been included in the Local Plan because it has demonstrated local support. Developments should seek to fulfil the aspirations of the Parish Council for the site. <p><u>ADD GRAVELEY Sites if the public consultation demonstrates support for development.</u></p> <p>And add a new supporting paragraph after paragraph 7.7:</p> <p>7.a The Parish Council led village residential development sites in policy H/1 have been proposed by Parish Councils to meet local aspirations for growth and as an alternative to their preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan. These have been included in the plan as an exception to the sustainable spatial strategy for the district set out in policy S/6 as local support has been demonstrated through local village consultations. Developers should work closely with the relevant Parish Council, and seek to fulfil the aspirations of the Parish Council for the site.</p>
--	---

Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages	
Site reference H/1a Sawston, Dales Manor Business Park	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 146 Support: 44 Object: 102
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridge Past Present and Future – support this policy. Cambridgeshire County Council – three Sawston sites can be appropriately accessed. Detailed Transport Assessment needed to determine impacts, required mitigation and viability, deliverability and acceptability of works. Education impacts capable of mitigation. Hinxton, Ickleton, Oakington & Westwick and Pampisford Parish Councils – support reuse of brownfield site. Sustainable development, brownfield land, will improve appearance of village boundary and benefit community. Allows for additional housing without ruining the Green Belt.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of only this site would limit traffic congestion on Babraham Road, minimise impact on schools, health centres and other local services. • Sawston provides housing to average income home owners who cannot afford to live anywhere else south of Cambridge. • One of the few communities with the infrastructure to support such developments. Need housing for local people. • Include a corner shop – already needed in the area. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency – former industrial site above a Source Protection Zone. Need a land contamination report prior to the drainage plan - suggest adding requirement to policy. • Governing Body of Icknield Primary School – object to all 3 Sawston sites: increased roll detrimental to education provision / school ethos, buildings inadequate; negative impact on education from construction noise and disruption; significant / negative impact on community; access, traffic and parking are major issues. If approved, require new buildings, retention of existing school site and grounds, improved access and parking, and full involvement in discussions / decisions. • Great Abington Parish Council – developments in or near Sawston, particularly on eastern edge, are unacceptable. Considerable traffic impacts for Sawston and Babraham. • James Binney Will Trust – accept need for more dwellings and in vicinity of Sawston and Pampisford is appropriate in principle. Serious concerns over highways safety and setting of heritage assets; increased traffic on Babraham Road, Sawston Road and Babraham High Street - roads inadequate, and significant upgrades to junctions will detract from rural character, impact on local residents and setting of Listed Pampisford Hall. Impact on drainage system to south must be assessed to ensure natural ecosystem not affected. • MCA Developments Limited – given limited employment opportunities in villages and there are locations (e.g. West Cambourne) that can accommodate housing without loss of employment land, there is not sufficient justification for this site. • Peterhouse (Bidwells) (promoter) – support allocation - will strengthen vitality and viability of village, and provide needed housing and employment opportunities. Site within a variety of ownerships and overall delivery is unlikely until after 2020 (2017/18 in housing trajectory). Delete 3rd bullet. • Salmon Harvester (Savills) (promoter) – support allocation, but opportunity for 230-250 dwellings. Insufficient market interest for employment - opportunity for redevelopment of underused site for housing and business uses. Traffic study shows capacity in highway network. Site is available on phased basis, but to be completed by the end of the plan period.
--	--

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>Replace 200 with 230 dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sawston Parish Council – fully supportive of sustainable new housing on brownfield site, within framework, supported by residents. Would not overburden facilities. If well planned, could enhance neighbourhood and provide better transition between built-up area and countryside. Alternative access to Wakelin Avenue needed. Consideration needed to cumulative impact should football stadium be permitted on adjacent site. • All 3 sites will create large housing estate, increase population significantly, and change nature of village - becoming a town. • Lower number of homes so new population can be absorbed into village. Need assurance of attractive and varied design. • Appropriate measures needed to deal with significant additional traffic, especially peak times. • Require developers to fund new access road - suggestions: (i) along old railway line, (ii) north of Deal Grove wooded area to Cambridge Road, (iii) parallel to Woodlands Road wooded area to Cambridge Road, (iv) new bypass from Babraham Road to Cambridge Road. • Wakelin Avenue is unsuited to extra traffic - use Grove Road and West Way. • Considerable distance from High Street – will encourage car use – parking in the village already saturated. • Too far from nearest bus stop and routes to Cambridge are infrequent, slow and unreliable. • Sawston does not have facilities for these houses, and no apparent mitigation. No room to expand Icknield School. Bellbird School not suitable for increased demand. Health centre at capacity. Limited local employment. Sewage plant needs upgrading. Water pressure already low. • Policy should require retention of tree belt located to rear of Broadmeadows / Fairfields - enhances environment and natural habitat. Part of a scheme to reduce noise and pollution. • Choosing industrial site short sighted – expanding population in Sawston / growing economy may mean more industrial units are needed. Consider non-industrial areas first. • Location between industrial and football stadium unsuitable. • Provide sustainable employment opportunities for residents, e.g. sports centre, ice rink or cinema. Need village hall. • Site is supposed to be for affordable homes but cannot ensure they will be allocated to local residents. • Will create suburb of Cambridge – Sawston, Stapleford and Babraham will all join together in future. • Consider land off New Road / smaller sites on west of village.
--	---

	Near bypass; easier for cars to leave village, nearer High Street; more likely to walk/cycle. Flood issues acceptable with careful controls. Whittlesford station is within walking distance.
Assessment	<p>Sawston is one of the largest and most sustainable villages in the District and is located south of Cambridge close to a number of successful business and science parks. It is a suitable location for housing development. The site was identified as having development potential for housing development through the SHLAA and SA processes and included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as one of the better site options to meet the development strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the housing capacity of the site the proposed indicative figure of 200 homes is considered to be a reasonable assumption to include in the Local Plan. The policy would not prevent a redevelopment for a higher number of homes if that can be demonstrated as acceptable, and if land does become available for development sooner than has been assumed in the plan it could do so.</p> <p>A transport assessment for Sawston has been carried out to test the impacts of the proposed housing sites on the main junctions in the vicinity to provide part of the evidence base for the plan. The level of delay that is predicted at the A1301/Mill Lane junction (on the west side of Sawston) with proposed development traffic does not greatly increase from current use. Delays at the A1301/Cambridge Road junction (the northern entrance to the village) are not forecast to significantly increase from current use, with the exception of traffic turning right out of Sawston from Cambridge Road to the A1301 in the AM peak. The level of delay may be less in practice given that the junction with the A1301 to the south at Mill Lane (on the west side of Sawston) is operating within capacity.</p> <p>The level of delay forecast at the Cambridge Road/Babraham Road/Hillside/New Road signalised junction in the centre of Sawston is likely to be significant for the Babraham Road arm in both AM and PM peaks, as well as Hillside in the PM peak with the addition of the development traffic. However there is scope for utilising the current road layout with revisions made to the signal timings and phasing to optimise the operation of the junction. Road widening to increase flare lengths may also be possible. While mitigation will be necessary to address the impacts of the development, there are potential measures available that would provide relief to the traffic movements.</p> <p>With development, the junction between High Street and the</p>

	<p>A1307 shows some significant increases in delay, particularly from High Street, Babraham turning on to the A1307 in both the AM and PM peaks. While there are increases in delay, the relatively low flow levels at this junction mean that the length of queue forecast does not significantly increase.</p> <p>Overall the assessment finds that a number of potential mitigation measures may be feasible to help reduce the impacts of development. Particular attention will need to be paid to the signal controlled junction at Babraham Road/Cambridge Road to effectively provide capacity for both vehicular and pedestrian movements.</p> <p>Education impacts are capable of mitigation and the application of policies SC/4 'Meeting Community Needs' and TI/9 'Education', will ensure that additional school capacity is provided in a suitable way and when it is needed.</p> <p>The planning application proposing to develop a football stadium for Cambridge City FC in the Green Belt to the north west of the site takes its vehicular access through the housing site. No decision has yet been made on the application, and account will need to be taken in that decision of the proposed residential allocation, which will gain weight on submission of the plan for public examination.</p> <p>For issues concerning the spatial strategy of the plan see the assessment of policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change.</p> <p>Amend Figure 3: Housing Trajectory to change the predicted housing completions for Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston, from being delivered in 2017-2021 to being delivered in 2021-2025 in recognition of the pattern of leasehold interests on the site.</p>

<p>Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages Site H1/b – Sawston, land north of Babraham Road (in Babraham Parish)</p>	
<p>Proposed Submission Representations Received</p>	<p>Total: 210 Support: 9 Object: 201</p>

<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – capacity available to serve proposed growth in water recycling centre and foul sewerage network. Surface water network capacity – major constraints to provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth. Sewers crossing the site – site layout should take into account. • Cambridgeshire County Council – three Sawston sites can be appropriately accessed. Detailed Transport Assessment needed to determine impacts, required mitigation and viability, deliverability and acceptability of works. Education impacts capable of mitigation. • Logical infill to improve appearance of entrance to village - create soft green edge. Make provision for maintaining or enlarging path along the current eastern edge of the village. • Sawston provides housing to average income home owners who cannot afford to live anywhere else south of Cambridge. • One of the few communities with the infrastructure to support such developments. Need housing for local people. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Babraham Parish Council – Green Belt should not be built on. Increase in traffic unacceptable - will make Babraham High Street/A1307 more dangerous. Will attract London commuters, not allocated to local residents. Medical centre and schools at capacity. Land owned by Ward’s Charity is not available for housing under charity’s terms. • Cambridge Past Present and Future – half the sites in villages lie within Green Belt - Council has not demonstrated ‘exceptional circumstances’. • Governing Body of Icknield Primary School – object to all 3 Sawston sites: increased roll detrimental to education provision / school ethos, buildings inadequate; negative impact on education from construction noise and disruption; significant / negative impact on community; access, traffic and parking are major issues. If approved, require new buildings, retention of existing school site and grounds, improved access and parking, and full involvement in discussions / decisions. • Great Abington Parish Council – developments in or near Sawston, particularly on eastern edge, are unacceptable. Considerable traffic impacts for Sawston and Babraham. Within Green Belt and Babraham parish. • Hinxton Parish Council – greenfield land in Green Belt. Increased traffic. Concerns over capacity of parking, schools and doctors surgery. • Ickleton Parish Council – not sustainable as good agricultural and Green Belt land. Too far out of village - car journeys to facilities elsewhere. Medical Centre at capacity. Public transport inadequate or non-existent.
---------------------------	--

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Binney Will Trust – accept need for more dwellings and in vicinity of Sawston and Pampisford is appropriate in principle. Serious concerns over highways safety and setting of heritage assets; increased traffic on Babraham Road, Sawston Road and Babraham High Street - roads inadequate, and significant upgrades to junctions will detract from rural character, impact on local residents and setting of Listed Pampisford Hall. Impact on drainage system to south must be assessed to ensure natural ecosystem not affected. • MCA Developments Limited – NPPF clear Green Belt should only be considered where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. Release of Green Belt land around Sawston is not justified when other options exist e.g. Cambourne West. • Pampisford Parish Council – consider effect of 540 homes in same area on Sawston and surrounding villages. Located far from village centre and few residents have employment in Sawston - reliance on cars. Increase congestion and pollution on Babraham Road. Roads unsuitable – no credible transport plan to mitigate impacts. No justification for using agricultural land outside village framework – contrary to NPPF. Impact on local infrastructure especially schools and medical services. • Quy Farms Ltd – hierarchy gives edge of Cambridge as preferred location - difficult to understand why releasing land from Green Belt on edge of villages. Some development is needed in villages to provide choice, quantum is unsound. Allocate land at Fen Ditton - edge of Cambridge. • Sawston Parish Council – 540 homes out of proportion. Poorly related to public transport and unacceptable distance from village facilities - increase car usage. Physically impossible to increase parking in village. Increase traffic on Babraham Road and no clear proposals for increasing capacity on road network. Existing amenities oversubscribed. Limited scope to expand Icknield School - site constraints. Bellbird 800+ metres away, discouraging walking. Green Belt important in preserving the separation between Sawston and Babraham. In public consultation only 33% of representations supported. • Stapleford Parish Council – Parish Plan states should resist Green Belt except for recreation. Recognise need for housing, but concerned that existing infrastructure cannot support massive rise in housing and population. Traffic increase will have massive impact on Stapleford parish. • Whittlesford Parish Council – will place added pressure on infrastructure e.g. schools, shopping, medical centre, roads. Nearby small villages depend on these services. Will add
--	--

	<p>considerable traffic accessing and joining A505 and cause congestion in Babraham.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All 3 sites will create large housing estate, increase population significantly, and change nature of village - becoming a town. • Adequate sustainability report not prepared. • Minimal contribution to five year supply, not vital. • Council has only considered land deemed available by owners. Look for appropriate brownfield sites and approach owners. • Loss of good quality agricultural land and wildlife habitat - don't need houses to soften the edge of the village – just plant trees. • Adverse impact on Babraham in terms of character and nature, facilities and safety. • Lower number of homes should be built so that the new population can be successfully absorbed into the village. • Too much strain on village centre - cannot expand. Shops would compete with village centre and endanger its vitality. • Village infrastructure will not support increased population and no substantive remediation plans. Increased load on schools, nursery and medical facilities. Access problem for dependent neighbouring villages. No employment in Sawston. Water pressure already low. If developed require: primary school, improved transport, additional village amenities and parking. • Need housing for local people. Will become commuter village. • Significant impact on traffic and surrounding roads. Strain on public transport. No adequate traffic impact appraisal done for this site or cumulative impacts of 3 proposals. No traffic mitigation planned. Congestion on main roads will lead to side roads being used as 'rat runs'. • Concerned about cumulative impacts of traffic if Cambridge City FC move to Sawston. • Require developers to fund new access road - suggestions: (i) along old railway line, (ii) north of Deal Grove wooded area to Cambridge Road, (iii) parallel to Woodlands Road wooded area to Cambridge Road, (iv) new bypass from Babraham Road to Cambridge Road. • Distance to village centre - car dependent. No plans for safe non-car routes. Car parks at capacity. No suitable public transport links to Cambridge. Locate homes around transport links - train stations. Bus routes infrequent, slow and unreliable. • Protect Babraham Restricted byway 10 along the edge of site. • Sawston carrying disproportionate housing burden – other villages could take 40-50 new homes. • Effects on Sawston and surrounding villages like Babraham, Pampisford and Whittlesford have not been considered. • Will create suburb of Cambridge – Sawston, Stapleford and Babraham will all join together in future. • Provide sustainable employment opportunities for residents,
--	--

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>e.g. sports centre, ice rink or cinema. Need village hall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider land off New Road / smaller sites on west of village. Near bypass; easier for cars to leave village, nearer High Street; more likely to walk/cycle. Flood issues acceptable with careful controls.
Assessment	<p>Sawston is one of the largest and most sustainable villages in the District and is located south of Cambridge close to a number of successful business and science parks. It is a suitable location for housing development. The site was identified as having development potential for housing development through the SHLAA and SA processes and included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as one of the better site options to meet the development strategy. Sites to the west of the village considered through the SHLAA and SA processes and not selected due to the constraints affecting the sites.</p> <p>A transport assessment for Sawston has been carried out to test the impacts of the proposed housing sites on the main junctions in the vicinity to provide part of the evidence base for the plan. The level of delay that is predicted at the A1301/Mill Lane junction (on the west side of Sawston) with proposed development traffic does not greatly increase from current use. Delays at the A1301/Cambridge Road junction (the northern entrance to the village) are not forecast to significantly increase from current use, with the exception of traffic turning right out of Sawston from Cambridge Road to the A1301 in the AM peak. The level of delay may be less in practice given that the junction with the A1301 to the south at Mill Lane (on the west side of Sawston) is operating within capacity.</p> <p>The level of delay forecast at the Cambridge Road/Babraham Road/Hillside/New Road signalised junction in the centre of Sawston is likely to be significant for the Babraham Road arm in both AM and PM peaks, as well as Hillside in the PM peak with the addition of the development traffic. However there is scope for utilising the current road layout with revisions made to the signal timings and phasing to optimise the operation of the junction. Road widening to increase flare lengths may also be possible. While mitigation will be necessary to address the impacts of the development, there are potential measures available that would provide relief to the traffic movements.</p> <p>With development, the junction between High Street and the A1307 shows some significant increases in delay, particularly from</p>

	<p>High Street, Babraham turning on to the A1307 in both the AM and PM peaks. While there are increases in delay, the relatively low flow levels at this junction mean that the length of queue forecast does not significantly increase.</p> <p>Overall the assessment finds that a number of potential mitigation measures may be feasible to help reduce the impacts of development. Particular attention will need to be paid to the signal controlled junction at Babraham Road/Cambridge Road to effectively provide capacity for both vehicular and pedestrian movements.</p> <p>Education impacts are capable of mitigation and the application of policies SC/4 'Meeting Community Needs' and TI/9 'Education', will ensure that additional school capacity is provided in a suitable way and when it is needed.</p> <p>Sawston has a good range of shops and services and buses to Cambridge every 20 minutes at peak times. The site is on the edge of the village and as one of the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire is therefore inevitably some way from the village centre. However, the facilities available locally are amongst the best in the district and it is preferable to locate development here rather than at smaller villages where village edge sites would be closer to the village centre but one with far fewer facilities, meaning that residents would have to travel from a smaller village to somewhere like Sawston to access facilities.</p> <p>The village centre and bus stops are within easy walking and cycling distance of the development sites for most people being generally within 1 kilometre (0.6 miles), which is around a 10-12 minute walk.</p> <p>For issues concerning the Green Belt see the assessment of policy S/4: Cambridge Green Belt, and in respect of the spatial strategy of the plan see the assessment of policy S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

**Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages
Site H1/c – Sawston, land south of Babraham Road (part in Babraham Parish)**

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 231 Support: 13 Object: 218
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - capacity available to serve proposed growth in water recycling centre. Foul sewerage network capacity – infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required or diversion of assets may be required. Surface water network capacity – major constraints to provision of infrastructure and/or treatment to serve proposed growth. Some localised enhancement to network may be required to receive foul water. Sewers crossing site – layout should take into account. • Cambridgeshire County Council – three Sawston sites can be appropriately accessed. Detailed Transport Assessment needed to determine impacts, required mitigation and viability, deliverability and acceptability of works. Education impacts capable of mitigation. • John Huntingdon Charity (promoter) – charity provides relief to local people who need housing through alms houses. Intend to provide further alms houses. • Good location / obvious place to extend village. Would give continuity to village and better access to amenities. Opportunity to improve boundary landscaping. • Need for affordable housing – prevents residents being forced to move away from family and support networks. • Sawston provides housing to average income home owners who cannot afford to live anywhere else south of Cambridge. • One of the few communities with the infrastructure to support such developments. Need housing for local people. • Site put forward by local charities who understand the local need. Some land could be used for school playing field. • Desperately need additional housing - should not be dismissed on basis of imagined or hypothetical problems. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Babraham Parish Council – Green Belt should not be built on. Increase in traffic unacceptable - will make Babraham High Street/A1307 more dangerous. Will attract London commuters, not allocated to local residents. Medical centre and schools at capacity. Land owned by Ward's Charity is not available for housing under charity's terms. • Cambridge Past Present and Future – half the sites in villages lie within Green Belt - Council has not demonstrated 'exceptional circumstances'.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governing Body of Icknield Primary School – object to all 3 Sawston sites: increased roll detrimental to education provision / school ethos, buildings inadequate; negative impact on education from construction noise and disruption; significant / negative impact on community; access, traffic and parking are major issues. If approved, require new buildings, retention of existing school site and grounds, improved access and parking, and full involvement in discussions / decisions. • Great Abington Parish Council – developments in or near Sawston, particularly on eastern edge, are unacceptable. Considerable traffic impacts for Sawston and Babraham. Within Green Belt and Babraham parish. • Hinxton Parish Council – greenfield land in Green Belt. Increased traffic. Concerns over capacity of parking, schools and doctors surgery. • Ickleton Parish Council – not sustainable as good agricultural and Green Belt land. Too far out of village - car journeys to facilities elsewhere. Medical Centre at capacity. Public transport inadequate or non-existent. • James Binney Will Trust – accept need for more dwellings and in vicinity of Sawston and Pampisford is appropriate in principle. Serious concerns over highways safety and setting of heritage assets; increased traffic on Babraham Road, Sawston Road and Babraham High Street - roads inadequate, and significant upgrades to junctions will detract from rural character, impact on local residents and setting of Listed Pampisford Hall. Impact on drainage system to south must be assessed to ensure natural ecosystem not affected. • MCA Developments Limited – NPPF clear Green Belt should only be considered where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. Release of Green Belt land around Sawston is not justified when other options exist e.g. Cambourne West. • Pampisford Parish Council – consider effect of 540 homes in same area on Sawston and surrounding villages. Located far from village centre and few residents have employment in Sawston - reliance on cars. Increase congestion and pollution on Babraham Road. Roads unsuitable – no credible transport plan to mitigate impacts. No justification for using agricultural land outside village framework – contrary to NPPF. Impact on local infrastructure especially schools and medical services. • Quy Farms Ltd – hierarchy gives edge of Cambridge as preferred location - difficult to understand why releasing land from Green Belt on edge of villages. Some development is needed in villages to provide choice, quantum is unsound. Allocate land at Fen Ditton - edge of Cambridge. • Sawston Parish Council – 540 homes out of proportion. Poorly related to public transport and unacceptable distance
--	--

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>from village facilities - increase car usage. Physically impossible to increase parking in village. Increase traffic on Babraham Road and no clear proposals for increasing capacity on road network. Existing amenities oversubscribed. Limited scope to expand Icknield School - site constraints. Bellbird 800+ metres away, discouraging walking. Green Belt important in preserving the separation between Sawston and Babraham. In public consultation only 33% of representations supported.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shelford & District Bridleways Group – Reword bullet 4 to incorporate access for horse riders as well as pedestrians and cyclists - not compliant with NPPF, evidence in Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and Equality Act. • Stapleford Parish Council – Parish Plan states should resist Green Belt except for recreation. Recognise need for housing, but concerned that existing infrastructure cannot support massive rise in housing and population. Traffic increase will have massive impact on Stapleford parish. • Whittlesford Parish Council – will place added pressure on infrastructure e.g. schools, shopping, medical centre, roads. Nearby small villages depend on these services. Will add considerable traffic accessing and joining A505 and cause congestion in Babraham. • All 3 sites will create large housing estate, increase population significantly, and change nature of village - becoming a town. • Adequate sustainability report has not been prepared. Site is amalgamation of Site Options 8 and 9, put forward separately by different developers - cannot legally be considered as one. • Minimal contribution to five year supply, not vital. • Council has only considered land deemed available by owners. Look for appropriate brownfield sites and approach owners. • Loss of good quality agricultural land and wildlife habitat - don't need houses to soften the edge of the village – just plant trees. • Within Babraham parish - adverse impact on Babraham in terms of character and nature, facilities and safety. • Small strip of land that gives access is owned by Ward's Charity - without this land the site is undeliverable. • Lower number of homes should be built so that the new population can be successfully absorbed into the village. • Too much strain on village centre - cannot expand. Shops would compete with village centre and endanger its vitality. • Village infrastructure will not support increased population and no substantive remediation plans. Increased load on schools, nursery and medical facilities. Access problem for dependent neighbouring villages. No employment in Sawston. Water
--	---

	<p>pressure already low. If developed require: primary school, improved transport, additional village amenities and parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need housing for local people. Will become commuter village. • Significant impact on traffic and surrounding roads. Strain on public transport. No adequate traffic impact appraisal done for this site or cumulative impacts of 3 proposals. No traffic mitigation planned. Congestion on main roads will lead to side roads being used as 'rat runs'. • Concerned about cumulative impacts of traffic if Cambridge City FC move to Sawston. • Require developers to fund new access road to bypass village centre / encourage traffic away from Babraham. Suggestions: (i) along old railway line, (ii) north of Deal Grove wooded area to Cambridge Road, (iii) parallel to Woodlands Road wooded area to Cambridge Road, (iv) new bypass from Babraham Road to Cambridge Road. No undertaking given to prevent access onto Church Lane. • Distance to village centre - car dependent. No plans for safe non-car routes. Car parks at capacity. No suitable public transport links to Cambridge. Locate homes around transport links - train stations. Bus routes infrequent, slow and unreliable. • Public footpath runs through site – object to its extinguishment but would consider a sensible diversion. • Sawston carrying disproportionate housing burden – other villages could take 40-50 new homes. • Effects on Sawston and surrounding villages like Babraham, Pampisford and Whittlesford have not been considered. • Will create suburb of Cambridge – Sawston, Stapleford and Babraham will all join together in future. • Provide sustainable employment opportunities for residents, e.g. sports centre, ice rink or cinema. Need village hall. • Consider land off New Road / smaller sites on west of village. Near bypass; easier for cars to leave village, nearer High Street; more likely to walk/cycle. Flood issues acceptable with careful controls. Consider housing on Michael Mallows Farm. • Infill small serviced sites within the village first.
Assessment	<p>Sawston is one of the largest and most sustainable villages in the District and is located south of Cambridge close to a number of successful business and science parks. It is a suitable location for housing development. The site was identified as having development potential for housing development through the SHLAA and SA processes and included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as one of the better site options to meet the development strategy. It is an amalgamation of three SHLAA sites under different ownerships but the policy requires that development come forward as a single proposal in a comprehensive scheme.</p>

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

A transport assessment for Sawston has been carried out to test the impacts of the proposed housing sites on the main junctions in the vicinity to provide part of the evidence base for the plan. The level of delay that is predicted at the A1301/Mill Lane junction (on the west side of Sawston) with proposed development traffic does not greatly increase from current use. Delays at the A1301/Cambridge Road junction (the northern entrance to the village) are not forecast to significantly increase from current use, with the exception of traffic turning right out of Sawston from Cambridge Road to the A1301 in the AM peak. The level of delay may be less in practice given that the junction with the A1301 to the south at Mill Lane (on the west side of Sawston) is operating within capacity.

The level of delay forecast at the Cambridge Road/Babraham Road/Hillside/New Road signalised junction in the centre of Sawston is likely to be significant for the Babraham Road arm in both AM and PM peaks, as well as Hillside in the PM peak with the addition of the development traffic. However there is scope for utilising the current road layout with revisions made to the signal timings and phasing to optimise the operation of the junction. Road widening to increase flare lengths may also be possible. While mitigation will be necessary to address the impacts of the development, there are potential measures available that would provide relief to the traffic movements.

With development, the junction between High Street and the A1307 shows some significant increases in delay, particularly from High Street, Babraham turning on to the A1307 in both the AM and PM peaks. While there are increases in delay, the relatively low flow levels at this junction mean that the length of queue forecast does not significantly increase.

Overall the assessment finds that a number of potential mitigation measures may be feasible to help reduce the impacts of development. Particular attention will need to be paid to the signal controlled junction at Babraham Road/Cambridge Road to effectively provide capacity for both vehicular and pedestrian movements.

Education impacts are capable of mitigation and the application of policies SC/4 'Meeting Community Needs' and TI/9 'Education', will ensure that additional school capacity is provided in a suitable

way and when it is needed.

Sawston has a good range of shops and services and buses to Cambridge every 20 minutes at peak times. The site is on the edge of the village and as one of the largest villages in South Cambridgeshire is therefore inevitably some way from the village centre. However, the facilities available locally are amongst the best in the district and it is preferable to locate development here rather than at smaller villages where village edge sites would be closer to the village centre but one with far fewer facilities, meaning that residents would have to travel from a smaller village to somewhere like Sawston to access facilities.

The village centre and bus stops are within easy walking and cycling distance of the development sites for most people being generally within 1 kilometre (0.6 miles), around a 10-12 minute walk. The site south of Babraham Road also includes a footpath/cycle link to Church Lane to provide more direct access to the village centre.

The Ward's Charity (a promoter of part of the site) have stated in a letter received after the close of the consultation that: 'As trustees we intend our land to remain in the SHLAA process. However we plan to retain control over access to the southwest of our land (to the remaining portion of site H1/c). In reaching this view we have been mindful of strong opposition to the scale of proposed development in Sawston. We are a charity associated with the parish church and it is clearly not our wish to alienate our parish community'.

However, the site is suitable for housing development and remains one of the best village sites available to meet needs and provide an element of housing in the south of the district and close to existing business parks. It is considered that there must be a reasonable prospect that the whole site will become available for development as the plan proposes between 2020/21 and 2026/27, especially as the policy requires that the site should come forward as a single proposal in a comprehensive scheme. On this basis it should be retained as a proposed site allocation in the Local Plan.

Development limited to the Charity owned land immediately south of Babraham Road would form an isolated promontory of development and would sterilise the development potential of the remainder of the site to the south and so would not be acceptable.

For issues concerning the Green Belt see the assessment of policy S/4 'Cambridge Green Belt', and in respect of the spatial strategy

	of the plan see the assessment of policy S/6 'The Development Strategy to 2031'. The assessment of policy TI/2 'Planning for Sustainable Travel' addresses the needs of horse riders and a minor change to the policy is proposed.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages Site H1/d – Histon & Impington, land north of Impington Lane	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 24 Support: 2 Object: 22
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – Capacity available for water recycling and foul sewerage to serve the proposed growth. • Support completion of Unwins site for small, affordable, carless properties to help young people stay locally. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WJ Unwins & Messrs Biggs (site promoters) – Support, but object to northern site boundary – illogical, not defined on ground. Green Belt release for only 25 houses at highly sustainable Rural Centre is inappropriate. Increase site size. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Within Green Belt. Not demonstrated exceptional circumstances. NPPF permits limited infill in Green Belt for affordable housing only. • Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards – Site outside IDB area but must be consulted (with Environment Agency) on surface water disposal proposals. • Histon and Impington PC – Need for homes not outweigh harm to Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances. Adverse impact on rural appearance and character of area, including setting of Conservation Areas and Grade II Listed Buildings, archaeological potential. Further strain on infrastructure – schools. Inappropriate access. Alternative brownfield sites. Already loss of Green Belt for Orchard Park, Darwin Green etc. Even if larger site, not strategic scale and faces same issues. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Object to site option.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt. Not exceptional circumstances to remove. Premature to release before proper review conducted, including all possible brownfield sites. • Outside village framework. • Floods during winter. Bidwells report erroneous claiming water table does not reach this field. • Access previously refused as inappropriate, dangerous and does not comply with highway regulations regarding visibility. Impact on pedestrian safety - main walk / cycleway to school. • Services over capacity – doctors, schools, recreation. • Impact on Green Belt, village character, village sprawl not offset by benefits of 25 dwellings. • Most employment in Cambridge or south of city. • Impington Lane and B1049 do not have capacity for more traffic. Junction Impington Lane / The Green - accident area. • Lack of information on “significant landscape buffer”. • Parish Council’s plans for ‘station’ should be followed. • Build barriers to reduce A14 noise pollution.
Assessment	<p>Histon and Impington is one of the largest and most sustainable villages in the District and located just to the north of Cambridge. It is a suitable location for housing development. The site consulted on was identified as having development potential for housing development through the SHLAA and SA processes and included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as one of the better site options to meet the development strategy. The impact on Green Belt purposes and landscape were taken into account through the SHLAA and SA processes and a smaller site consulted on at Issues and Options and in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The site lies adjacent to a recently completed housing development and the Local Plan site would round off and not extend development further north than the recently completed development site.</p> <p>Account was also taken of the views of Cambridgeshire County Council concerning site access and education provision who told us that the site is acceptable to the Highway Authority subject to detailed design and that the approach to mitigating the education impact of development will need to be considered as part of a wider review of provision in the village.</p> <p>A larger development area would have greater impact on Green Belt purposes, heritage assets and local townscape and landscape and part would be at risk of flooding.</p> <p>For issues concerning the Green Belt see the assessment of policy</p>

	S/4 'Cambridge Green Belt', and in respect of the spatial strategy of the plan see the assessment of policy S/6 'The Development Strategy to 2031'.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages Site H1/e – Melbourn, land off New Road and rear of Victoria Way	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 230 Support: 179 Object: 51
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <p>A high number of largely identical representations have been submitted as part of a local campaign supporting the site but opposed to any wider scale of development in the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brian Tyler (site promoter) – Site is sustainable, deliverable, and owner preparing planning application. No overriding constraints to delivery of high quality housing for local people. • Nicholas Newman (site promoter) – Sustainable site forming an obvious extension to the settlement. • Anglian Water – Capacity available for water recycling and foul sewerage to serve the proposed growth. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Supports policy. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation – Site falls outside of statutory consultation zones for MOD aerodromes. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support site allocation. • Support housing site off New Road to the rear of Victoria Way. • Support but consider 65 to be absolute maximum for village. • Evidence of democracy in action – listened to response of village to H7 & H8 (overwhelmingly against). • As long as sustainability is factored in i.e. % families / elderly, affecting all services – medical, schools, transport, parking. • Will need imaginative landscape as forms promontory development jutting into farmland. • Sustainable location, obvious extension to village, capable of

	<p>meeting housing needs. Access achievable from New Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support site, with plans for The Moor, the Old Elm Tree and the Old Police Station, ample housing for Melbourn. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to housing site off New Road to the rear of Victoria Way • Too many houses. Village already at capacity. More like small town than village. Housing not required and sets precedent. • Does not deal with (overstretched) infrastructure – water, sewerage, doctors, school, village centre gridlocked at traffic lights, community halls. • Contradicts Minor Rural Centre policy – no more than 30 dwellings. • Access to New Road insufficient. Roads inadequate. Traffic from scientific and technology parks not taken into account. • More in favour of creating new village than diminishing quality of life in Melbourn and other affected villages. • Loss of significant area of high quality agricultural land. • 54% population children or pre-middle age, remainder elderly - enhance schools and communal facilities not add to demands. • Would be serious social disruption to established community. • Serious engineering / surveying difficulties within site. • Strange change of use of a field that provides a buffer to the extension of the village. Would be open except for cemetery.
Assessment	<p>Melbourn is one of the larger and more sustainable villages in the District. It is a suitable location for housing development. The site consulted on was identified as having development potential for housing development through the SHLAA and SA processes and included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as one of the better site options to meet the development strategy. It is separated from New Road by a recently completed rural affordable housing exception site, whilst to the south it is largely shielded from views by a shelter belt of trees and by hedges. Site access will primarily be via an existing access road (Victoria Way), which serves the affordable housing and the village cemetery. The site has attracted a majority of local support.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

**Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages
Site H1/f – Gamlingay, Green End Industrial Estate**

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 13 Support: 4 Object: 9
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – Capacity available for water recycling and foul sewerage to serve the proposed growth. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation – Site falls outside of statutory consultation zones for MOD aerodromes. • Gamlingay PC – Support inclusion as it was the most sensible option to cater for Gamlingay’s housing needs in this period. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support site allocation. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green End Trading Company (site promoters) – Support in principle. Object to clause “employment uses utilising not less than 25% of the site” on viability grounds. Only some existing uses could be retained, rest speculative – limited demand and excess supply locally. Alternative wording proposed. • Gamlingay PC – Concerns about ensuring proposed mix of development properly caters for existing businesses on site. Support need for them to be retained on site or relocated to Station Road site. • Objectives of climate change must be rigorously pursued in this development – where feasible zero carbon policy applied. • Over 65s need 2 bed houses of sensible size in Gamlingay to downsize. • Roads already choked. Trucks, lorries and buses cannot get through. Further industrial development will add to problem. Gamlingay has reached capacity – no more. • Can infrastructure cope? – doctors, shops, schools, transport / roads. Excess traffic. Roads full of potholes. • Lack of amenity space this side of village. Overdevelopment of village.
Assessment	Gamlingay is one of the larger and more sustainable villages in the District. It is a suitable location for housing development. The site consulted on was identified as having development potential for housing development through the SHLAA and SA processes and included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as one of the better site options to meet the development strategy. The site currently provides a significant number of local jobs in an area of the district relatively distant from major centres of employment and

	it is appropriate that it should continue to provide some employment alongside much needed housing.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages Site H1/g – Willingham, land east of Rockmill End	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 5 Support: 4 Object: 1
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ely Diocesan Board of Finance (site promoter) – Site justified when considering reasonable alternatives. Willingham sustainable village. Viable, deliverable, minimal landscape, access, heritage, wildlife impacts - capable of being mitigated. Quantum of development corresponds to Minor Rural Centre. • Anglian Water – Capacity available for water recycling and foul sewerage to serve the proposed growth. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation – Site falls outside of statutory consultation zones for MOD aerodromes. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support site allocation. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards – Site drains into Old West IDB. No residual capacity for increased run-off – must include scheme for water accommodation within development, at developers expense.
Assessment	Willingham is one of the larger and more sustainable villages in the District. It is a suitable location for housing development. The site consulted on was identified as having development potential for housing development through the SHLAA and SA processes and included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as one of the better site options to meet the development strategy.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy H/1 Allocations for Residential Development at Villages

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

Site H1/h – Comberton, land at Bennell Farm (in Toft Parish)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 32 Support: 2 Object: 30
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – Capacity available for water recycling and foul sewerage to serve the proposed growth. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation – Site falls outside of statutory consultation zones for MOD aerodromes. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr & Mrs Arnold (site promoters) – Support but seek more flexibility: (1) alternative disposition of residential development across site, not restricted to east of access road. (2) Query need for football pitch, monies better directed to existing facilities & Village College overspill car parking provision – allow flexibility for on- or off-site provision or both. (3) Expand site to include remaining part of field to allow better disposition of uses – unsuitable for agriculture once site built. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Within Green Belt. Not demonstrated exceptional circumstances. NPPF permits limited infill in Green Belt for affordable housing only. • Barton PC – Must reduce amount of traffic through villages - access from A428 to M11 must be provided before houses. • Comberton PC – Majority of residents support no significant changes to Comberton. Sewage capacity issues. Traffic flow without traffic calming / controls – impact on pedestrian safety and children attending schools. All negative impacts while Toft gets financial benefits. Remove site, or offset adverse impacts. • Toft PC – Site not suitable for 90 houses, cannot achieve low density. Overstretch local infrastructure, amenities and services. Opposite Village College – hazardous. Within Toft Parish but adjacent to Comberton – support any representation from Comberton PC. Concerns about football pitch / changing room proposals – not discussed with PC. • Green Belt should be protected and not “released”. Loss of separation with Toft. Alternative non-Green Belt sites available. • Goes against Council’s own policies - outside village framework, Minor Rural Centre - maximum size 30 dwellings. • Road and public transport cannot support traffic – commuting

	<p>already difficult, congestion. Roads blocked by parked cars. Opposite Village College – hazardous. Poor pavement continuity. No safe cycle path.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toft does not need elaborate football field and changing facilities. Takes no account of existing provision in Comberton. Unlikely to benefit younger children - too far from village. • Drainage and risk of flooding need to be planned for. • Consult Comberton residents on how to spend monies – new footpaths, cycleways, road safety measures etc. • Overstretch local infrastructure, amenities and services in Comberton – library, health, schools, shops etc. No mains gas. • Lack of local employment – commute elsewhere. • Historical grazing land, rich in wildlife. • Within Toft Parish but on edge of Comberton – Toft receives benefits / finance (move Parish Boundary), whilst Comberton gets the negative impacts. • Numerous planning applications refused as outside village framework and encourage ribbon development. • Disproportionate number of homes planned for area. Developments this size should be near good fast roads and adequate local shopping and employment. • Requirement for affordable housing to meet local needs welcomed, but need to preserve character of area, reduce traffic impact and address drainage – no more than 50-60. • Hierarchy preference for edge of Cambridge. Quantum of development in villages compared to edge of Cambridge unsound. Object to release of Green Belt land at villages in preference to land at Fen Ditton.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>Comberton is one of the larger and more sustainable villages in the District. It is a suitable location for housing development. The site consulted on was identified as having development potential for housing development through the SHLAA and SA processes and included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as one of the better site options to meet the development strategy.</p> <p>Restricting built development to the east of the access road is important to restrict the impact of the development on the landscape and to maintain the existing separation from Toft. The access road is almost opposite the western boundary of the Village College and built development west of the access road would extend the village rather than round it off opposite the school. The part of the site to the west of the access road is also the most suitable to accommodate sustainable drainage systems features to mitigate surface water drainage and flood risk impacts. Neither should the development site extend further to the north. This site</p>

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>boundary consulted on was proposed by the landowner and described when submitted to the Council as extending the natural line of residential development to the west of the village. Further extension to the north would breach this line and have a greater impact on townscape and landscape.</p> <p>The policy provisions for a football pitch and facilities and Village College parking were included in the plan having been proposed to us by the landowner in 2012 following what they described as their own 'detailed consultations' with Comberton and Toft PC's and the Village College. The views of both Parish Councils were sought by the Council at that time but without reply. Both Parish Councils have now objected to the proposal and Toft PC have stated that the proposed football facilities are of concern to them. The Village College has not made representations on the community car parking. The landowner has proposed that the policy be made more flexible to allow provision for football, and VC parking, either on site or off-site (by way of financial contributions) and that parking provision only be made in response to an identified need. A minor change is proposed to the supporting text of the policy to clarify the status of the development requirements to address the concerns of the landowner and Parish Councils.</p> <p>Regarding local concerns about sewage and drainage in Comberton, policy CC/7 'Water Quality' requires that adequate sewerage and drainage provision is made to serve each development. Policy CC/8 'Sustainable Drainage Systems' requires the use of drainage systems to minimise flood risk and pressure on piped drainage systems. Policy CC/9 requires that development not create a flood risk elsewhere and that discharge from the site is kept at natural greenfield rates or lower. The site is large enough to accommodate such features especially given the proposed low density of development. It can also be noted that Anglian Water have not objected to the allocation.</p> <p>Traffic and access matters were taken into account during the preparation of the SHLAA.</p> <p>See also the assessment of policies S/4: Cambridge Green Belt, concerning the Green Belt, and S/6: The Development Strategy to 2031 regarding alternative development options on the edge of Cambridge and elsewhere.</p>
Approach in	

Submission Local Plan	Minor change Add additional text to paragraph 7.7 after the first sentence as follows: ‘A development requirement will apply unless it can be demonstrated when a planning application for site development is submitted, that a requirement is no longer needed, or it could be better addressed in a different way either on or off site.’
------------------------------	--

Policy H/2 Bayer CropScience Site, Hauxton	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 21 Support: 8 Object: 13
Main Issues	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency – Support the remediation of all contamination to make the drainage of the site effective. • Natural England – Welcome policy references to landscape, biodiversity, and cycle and pedestrian linkages. • Support the development which will deliver riverside open space, bus services and cycle links into Trumpington which will benefit residents from Hauxton, Harston and Trumpington. • Support subject to adequate de-contamination measures. Objection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency – FRA required at an early stage. Land decontamination must take account of ground water. • Provision should be made for the needs of horse riders in section 1 and in section 2 b, and c. • Development will lead to a huge increase in traffic on the Hauxton Road. The A10 should be diverted around the village. • Harrow Estates PLC - Site boundary should be extended to include the former Waste Water Treatment Works which could be developed for up to 35 family properties without any greater impact on the Green Belt.
Assessment	Outline and reserved matters planning permissions have already been granted for the development of the part of this site to the east of the A10 and which do not require the diversion of the A10. The policy is retained in the plan to provide a context for the development of the site and will remain in the plan until the development is completed.

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>The site of the former water recycling centre and recreation buildings to the west of Hauxton Road are within the Green Belt. They are separate from the current development site by the A10 and recreation land. Proposals for its development which are consistent with the policy set out in paragraph 89 of the NPPF can be considered on an exceptional basis with the land remaining as Green Belt. The NPPF requires development not to have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it than the existing development. Allocating the site for development in the Local Plan would not affect these robust policy tests which make it difficult to forecast what scale and nature of development would be acceptable on site and whether an acceptable scale of development would allow for the remediation of the site. There is no certainty that the site is developable on the basis of current evidence and so it cannot be allocated in the Local Plan for development.</p> <p>The Local Plan addresses flood risk issues at policy CC/9.</p> <p>Provision for horse riders will be addressed in response to representations on Chapter 10 of the Local Plan which deals with sustainable transport infrastructure.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/3 Papworth Everard West Central	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 3 Support: 1 Object: 2
Main Issues	Support Objection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne, Caldecote PCs – The policy should require contributions to be made to the A428/A1198 junction as the scale of development proposed will have an adverse effect on the junction.
Assessment	Disagree that a change to the policy is justified. Planning

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>permission has recently been given for the redevelopment of a significant part of the site subject to the signing of a s106, for 58 dwellings, and open space, and the reuse of the printworks as a brewhouse, bakery, community rooms and 8 live work units. No provision for transport infrastructure was sought by Cambridgeshire County Council although there are other required contributions towards education and open space. The affordable housing contribution was set at 15% after viability assessment of the scheme. Any further development on the policy area is anticipated to be of a smaller scale.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/4 Fen Drayton Former Land Settlement Association Estate	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 3 Support: 3
Main Issues	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency – No soundness concerns on flood risk as development is limited to the existing footprint. • Support the continuation of this policy.
Assessment	A policy carried forward with limited changes from the Site Specific Policies DPD, which has been supported on consultation.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/5 South of the A1307, Linton	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 4 Support: 3 Object: 1
Main Issues	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suffolk County Council – Policy H/5 is designed to improve the safety of this road and is supported. • The A1307 is operating at and above capacity and transport

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>issues along it need to be addressed.</p> <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy serves no useful planning purpose and should be deleted from the plan. Safe access across the A1307 can easily be achieved. A purely affordable home development for 18 affordable homes was permitted in February 2013 on the Old Police Station site.
Assessment	<p>This long established policy seeks to prevent residential development south of the A1307 in the interest of public safety and sustainability. With regard to the Old Police Station, the site was already in residential use with 4 existing homes, and Planning Committee determined that a departure from policy was justified to provide a substantial number of new affordable homes in a village with a very high level of local need.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/6 Residential Moorings	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 2 Support: 2 Object: 0</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambridge City Council – The City Council has allocated adjoining land in Cambridge for the same purpose since 2006, the addition of this land will render the scheme more developable and so have positive impacts on residential and leisure moorings on the river
Assessment	Allocate the site in the Local Plan.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/7 Housing Density

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 1 Object: 7
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support policy. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy is inflexible and too prescriptive and should give more weight to site and design related considerations. Remove the minimum density requirements. • Not consistent with the NPPF which has removed density requirements. • The Taylor Family and Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd - 40 dph is too high for the Bourn Airfield development as there is no market locally for flats. Clause 1b should refer to 30-35dph being acceptable at Bourn Airfield. The site could deliver 3,500 homes at an average density of 33.3 dph. • Use higher densities to reduce the number and area of development sites required.
Assessment	<p>Policy H/7 is flexible and allows for a wide variety of local circumstances to be taken into account. The NPPF at paragraph 58 requires planning policies to aim to ensure the optimal use of sites. Site and design considerations are not excluded which will allow lower densities including at Bourn Airfield. The actual capacity at Bourn Airfield will be arrived at following a design led approach and confirmed in the required AAP. The August 2013 SHLAA technical assessment demonstrates that a capacity of 3,500 homes can be achieved on 40% of the wider AAP area of 282 hectares at a density of between 30 dph and 35 dph. The promoters alternative land budget methodology confirms that densities will be in this vicinity on average across the site as a whole. The site will not need to be developed at an average density of 40 dph.</p> <p>Without density guidelines to inform notional capacities for the site allocations it would be difficult to know if enough land had been allocated in the plan to meet objectively assessed needs.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/8 Housing Mix (paragraphs 7.26, 7.28 and 7.29)

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 30 Support: 3 Object: 27
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamlingay PC - Smaller housing units and lifetime homes are needed to cater for an aging population. • The 30% allocation for larger family houses is appropriate for rural communities. • Agree that specialist accommodation for the elderly should not be subject to the housing mix policy. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC - Plan should define the meaning of local circumstances. • Gt Abington and Little Abington PCs - Greater flexibility required, policy should allow input from local housing need assessments. • Cambridgeshire County Council - For sites providing 100 homes or more a 'demographic change impact assessment' should be required. New policy sought. All market homes should be built to the lifetime homes standard. • Cambourne Parish Council - Include a 20% flexibility allowance. • Homes and Communities Agency – Support the provision of lifetime homes, but delivering 1 in 20 homes as lifetime homes could affect the deliverability and viability of Northstowe. • Gallagher Estates - The percentages of differently sized homes in the policy do not reflect forecast needs. Account should be taken of the higher provision in Cambridge of 1 and 2 bedroom homes. Flexibility is required in respect of the phased development of new settlements. Amend the proportions to accord with SHMA evidence:(At least 12% 1 or 2 bedroom homes, at least 22% 3 bedroom homes, at least 23% 4 or more bedroom homes, with a 10-15% flexibility allowance and unless it can be demonstrated that the local circumstances of the particular settlement or location suggest a different mix would better meet local needs). • Too inflexible and prescriptive. Not justified by the evidence base and changing market conditions over the plan period.

	<p>Ignores site circumstances and location. Amend to remove the percentages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For developments of 9 or fewer homes the policy should state that the mix will take account of local circumstances.
Assessment	<p>The mix of market homes proposed, with the 10% flexibility allowance, provides a match to the changing household structure of the district population, whilst providing an appropriate level of flexibility. The policy allows local circumstances to be taken into account which can include market, site and location considerations. The policy is a response to the situation before a housing mix policy was included in the adopted LDF. Developers wanted to build a very high proportion of large properties of 4 or more bedrooms in this area – more than half of all properties built over many years. This reduced housing choice and exacerbated the challenge of affordability of housing for our residents.</p> <p>The proposed approach was endorsed both through the Issues and Options consultation (25 representations in support, and 5 objections) and the Member workshops (the workshop notes recording the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is a need for more 2 bed properties, including for starter homes and downsizing; ○ Concerns at building small homes especially of type sought by older people downsizing, fewer bedrooms but decent room sizes (could address with space standards); ○ Need for some flexibility to address local needs. Consult the local community; ○ General support for including a policy, and the mix identified in the option (30% 1 or 2 bed, 30% 3 bed, 30% 4 bed), but some views there should be slightly greater flexibility. ○ The policy provides a balanced approach and builds in flexibility. Ultimately, if there are financial viability issues, the Council will take that into account in determining a planning application. <p>The policy also addresses demographic pressures revealed by each Census of a growing elderly population and a growing level of household formation, all leading to a need for more smaller homes.</p> <p>It is appropriate to leave the definition of local circumstances to the judgement of the decision maker.</p> <p>Agree that the policy wording could be clarified with regard to the treatment of sites of 9 homes or fewer.</p> <p>The evidence does not support that all market housing should be lifetime homes, nor that the provision of a limited proportion of lifetime homes would be unviable. Purpose built lifetime homes</p>

	<p>are only marginally more expensive to build than a standard home, and the policy only requires that 5% of homes be built to this standard. There is no evidence that deliverability and viability will be affected. The Government Housing Standards Review Impact Assessment (August 2013) shows that these costs to be just over £1,000 per dwelling (table 19).</p> <p>The plan already requires Health Impact Assessments at policy SC/2. The accompanying SPD can ensure that demographic change impacts over time are addressed.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>To improve clarity, reword the text at section 2 (f) and make it into a new section 3, renumbering the remaining sections:</p> <p>‘3. The mix of market homes to be provided on sites of 9 or fewer homes taking will take account of local circumstances’.</p>

<p>Policy H/9 Affordable Housing</p>	
<p>Proposed Submission Representations Received</p>	<p>Total: 24 Support: 8 Object: 16</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamlingay PC - Will deliver balanced communities • Fowlmere, Caldecote PCs – Support • Madingley PC – Support, local need in the Parish • A threshold of 3 dwellings is much better. • Avoids creation of them and us ‘ghettos’. • Support this approach and the flexibility it provides in respect of viability. Accords with the NPPF. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamlingay PC - Provision must be on-site. Financial contributions should be ‘ring-fenced’ to that community • Bourn PC – Allows off site provision and should include a definition of the term ‘local circumstances’. Not clear on how Parish Councils can get involved. • Cambourne PC – Would support a threshold of 5 homes. • Threshold should be set higher (at between 5 and 10 homes).

	<p>If set at 5 homes, 2 on site affordable homes could be achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homes and Communities Agency – Support H/9, but to ensure clarity the status of the Affordable Housing SPD must be clarified. • The viability of this policy has not been demonstrated, there is a lack of clarity about how small sites will be treated where exactly 40% provision cannot be made on site. • Home Builders Federation - The evidence does not support a 40% affordable housing rate across the District taking account of CIL and the impact of other plan policies on viability. • Section f) should be deleted as it contradicts sections d) and e).
Assessment	<p>Policy towards the provision of affordable housing is largely based upon an existing policy which has been tested through examination.</p> <p>The policy already prioritises on-site affordable housing provision. It would be unreasonable and not consistent with the NPPF to seek to prevent it completely. It is appropriate to leave the definition of local circumstances to the judgement of the decision maker.</p> <p>A higher threshold would tend to reduce affordable housing provision across the district.</p> <p>The evidence shows that the policy is viable in most locations across the district and the 40% rate has been successfully implemented since 2007. Land values are variable and the most appropriate way to reflect this variability is to allow flexibility in the policy rather than to try to reflect this complexity by different affordable rates across the district.</p> <p>Disagree that the policy wording is unclear with regard to small sites or to the meaning of section f); regarding the later any financial contribution to off-site provision would be the equivalent to what would have been viable on site.</p> <p>The policy refers to preparation of a new affordable housing SPD to provide detailed guidance on its implementation.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy H/10 Rural Exception Site Affordable Housing (paragraphs 7.36, 7.39)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 25 Support: 5 Object: 20
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamlingay PC – Where there are no other sites available within the village envelope to meet local needs. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamlingay PC – Allowing some market housing will inflate the hope value of land for landowners. There is no mention of a role for Parish Councils. • Bourn PC – Support the policy generally, but object to the lack of clarity about Parish Council involvement regarding identification of local needs, siting, phasing and the level of market housing. • Great Abington PC – Support policy but exception schemes should not be the only way to get more housing in Group Villages like the Abingtons. • Little Abington PC – More flexibility required in definition of exception sites to allow the housing to meet local needs including for market housing. • Cambourne and Caldecote PC's – Policy should require that the affordable homes are not isolated or disenfranchised from the existing settlement. • Exemption housing schemes in the Green Belt should be limited to no more than 5 dwellings. • Delete section 2. Replace section 2f) with: 'Including an appropriate mix of market housing to make the scheme viable to meet the needs of the Parish Councils and still remain an exception site'. • Not consistent with the NPPF, a more positive and flexible approach to the inclusion of market housing is required particularly to allow exemptions for Community Land Trusts. • There is a need for more market housing in the Abingtons to meet local needs and allow downsizing.
Assessment	Regarding the terms of the objections, the policy is considered to be consistent with the NPPF; and sufficiently flexible to allow full consideration to be given to the views of Parish Councils. It seeks

	<p>to enable the future provision of rural affordable housing in circumstances where public subsidy may not be available including where the developer is a Community Land Trust. It is not intended to provide a means whereby villages can bring forward predominantly market housing schemes.</p> <p>The policy already takes into account whether the scale and location of the site is appropriate in terms of the size of the village and its facilities and character.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/11 Residential Space Standards for Market Housing (Figure 10: Residential Space Standards)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 16 Support: 0 Object: 16
Main Issues	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamlingay PC – Ensure smaller accommodation meets Lifetime Homes standards. • The policy is unduly prescriptive and inflexible and not consistent with the NPPF. It fails to allow for the implications of individual sites to be taken into account. Space in the home should be left to the market. • We should use the same standards as are proposed in Cambridge. • No adequate evidence base or viability testing. It will increase house prices. It ignores the fact that market homes are often under-occupied and that purchasers are satisfied with their new homes. • The standards are different from those in the Government’s Housing Standards Review which includes a proposed national minimum standard. They should be amended to be consistent with the minimum level 1 standards in Table A1-A3 of the review. • Remove the restriction on the area of a study. • The Council has used the upper end of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) standards for affordable homes, but to establish a minimum acceptable standard it should have

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>used the lower end room sizes from the HCA range.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed standards are too small and will not increase the size of homes.
Assessment	<p>The residential space standards proposed are intended as a safety net to prevent home sizes continuing to decline over the plan period. The NPPF at paragraph 50 requires the planning system to deliver high quality homes that meet the needs of different groups in the community such as families with children, and older people. Being derived from functional studies of space needs in the home, undertaken by the Homes and Communities Agency, this is what the standards in policy H/11 seek to achieve.</p> <p>If a system of national minimum homes size standards were to be introduced they would supersede those in the Local Plan (a Government review of Housing Standards was published in August 2013). It can be noted that the minimum level 1 standard home sizes in the Housing Standards consultation are provide marginally more space than the residential space standards proposed in the Local Plan in almost all cases. This is consistent with their being based upon functional studies of space needs in the home.</p> <p>Furthermore the Impact Assessment which accompanies the Housing Standards Review notes at table 43 that typical market house sizes in England are larger than those proposed in the level 1 standard in almost all cases. It follows that concerns regarding the impact of the Local Plan standards in policy H/11 on construction costs, house prices, affordability are unproven.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/12 Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 3 Support: 3 Object: 0
Main Issues	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourn PC – This will help protect local character. Great Abington PC – Welcome policy which will help address

	<p>planning issues in the Abington Land Settlement Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The equivalent policy in previous plans was unduly restrictive.
Assessment	<p>Previous plan policy has been unduly restrictive. The proposed policy lifts unnecessary restrictions and has received public support.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>No change.</p>

<p>Policy H/13 Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside</p>	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 5 Support: 1 Object: 4</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Great Abington PC – Welcome policy which will help address planning issues in the Abington Land Settlement Area. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourn PC – Generally support but seek a 15% maximum increase limit to any extension put back in the policy to protect local character and the availability of smaller homes. Cambourne, Caldecote PCs – Limit extensions to no more than 15% of original dwelling.
Assessment	<p>Previous plan policy was unduly restrictive for very small houses and made updating them to modern living standards very difficult. This has been an issue across the district but particularly in the Abington Land Settlement Area. It could also have prevented the re-use of large housing plots for high quality executive homes and for small and medium plots for self-build housing.</p> <p>Inclusion of a percentage limitation would be unduly restrictive and contrary to the NPPF. The Local Plan includes policies to control harmful developments.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>No change.</p>

<p>Policy H/14 Countryside Dwellings of Exceptional Quality</p>
--

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 5 Support: 0 Object: 5
Main Issues	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Would be divisive and allow wealthy applicants to bypass normal planning controls. • The policy criteria are subjective. Replace ‘truly outstanding and innovative’ with ‘consistent with local building materials and historical and landscape context’. • Support the principle but disagree that such dwellings should be excluded from the Green Belt (GB). The GB surrounds Cambridge where entrepreneurs may live and work. Existing policy can allow rural worker dwellings and rural exception site affordable housing in the GB. Development could improve damaged and derelict GB land. • Lack of evidence that it would help to satisfy a demand from top executives.
Assessment	<p>Permitting such homes in the Green Belt would be contrary to the essential characteristics of the Green Belt which are permanence and openness. Countryside dwellings of exception quality cannot reasonably be compared to village exception sites for affordable housing as these would form part of an existing village, or to rural worker dwellings as these are usually located close to existing buildings.</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that the development of a limited number of such homes would be socially divisive.</p> <p>There is some evidence of a shortage of executive homes as set out in the Economic Development Strategy.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/15 Development of Residential Gardens	
Proposed Submission Representations	Total: 3 Support: 3 Object: 0

Received	
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over development of gardens can adversely affect the character and environment of historic areas of South Cambs. • Natural England – Welcome reference in the policy to biodiversity and trees.
Assessment	Policy supported. Include in the Local Plan.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/16 Reuse of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 6 Support: 0 Object: 6
Main Issues	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Support the policy, but it should actively promote the use of the Community Asset Register to protect employment buildings from conversion to residential. • Contrary to paragraph 55 of the NPPF which removed the ‘employment use first’ sequential test. • Bullet point 2 of paragraph 55 of the NPPF allows for the conversion of redundant countryside buildings for residential where this would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be enabling development to secure the future of the heritage asset. The policy fails to include these provisions and should be amended to do so. • Policies H/16 and H/13 are inconsistent. H/16 allows the reuse of redundant or disused buildings in the countryside for residential whilst H/13 requires demonstration that residential use has not been abandoned.
Assessment	<p>The NPPF does not prevent the Local Plan seeking to give some priority to employment uses before residential. This is consistent with the emphasis given to economic growth in the NPPF and in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council keeps a ‘List of Assets of Community Value’ as required under the Localism Act 2011 and this is referred to in paragraph 9.3. A modification is proposed to add to the supporting text to highlight those local facilities valued by the local community can be added to this list.</p>

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>There is no inconsistency between the approach in H/13 towards replacement dwellings in the countryside and that in H/16 towards the reuse of buildings in the countryside for residential. The first relates to replacement dwellings and the other to the reuse of buildings.</p> <p>The Local Plan addresses the non heritage provisions of paragraph 55 of the NPPF in policies H14, H/16, and H/18. Heritage provisions are addressed by policy NH/14: Heritage Assets. This states that ‘development proposals will be supported when they sustain and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their settings’. A wide ranging schedule of such assets is then listed in the policy including listed buildings.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend paragraph 9.9 to read: Village services and facilities in South Cambridgeshire perform a vital function in rural communities, particularly for the less mobile. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that plans should guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs. <u>The local community can highlight the facilities it values within its parish by applying for them to be included on the register of Community Assets held by the Council.</u></p>

Policy H/17 Working at Home	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 4 Support: 4
Main Issues	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to safeguard residential amenity and the character of the locality.
Assessment	Policy supported. Include in the Local Plan.
Approach in Submission	No change

Local Plan	
-------------------	--

Policy H/18 Dwellings to Support a Rural-based Enterprise	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 1 Object: 1
Main Issues	Objection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the principle of policy H/18 but object to the wording of section 4 k). The required marketing exercise would contravene the Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 or the Misleading Marketing Regulations 2008.
Assessment	The use of marketing exercises is a long established planning procedure used widely across the Country and in South Cambridgeshire. Disagree that there is any contravention of consumer or business protection legislation.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change.

Policy H/19 Provision for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (table of needs, paragraphs 7.61, 7.62 and 7.65)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 17 Support: 1 Object: 16
Main Issues	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Essential that need is expressed as a minimum figure. Objection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cottenham PC – Section 1 of the policy should say that provision has been made, rather than will be made. Section 2 of the policy should either be deleted as contrary to Government policy for Travellers Sites, or amended to be clear that it applies to both private and public sites. Paragraph 7.62 should explain why sites in Meldreth and Willingham have been excluded. Paragraph 7.65 should name the relevant major developments. Distribution of need should be front loaded and thereafter less prescriptive. Unrealistic to assume there will be periods when

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>there will be no need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy should offer greater flexibility and choice of location, size and tenure of sites. There are suitable alternatives to Chesterton Fen. • Land suitable for the development of affordable homes should not be used to accommodate travellers as proper homes provide a healthier lifestyle. • The GTANA needs assessment is not robust failing to take account of overcrowding, household growth, unauthorised sites and waiting lists, and so cannot be relied on. A new needs assessment for Cambridgeshire is needed which engages with the Traveller communities. This will show a substantial need for which the plan should allocate sites and broad locations including sites in rural locations and on village edges.
Assessment	<p>The target included in the policy reflects the need identified for the district by the Cambridge Sub Region Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 as required by national 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites'.</p> <p>The Cambridge Sub Region Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment 2011 was commissioned by a partnership of nine local authorities, in Cambridgeshire and parts of Norfolk and Suffolk. The methodology was established following consideration of a range of factors and advice including that from Traveller Liaison Officers. The study was carried out as a requirement of the 2004 Housing Act. It used the CLG Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment Guidance 2007 and what was in 2011 the DCLG consultation paper Planning for Traveller Sites in arriving at what was considered to be the most appropriate methodology. As recommended in Government Guidance on completing Needs Assessments the process involved in conducting the assessment has been transparent, with clearly documented evidence included in the study of assumptions made, and decisions taken.</p> <p>The Needs Assessment utilised data gathered in recent surveys as well as statistical and other sources of information. It used information from existing local primary and secondary sources, including the number of young people of family forming age, and unauthorized caravans recorded in the caravan counts. The assessment built on research carried out in 2006 for the previous assessment. The previous survey was comprehensive and provided considerable information which has either not changed</p>

	<p>significantly, or any change can be measured without repeating the survey.</p> <p>Future need from population growth fluctuates reflecting the population data. The study notes that beyond the immediate need, assessments of growth are based on modelling using locally gathered evidence. The difficulties in projecting forward beyond 10 years are noted in national guidance regarding carrying out needs assessments. However, for plan making purposes we need to plan ahead at least 15 years from adoption of the plan. There will be a need to monitor the plan and review it as necessary to take account of more up to date evidence, including updated needs assessments.</p> <p>As well as identifying a target for provision, the policy also safeguards existing sites, to ensure that the levels of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation are maintained, sites are safeguarded to meet the continuing housing needs of these communities. Former sites at Willingham and Meldreth were excluded because the use had been discontinued. It applies to all permanent sites, public or private, and is a sound element of the policy.</p> <p>A minor change is proposed, in order to update the information regarding number of pitches delivered through windfalls.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor modification</p> <p>Amend paragraph 7.61 to read, ‘Government policy requires Councils to maintain a five year land supply of Travellers sites, in a similar way to housing, and identify deliverable sites to meet the needs to meet identified for the first five years. Between January 2011 and May 2013 <u>January 2014</u>, the Council had granted or resolved to grant planning permission for 72 <u>79</u> pitches. In addition, a site at Chesterton Fen Road for 26 pitches, on land identified for Gypsy and Traveller pitches in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004, <u>had been recently completed</u> is under construction at time of writing, with a number of pitches now occupied. Therefore sufficient sites have come forward through windfall planning applications to meet the identified need. The Plan does not propose any further allocations.’</p>

Policy H/20 Gypsy and Traveller Provision at New Communities (paragraphs 7.66,

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

7.67, 7.68, 7.69)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 23 Support: 5 Object: 18
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenham PC – Support the wording of policy section 2, a) and b). Support the wording in paragraph 7.68 as consistent with section 2 of policy H/20. • Support in principle, but it is unclear how it will be achieved and whether the sites will be affordable, suitable and accessible. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne PC – Policy is unclear as to which developments would be affected. How would it affect Northstowe and Cambourne? • Cottenham PC - Policy is ambiguously worded and should be amended for clarity and to avoid creating an escape clause for reluctant developers. The final sentence of paragraph 7.66 should be given more emphasis. Paragraph 7.67 should specify phasing requirements to avoid provision only in later phases. The reference to policy H/20 providing a criteria based approach to site identification is incorrect. Disagree with the proposed site guidelines in paragraph 7.69, allowance should be made for the growth of extended families. • Caldecote PC – The policy is unclear and so unsound. Does it include Bourn Airfield and a new town at Waterbeach? • No examples exist of the implementation of such a policy. It prescribes to Gypsy and Traveller communities where they should live, whereas sites should be provided where such communities want to live. The wishes of the landowner must be taken into account to demonstrate that such sites are deliverable. • All such developments should include G&T sites, like affordable housing. • The policy is too vague and uncertain. • Provision should be made for 2-5 pitch family sites.
Assessment	Major development sites can provide opportunities for the delivery of sites. The issue was explored through earlier stages of plan making. These locations could provide access to services and facilities, and add to choice of locations, and provide a mechanism

	<p>to assist delivery.</p> <p>The policy does not identify specific major developments. This would allow provision to be tailored by need, and be negotiated to reflect specific opportunities.</p> <p>The policy does not restrict sites specifically to later phases of major developments, but availability of services and facilities has been raised as an important issue through consultation, so the plan establishes that this would need to be addressed when planning a site. The support text also provides guidance on the size of site, also reflecting best practice guidance and issues raised during consultation.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy H/21 Proposals for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Sites on Unallocated Land Outside Development Frameworks (paragraphs 7.70 to 7.77)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 43 Support: 10 Object: 33
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamlingay PC – Support the policy taking into account cumulative impacts and proximity to facilities and services. • Cottenham PC – Support criteria a). Support paragraphs 7.72 and 7.73. • Natural England – Welcome policy reference to assessing impacts on biodiversity and trees. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenham PC – The site size guideline of 5-10 pitches in major developments (policy H/20) must also apply to policy H/21. Existing sites must also be capped at the officially approved number and no further growth in pitch numbers allowed. The policy criteria fail to reference activities which may/may not be conducted from sites. Policy criteria b) is unrealistic regarding location, access to services. A definition of what ‘dominating’ means should be given in context of section 2 f). A definition of ‘nearest settled community’ is needed. Similarly the enforceability of 2 g) and 2 h), cannot be understood without greater exemplification of what would be

South Cambridgeshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Consultation
Key Issues and Assessment

	<p>unacceptably adverse impacts. Criteria i), should cover noise and disturbance issues from on-site business activities. The policy and supporting paragraphs should also apply to existing sites and not just to new sites. If an existing site falls vacant and does not meet the standards it should be denied further occupancy. Definition of nuisance required in paragraph 7.77.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria a) is contrary to paragraph 22 (d) of Planning Policy for Travellers Sites, which does not require a need to be identified. • Policy H/21 is too complicated and creates unnecessary obstacles to development.
Assessment	<p>The policy provides a framework for considering applications for windfall sites. It provides certainty by being clear on the issues the Council will consider when determining applications.</p> <p>A policy is needed to ensure sites are appropriate to the location. Due to the significant existing level of provision in the district, it is reasonable for applications to demonstrate a need for provision in the countryside. National guidance advises that the availability of alternative accommodation is a material consideration.</p> <p>A number of issues addressed in the policy are matters of fact and degree for consideration through an application, and it would not be reasonable to set a specific threshold or figure. For example judgement about the significance of an impact is a typical issue for planning application decisions. Some of these criteria specifically reflect national planning guidance.</p> <p>It would not be reasonable to set a specific cap on sites of existing sites, but issues of scale are relevant, and are addressed by the policy. The policy would apply for proposals to extend existing sites as well as for new sites. The policy addresses relevant planning issues for the consideration of applications, and a number of representations raise issues related to planning enforcement, which are not for the plan.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy H/22 Design of Gypsy and Traveller Sites, and Travelling Showpeople Sites (paragraphs 7.78.7.86, 7.87)

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 12 Support: 1 Object: 11
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Welcome reference to space for play on sites of 10 or more pitches. <p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Space for play should be required on all sites. • Cottenham PC – Criteria i) on play is at odds with the 5-10 pitch guideline from paragraph 7.69. Paragraph 7.86 should also refer to space for grazing and exercising horses. A criteria is needed concerning the keeping and control of dogs. The policy should include provision to help control litter and the abuse of verges. • The 2008 Good Practice Guidance should not be used in isolation to decide whether a private application is permitted. Para 1.13 of the guide makes clear it was not intended for private sites. • This policy is too complicated and creates unnecessary obstacles to necessary Gypsy and Traveller development.
Assessment	<p>It is important that sites are developed to an appropriate quality, to ensure they provide an appropriate living environment for their occupiers, and that they address design issues that would be expected of other forms of development.</p> <p>The policy offers flexibility in that regard should be had to the national design guidance, not that it must be followed rigidly. Whilst open space may be a consideration in the design of sites, specific play provision is required for larger sites. The policy appropriately addresses waste management, which would be a consideration for all types of residential development. Space for grazing horses is not a requirement for a site to be suitable, as is space for dogs.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Chapter 8: Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Paragraphs 8.1 to 8.11 Introductory Paragraphs	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 0 Object: 8
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 8.4 indicates that growth in the R&D sector will be slower than in the past and other sectors will account for a higher proportion of growth. Evidence suggests that this will not be the case. The Cambridge area has a truly exceptional level of R&D employment, more than any other district. • Insufficient land allocated in the right locations to accommodate the level of required employment need and support the economy. The employment land proposed for allocation is either not available, not suitable or will be subject to deliverability issues. Provision for B use class employment, particularly B1(b) R&D uses in Cambridge is location sensitive. Employers want to be located in, or on the edge of Cambridge. An additional 112,700 sq m of employment floor space on 31 ha of land is needed. This represents an additional 2,700 jobs. • Objection proposes a science park at Cambridge South that would meet the forecast employment land requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ in the most sustainable location that is accessible by public transport in a location attractive to occupiers and investors. ○ Promote and facilitate the expansion of Cambridge's world class knowledge and high technology cluster in Cambridge. ○ Provide competition between providers and choice for occupiers, as the lack of planned provision is acting as a barrier to business growth. ○ Provide a strategic site for inward investment.
Assessment	<p>The Local Plan has responded to the National Planning Policy Framework by proactively encouraging sustainable economic growth. It identifies a range of strategic sites for development, as well as policy criteria for considering other sites. It plans to support the continued success of the high technology clusters, by ensuring sufficient sites are available but also providing additional flexibility to support their evolving needs.</p> <p>The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan is planning for 22,000 jobs, reflecting objectively assessed needs identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The Council's Employment</p>

	<p>Land Review (commissioned Jointly with Cambridge City Council) considered the land required to support this level of growth, including the employment sectors likely to grow, and the types and locations of land they would need. It estimated that this would need around 43 hectares, or 143,000m² to deliver the jobs in business land uses in South Cambridgeshire, and this has been reflected in paragraph 2.36 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan.</p> <p>A number of forecasting models were used during the preparation of the plan, and the figure in 2.36 was based on the Local Economy Forecasting Model, by Cambridge Econometrics (LEFM). LEFM provides a robust model for predicting economic growth, and is used by many authorities across the country. The SHMA took the sensible approach of reviewing a number of forecasting models before determining the appropriate level of growth, recognising their limitations. It also considered the East of England Forecasting Model, by Oxford Economics (EEFM), which anticipates a similar level of jobs growth to the LEFM for South Cambridgeshire, but had differing results for Cambridge.</p> <p>The two models provide their forecasts using a different set of employment sectors, therefore direct comparison is not straight forward, but as the EEFM anticipated growth used in the SHMA was so different for Cambridge, an update to the Employment Land Review was prepared to reconsider the results for the City. The comparison identified higher growth in offices and R&D sectors, but greater losses in industry. This information was then used in the Cambridge Local Plan.</p> <p>If the assumptions in the update for Cambridge were applied to South Cambridgeshire, this would increase the need from 43 hectares to 56 hectares of employment land. It would show a higher proportion of new jobs in research and development, and less in offices, with greater loss of industry. However, a change to reflect the EEFM for consistency with Cambridge is not considered necessary. It would not require a change of strategy, policy approach or additional land allocations.</p> <p>As well as raising the issue with the forecasts, one objector identifies a range of issues with the Employment Land Review which they consider would increase the land supply requirement. However, their approach to maximise the apparent need is not justified.</p>
--	--

	<p>The Local Plan identifies a comfortable supply of employment land, meaning that supply still exceeds the forecast need. The employment land position has been updated in the latest Annual Monitoring Report. There is now around 95 hectares of employment land with planning permission in the district. In addition, allocations brought forward through the adopted Local Development Framework such as Northstowe, will deliver new employment during the plan period.</p> <p>The South Cambridgeshire Proposed Submission Local Plan identifies further new employment provision. On the edge of Cambridge, the Local Plan identifies Cambridge Northern Fringe East and an allocation at Fulbourn Road, as well as supporting the development of additional capacity at Cambridge Science Park. Outside Cambridge there will be additional capacity through new developments at Waterbeach New Town and Bourn Airfield new village.</p> <p>The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans describe a good supply and range of employment sites, with new sites in and on the edge of Cambridge, new development opportunities at planned new settlements, completion of existing rural business parks and at the biotechnology parks south of Cambridge. Together these provide opportunities which exceed alternative supply requirements indicted by objectors. The types of site available reflect the need identified, with the local plans identifying some old industrial sites for redevelopment, whilst proposing new land for offices and research and development.</p> <p>The Councils have responded appropriately to issues identified in the Joint Employment Land Review. In particular need in and on the edge of Cambridge where there is particularly high demand at the moment. A joint Area Action Plan is proposed for Cambridge Northern Fringe East, to bring forward a significant employment led development opportunity around the new Science Park Station. There are significant parcels of land in both districts. Development of this site is progressing, with the planning application recently being granted for the station, with completion anticipated in 2016. Additional opportunities are identified at Cambridge Station Area West, the Cambridge Science Park, and new allocations near the Peterhouse Technology Park. These are in addition to developments at North West Cambridge, West Cambridge, and the Addenbrookes Biomedical Campus.</p> <p>Whilst some sites are restricted to specific types of user, such as the Biomedical campus or Northwest Cambridge, they will still</p>
--	---

	<p>deliver significant numbers of jobs in the types of uses that need a Cambridge location. Other sites, such as Cambridge Northern Fringe East, Station Road, and the Land near Peterhouse, are not restricted.</p> <p>The Local Plans seek to protect existing stock and support the modernisation of sites to meet future employment needs. They provide a flexible framework for bring forward new sites and adapting existing ones.</p> <p>A range of policies in adopted plans and the Proposed Submission Local Plan support employment development, on established employment sites, in settlements, and the expansion of rural businesses where appropriate. They will continue to deliver windfall development.</p> <p>There is no evidence of need to justify a significant development in the Green Belt proposed by objectors at Cambridge South, which was tested through the plan making process and demonstrated to have a significant negative impact on the Green Belt. The Local Plans have to balance a range of factors, and the strategy selected is the most appropriate one for the area.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/1: New Employment Provision near Cambridge - Cambridge Science Park (and paragraphs 8.12 to 8.14)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 9 Support: 2 Object: 7
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trinity College Cambridge is pleased to note that the Local Plan identifies the importance of the Cambridge Science Park to assist in delivering employment growth through densification. There are already a number of examples of plots on the park that have been successfully reconfigured. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cambourne Parish Council / Caldecote Parish Council - Encourages commuting rather than encouraging extra

	<p>employment growth at the major development sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Masterplan should also be produced to show how the density of the existing Science Park could be increased. Car parking should be addressed as it is a waste of valuable land.
Assessment	<p>The increased accessibility provided by the guided bus and the new railway station means that higher employment densities are suitable and capable of being achieved, particularly as some of the building stock comprises dated single storey buildings. The policy has been supported by the landowner, and forms a sound part of the plan.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/2: Fulbourn Road East (Fulbourn) (and paragraph 8.15 to 8.16)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 36 Support: 6 Object: 30</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council - Support the allocation of this site. Provides scope for on-going employment development at Peterhouse Technology Park. • English Heritage - welcome the consideration in part 2 of the setting of new development into the landscape in this location. • Natural England - welcome specific reference to landscape, biodiversity and GI requirements for relevant developments • Support if policy requirements are fully applied. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn Parish Council – Parish Plan opposed to changes to Green Belt in village. Contrary to proposed policies S/2, S/4, NH/2, NH/3 and NH/13. • The land immediately adjoining Peterhouse Technology Park, in the Parish of Fulbourn, is in the ownership of a charity which has no intention to dispose of this land. Request it is removed from plan. Important to character of Fulbourn and the Green Belt. • Impact on the Green Belt, highly visible from the south east, and will merge Cambridge towards Fulbourn. • Exceptional circumstances required for development in the Green Belt have not been demonstrated. There are other sites available for employment in Cambridge, and on Capital Park.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The December 2012 Inner Green Belt Appraisal assessing the importance of the Green Belt in this location is flawed and contains errors and inconsistencies. • There may be insufficient planning control to ensure that these sites are released for employment purposes that support the Cambridge Cluster. Should be restricted to firms that have a need. • Fulbourn Road already busy at peak times. Need improved safety measures for pedestrians and cyclists. • Should retain land south of roundabout in case there is a future proposal for southern relief road. • Loss of agricultural land.
Assessment	<p>The Green Belt Boundary Review 2012 indicates that the land is capable of development without significant harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. It is therefore removed from the Green Belt. The Local Plan's approach is sound.</p> <p>The Joint Employment Land Review indicated a need for additional employment land in and on the edge of Cambridge. It therefore provides an opportunity to help address these employment needs, although the soundness of the plan is not reliant on this site. Whilst the landowner has no current intention to dispose of the land, this could change during the plan period and it remains a good site for employment development as an extension to the Peterhouse Technology Park.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/3: Allocations for Class B1 Employment Uses and Policy E/4: Allocations for Class B1, B2 and B8 Employment Uses (and paragraph 8.17)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 6 Support: 4 Object: 2
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Waste Water infrastructure available to serve the sites (all four sites) • Environment Agency – raised concern regarding location, but subsequently updated comments that issues are capable of mitigation at the planning application stage.

	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional Site: Sawston – Spicers Estate. Business led development on the existing Spicers employment site, supported by residential enabling development on a site north of Whitefield Way. .
Assessment	<p>The Spicers Site at Sawston is identified as an Established Employment Area in the Countryside on the policies map, which already provides flexibility for future employment development of the site, and is the appropriate designation for the site.</p> <p>The proposal for residential development north of White Field Way was considered as a site option through the Issues and Options process, but rejected as there were other more suitable options available for residential development. This green belt site has a number of constraints, including landscape impact and access. The proposal to make it enabling development for the wider Spicers site is not justified.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/5: Papworth Hospital (and paragraphs 8.18 to 8.22)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 12 Support: 3 Object: 9
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Papworth Everard Parish Council - very important that the housing and employment balance of the village is maintained. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust - Having a framework for redevelopment is helpful, but policy is not coherent. Suggest the following changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition of healthcare imprecise – should be ‘hospitals, nursing homes, residential care homes, clinics and health centres’. Reference to ‘other’ employment uses not compatible with definition of healthcare above. Requirement for 2 year marketing unreasonable as would have to start before policy adopted. Requirement to ‘maintain’ the viability of Papworth Everard is unreasonable.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requirement to ‘Maintain the present setting of Papworth Hall’ should be to sustain and enhance the setting. Reference to the Conservation area in the policy is superfluous. ○ Should be greater flexibility for residential as part of a mixed use scheme.
Assessment	<p>This policy has been carried forward from the adopted Site Specific Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The policy principles have also been tested again through the Issues and Options process for the new Local Plan.</p> <p>The policy focuses on maintaining employment uses on the site, and in particular healthcare, reflecting the current job profile. This is important for making the most of existing assets, and maintaining the viability of the village. Changes to make the policy more flexible for residential development are therefore not supported. The marketing requirement is included in the adopted plan, and remains reasonable.</p> <p>Minor changes to the policy are proposed in response to representations, acknowledging the potential to enhance setting of the Hall, and correcting the name of a building referenced in the supporting text.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend Policy E/5 paragraph 3c to read: ‘Maintain and enhance the present setting of Papworth Hall’</p> <p>Amend Para 8.19 to read: ‘The buildings identified include the Bernhard Baron Hospital Building and Princess Hospital Building (both are examples of hospital buildings designed specifically for tuberculosis patients with design features to ensure access to sunlight and fresh air) and the Sims Woodhead Memorial Laboratory Building (Lakeside Lodge).’</p>

Policy E/6: Imperial War Museum at Duxford (and paragraphs 8.23 to 8.24)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 2 Object: 6
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ickleton Society - IWM Duxford is a major asset of

	<p>significant importance to our district.</p> <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IWM Duxford - pleased to note and give support to the proposal for a more flexible and appropriate policy for IWM Duxford, but suggest paragraph 8.24 is included in the main policy. • English Heritage – Reference to a ‘special case’ should be clarified. The significance of the site should be weighed appropriately in considering any proposals for development. Should include reference in policy to address their protection.
Assessment	<p>Paragraph 8.24 provides a context for the special case applied to the museum by the policy due to its national significance. It highlights that it is a sensitive site on the edge of the Cambridge Green Belt. It is reasonable to provide this context in the supporting text rather than the policy, but it is agreed that reference to the national importance should be added to the policy.</p> <p>The museum is in a Conservation Area and includes a significant number of Listed Buildings. The impact of proposals on these heritage assets would need to be considered, in accordance with Policy NH/14. However, it is acknowledged that this important heritage role could be highlighted in the plan.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend Policy E/6 paragraph 1 to read: ‘The Imperial War Museum site at Duxford Airfield <u>is of national significance, and</u> will be treated as a special case as a museum which is a major tourist / visitor attraction, educational and commercial facility.’</p> <p>Amend Policy E/6 paragraph 2 to read: ‘Proposals will be considered with regard to the particular needs and opportunities of the site and any proposals involving the use of the estate and its facilities for museum uses or non-museum uses must be <u>complementary</u> complimentary to the character, vitality and sustainability of the site as a branch of the Imperial War Museum.’</p> <p>Amend first sentence of paragraph 8.23 to read: ‘The Imperial War Museum Duxford (<u>IWM Duxford</u> IWM D) is an integral element of the multi branch Imperial War Museums and is a major tourist / visitor attraction, educational and commercial facility based on a long established airfield.’</p> <p>Add additional text after 5th sentence of 8.23 as follows:</p>

	<p><u>'Duxford is regarded as the finest and best-preserved example of a fighter base representative of the period up to 1945 in Britain, with an exceptionally complete group of First World War technical buildings in addition to technical and domestic buildings typical of both inter-war Expansion Periods of the RAF. It also has important associations with the Battle of Britain and the American fighter support for the Eighth Air Force. Development proposals will need to consider the impact on this important heritage asset, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy NH/14.'</u></p>
--	---

Policy E/7: Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospitals (and paragraphs 8.25 to 8.36)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 5 Support: 1 Object: 4
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England - welcome specific reference to landscape, biodiversity and GI requirements. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn Parish Council - should make specific cross-reference to proposed policy NH/9 in particular to maintaining existing height and openness in any redevelopment. • Risk of merging Fulbourn with Cherry Hinton. Expand the green wedge further east.
Assessment	<p>The policy approach reflects the adopted Site Specific Policies DPD, which was tested at examination, and has been considered again through the Issues and Options process or the new Local Plan. The redevelopment of the Ida Darwin site and the creation of a green wedge will add the openness of the Green Belt. The exact width will need to be determined through the development brief, and it would not be appropriate for the plan to include a specific scale. The plan avoids general cross referencing to potentially relevant policies, as it should be read as a whole.</p> <p>As the policy is focused on enabling residential development, a minor change is proposed to relocate it to the housing chapter of the plan.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Move policy E/7 and supporting text (8.25 to 8.36) to Chapter 7 (Delivering High Quality Homes), and place after paragraph 7.13.</p>

--	--

Policy E/8: Mixed-Use Development in Histon & Impington Station Area (and paragraphs 8.37 to 8.43)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 18 Support: 13 Object: 5
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Histon and Impington Parish Council - Significant support from majority of residents. Mixed use has been misinterpreted by some, and vision offers greater flexibility. Evidence that guided bus has increased footfall in the area. • Worthwhile, as long as it is led by the local Parish Council for villagers and to attract visitors passing through from Cambridge and St Ives. • Has potential to benefit area, but must not impact on retail in High Street. • Need firm decision making to implement vision for mixed use. • Regarding a supplementary Planning Document, Consultation will need to be undertaken with property owners to ensure their future plans are addressed. Need flexibility rather than fixed use allocations. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal not subjected to full and proper evaluation before being promoted. No clear support from land owners. No impact assessment on village centre. No evidence of additional need for retail uses. Not appropriate to indicate the area as a destination. Too restrictive. Local Plan should not been seen as an alternative to a Neighbourhood Plan. • Welcome the intent, but needs to explain costs / viability, and how future benefits will be accrued if existing businesses are to review their accommodation. Less pre-occupation with small specialist shops and leisure outlets as they could not be viable. • Needs to be flexible and not prejudice existing businesses. • Reality is that redevelopment will need to be led by residential development and the proposed allocation fails to recognise the desirable benefits of this highly sustainable location for residential development or the impact on the remainder of the village of a second retail centre. There is not support from the principle landowners and there has been no discussion with the key stakeholders.

Assessment	<p>This policy is a Parish led proposal, reflecting the community led approach to the local plan. It was initiated by the Parish Council, and was supported by the majority of respondents to the proposal at the issues and options consultation. National Planning Practice Guidance highlights that Communities may decide that they could achieve the outcomes they want to see through planning routes outside a neighbourhood plan, such as incorporating their proposals for the neighbourhood into the Local Plan. Although explained in the audit trail and through the issues and options process, a reference to this in the supporting text would help clarify the origin of the policy.</p> <p>The policy seeks to achieve mixed use development at this new transport interchange. It provides a high degree of flexibility, so that proposals can be tailored to the circumstances of individual sites. Due to this flexibility it is challenging to provide specific viability assessment in advance of individual planning applications.</p> <p>The policy does not seek that the station area challenges the village centre as a destination, and given the scale of land in this area, it is difficult to see how creation of mixed use development in this area would significantly impact on viability of the village centre. It seeks to ensure this area retains a mixed use character which benefits the village.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Add additional paragraph before 8.37: <u>'This policy is a Parish Council led proposal, reflecting the community led approach to the local plan, enabling it to address local issues without the need for a neighbourhood plan. It was subject to consultation during plan making and received clear support.'</u></p>

Policy E/9: Promotion of Clusters (and paragraphs 8.44 to 8.48)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 11 Support: 5 Object: 6</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimous agreement by all the businesses consulted on the Cambridge PPF 2030 Vision that location in clusters with like-minded companies was essential for their success. • The concentration (in the form of a mini-cluster) of businesses

	<p>at Granta Park/TWI has itself brought significant benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy will proactively drive and support the sustainable economic development of existing business and help attract new businesses to South Cambridgeshire. • Existing policy ET/1 (Development Control Policies DPD) is very restrictive, failing to recognise high value manufacturing, high tech headquarters, and support services can help reinforce development of high-technology clusters. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council, Calcedote Parish Council - Cambourne should be included as a site suited to cluster development. • Clusters should be located only where there is adequate provision of public transport or where new public transport is planned. • The promotion of clusters requires more than the identification of additional employment land in appropriate locations. It is important that the plan recognises the importance of maintaining the character of Cambridge and providing sufficient and accessible supporting development, including new housing, to support the jobs target and the creation of effective clusters in and on the edge of the City. • Paragraph 8.48 should be deleted because it undermines a number of key policies in the NPPF, including planning positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters and the provision of sustainable economic development generally. • The supporting text to Policy E/9 should recognise the potential need for new high technology businesses to be located close to existing centres of excellence where linkages and collaborative work can be facilitated. • Object to the non-allocation of the Cambridge South site for an 85,000 sq m R&D led mixed use development. Sustainable location, would benefit the economy, provide a new focus for R&D south of the City.
Assessment	<p>A number of the issues raised by objectors are addressed by the wider strategy of the Local Plan, in particular in the spatial strategy chapter, and the transport and infrastructure chapter.</p> <p>Paragraph 2 of the policy highlights strategic employment sites with particular opportunities for new cluster development. There are other locations which will continue to contribute to the development of clusters, but due to the number not all are specifically referenced. The policy maintains general support for</p>

	<p>cluster development.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.48 highlights the importance of monitoring the impact of removal of selective management policies that were part of previous plans. This is a significant policy change and it is important the impacts are monitored. This is a sound element of the plan.</p> <p>Additional supporting text is not required, as the policy provides appropriate support for cluster development, and recognises the benefits of colocation.</p> <p>Sufficient employment land is available for cluster development, and the development strategy is the most appropriate solution for the district. The allocation proposal on the South of Cambridge is addressed elsewhere.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/10: Shared Social Spaces in Employment Areas (and paragraphs 8.49 to 8.50)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Support: 1 Object: 1
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Granta Park/TWI benefits from shared social spaces. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The words 'small-scale' should be replaced with 'appropriately scaled'. Whilst uses should be ancillary to business, they should be appropriate to meet needs.
Assessment	It is agreed that a change would make the policy more flexible to meet the needs in different scales of employment areas. There are sufficient controls in the other elements of the policy to ensure facilities are ancillary to the business uses and focus on meeting needs of the business park only.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend first part of Policy E/10 to read: <u>Appropriately scaled</u> Small-scale leisure, eating and social hub facilities will be permitted in business parks and employment areas</p>

	where:'
--	---------

Policy E/11: Large Scale Warehousing and Distribution Centres (and paragraph 8.51)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Support: 0 Object: 2
Main Issues	Object <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council, Caldecote Parish Council - applications for Large Scale Warehousing and Distribution Centres should be taken on a case by case basis with a view to promoting sustainability by providing alternative employment.
Assessment	These uses require a large land area, but generate relatively low numbers of jobs. They could quickly reduce the available land supply, and increase pressure on transport networks. The policy remains a sound element of the plan.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/12: New Employment Development in Villages (and paragraph 8.52)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 3 Support: 0 Object: 3
Main Issues	Object <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council - weakens the existing LDF policy (ET/4) by removing all size restrictions. It also does not define any local employment criteria. • Concerned that the term "very small scale" requires further definition and clarification to provide better guidance for would-be developers and parish councils.
Assessment	Thresholds provide certainty regarding scale, restricting large scale development in rural areas, but the thresholds have proven insufficiently flexible to deal with the variety of sites within the villages of the district. There is concern that flexibility will mean impacts are not properly considered, but the Local Plan will be read as a whole, and other policies will apply to address general issues such as traffic and environmental impact.
Approach in Submission	No change

Local Plan	
-------------------	--

Policy E/13: New Employment Development on the Edges of Villages (and paragraph 8.53)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 9 Support: 4 Object: 5
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permissive towards new employment uses adjoining or close to development frameworks and expressly prioritises previously developed land. • Support elements e and f as will protect rural nature of South Cambs. • Support subject to good design. • Reference to green belt policy is fundamental. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council - it will remove any protection offered by the village framework with respect to business development (as opposed to housing development). Sections a and b do not provide a mechanism for a formal consultation process involving the applicant, SCDC and PC. • Amend to remove the onerous requirements that prevent existing established businesses in villages from expanding (development framework at Volac International site Fishers Lane Orwell should be amended)
Assessment	<p>The policy sets a reasonable balance between flexibility and control of development. Parish Councils are already be consulted through the planning application process.</p> <p>The Fishers Lane Orwell site was considered through the issues and options process, and rejected. The framework is correctly drawn in this location, and there is no need for an employment allocation at a group village. Any proposals can be considered through the planning application process.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/14: Loss of Employment Land to Non Employment Uses (and paragraphs 8.54 and 8.55)	
Proposed	Total: 7

Submission Representations Received	Support: 1 Object: 6
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully supportive in restricting development employment sites. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council – Support the policy, but it should include formal consultation with Parish Councils. • 12 months marketing is not enough. It must be shown that a very robust marketing strategy has been implemented to retain land for employment. It should be VERY difficult to get employment land approved for housing. • Policy is unduly restrictive. Does not deal with derelict sites. Need to take account of viability. If not viable for employment marketing not required. • Negative presumption within Policy against alternative uses, at odds with NPPF which states Planning Policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is little prospect of a site being used for that purpose. • Policy ET6, which would be replaced by Policy E/14 does not require valuation to be agreed with Council before marketing properties stated in 8.55. Instead Council has ability to seek independent advice when it considers a property has been inappropriately valued. Insufficient evidence to justify proposed change in approach. May add delay, cost and place additional burden on developer. • If one of criteria a, b, or c has been met it should not be necessary to meet point 2 - should be deleted.
Assessment	<p>Maintaining the supply of employment land is important to the sustainability of villages. The policy aims to support the retention of village employment whilst avoiding long term protection that would be inconsistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Paragraph 2 of the policy seeks to identify whether any element of employment could be achieved on a redeveloped site. It is a reasonable requirement where scarce village employment uses are being lost.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.55 seeks for the marketing terms to be agreed, to ensure a fair marketing exercise is carried out. By agreeing terms upfront it will help the applicant avoid the risk of the Council considering a site has not been marketed fairly at the end of the period.</p>
Approach in	No change

Submission Local Plan	
----------------------------------	--

Policy E/15: Established Employment Areas (and paragraphs 8.56 to 8.58)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 5 Support: 2 Object: 3
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Granta Park/TWI and the Wellcome Trust support the policy and the amended boundaries shown on the policies map. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Babraham Bioscience Technologies - Babraham Research Campus should be removed from the Green Belt to deliver new specialist research and development floorspace. • Richard Arbon - Syngenta Site Whittlesord should be removed from the green belt and identified as an established employment area. Site should not be lost to employment as other village sites have. • John Shepperson - Buckingway Business Park Swavesey should be expanded to the east. SCDC assessment identified no significant constraints. Need for employment land. Most sites near to Cambridge serve only high tech.
Assessment	<p>The policy does not identify sites in the Green Belt, as these are covered by other policies regarding appropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Separate representations have been made seeking changes to the Green Belt. In both cases the Green Belt boundary is considered sound.</p> <p>The Established Employment Areas policy identifies major employment areas, and supports their continued use and adaptation. The 'Established Employment Areas in The Countryside' designation is not intended to allocate additional land for employment development, or to allow sites to expand into the countryside unchecked. They have been drawn around previously developed major employment sites, or land that has been committed for development i.e. land with planning permission.</p> <p>Proposals for additional development at Babraham Research Campus were not made at previous stages of the plan making process. Given the general land supply situation there is not a compelling case for amending the Green Belt. Proposals can be</p>

	<p>considered through the planning application process as to whether site specific issues warrant exceptional circumstances within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Expansion at Buckingham was considered and rejected through the issues and options stage. Around a third of the existing Buckingham site remains undeveloped. Additional employment land allocation is not needed to make the plan sound.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/16: Expansion of Existing Businesses in the Countryside (and paragraphs 8.59 to 8.60)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 4 Support: 2 Object: 2</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offers appropriate encouragement for the sustainable growth of existing businesses in rural areas. Support for paragraph 8.60 in clarifying the scale of growth must be sustainable. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourn Parish Council – Weakens existing policy, the original period of operation of 5 years in the LDF has been reduced to just 2 years, and the restrictions on the scale of development have been removed. Fails to provide for a formal consultation process with Parish Councils.
Assessment	<p>The policy needs to ensure firms are established, but not be overly restrictive. It is considered that a two year establishment period offers this balance better than a five year period. Criteria have been included in order that scale of development can be controlled to be appropriate to the location.</p> <p>Parish Councils will already be consulted through the planning application process.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/17: Conversion or Replacement of Rural Buildings for Employment (and paragraph 8.61)
--

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Support: 0 Object: 2
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally support this policy, but consider that it should provide greater flexibility by allowing for the development of live / work units. • As the policy relates to the re-use of existing buildings without material changes, the form, bulk and general design will not be altered. Furthermore the building will remain in its existing context and surroundings. Therefore, what is the intention and meaning of paragraph c?
Assessment	<p>Following consideration through the Issues and Options process, the Local Plan retains an employment first preference as in the current LDF. Policy H/16 supports residential development if employment uses are not possible.</p> <p>The intention of part c is to ensure that existing buildings are suitable for conversion, in terms of their form, bulk and general design. It has been included in previous South Cambridgeshire Development Plans, and remains a sound element of the policy.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/18: Farm Diversification (and paragraphs 8.62 and 8.63)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 0 Object: 8
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A cohesive bridleway network opens up opportunities for farm diversification into horse-related business (bed and breakfast, holidays etc). Should add reference to horse riding. • Dernford Farm Great Shelford / Sawston – allocate as leisure / tourism facility utilising former mineral workings.
Assessment	The Dernford farm site was not submitted through the issues and options consultation process. Dernford Farm is located within the Green Belt. There is not sufficient justification to allocate land for development for a major tourism facility, and the plan remains sound.
Approach in	No change

Submission Local Plan	
----------------------------------	--

Policy E/19: Tourist Facilities and Visitor Attractions (and paragraphs 8.64 and 8.65)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 12 Support: 0 Object: 12
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage - Part c of the policy is phrased so as to allow some degree of adverse impact to local character. We would prefer a more positive wording, and one that allowed for enhancement. • National Trust - It is unclear what "in scale with its location" means for an existing large scale tourism attraction. The second part of the sentence appears to be duplicated in part e. of the policy. • National Trust – Concern with last sentence of paragraph 8.65. The scale of growth proposed in the SC and CC Local Plans will mean that existing tourism sites are put under increasing pressure to expand. If limitations are to be placed on existing sites but no further sites are to be encouraged then how will the Council plan pro-actively to provide tourism-based leisure to meet the demands of a growing population? • IWM Duxford seek amendment to part c to include no significant adverse impact on operation and function of the area. • Add horse riding to point e - "walking, cycling, horse riding and public transport". • Object to policy item f on the basis that sustainable site management of green spaces requires on-site accommodation to make them more viable and sustainable, especially in urban fringe and rural areas.
Assessment	<p>The policy aims to support a sustainable scale of development, which supports the continued success of the district's attractions.</p> <p>Part c aims to ensure proposals are in scale with their location. A minor amendment is proposed to clarify that this will depend on the nature of the facility being supported. The traffic issue is addressed by paragraph e, so does not need to be repeated in c.</p> <p>It is also agreed that the policy could support opportunities for horse-riding.</p>
Approach in	Minor change

Submission Local Plan	<p>Amend Policy E/19 part d to read: 'The scheme is in scale with its location, <u>and the nature of the facility it supports</u> particularly in relation to the amount and nature of traffic generated;</p> <p>Amend Policy E/19 part e to read: The proposal maximises sustainable travel opportunities, including walking, cycling, <u>horse-riding</u> and public transport. Proposals which would have a significant adverse impact in terms of the amount or nature of traffic generated will be refused'</p>
------------------------------	--

Policy E/20: Tourist Accommodation (and paragraph 8.66)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 9 Support: 2 Object: 7
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the development of tourist facilities/accommodation in the countryside. • This policy could help struggling or closed public houses to become re-vitalised by the addition of sensitively developed accommodation. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add reference to horse riding.
Assessment	The policy appropriately addresses tourist accommodation, and does not need specific reference to horse riding. Any stabling proposals could be considered on their merits.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/21: Retail Hierarchy (and paragraphs 8.67 to 8.70)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 4 Support: 2 Object: 2
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Towns and town centres first is consistent with national policies including the NPPF. • New retail development should remain to be encouraged within

	<p>the Rural Centres, in order that services and facilities can continue to support additional growth in these areas at a proportionate level.</p> <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council / Caldecote Parish Council - Item a, should read ‘town centres’ and not list names as in the other Retail Hierarchy categories. This allows other settlement centres or settlements to be upgraded as they develop and grow.
Assessment	The role of settlements should be established in the Local Plan. If the role of a settlement changes this could be addressed through a Local Plan review. Cambourne is correctly identified as a Rural Centre.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/22: Applications for New Retail Development (and paragraphs 8.71 to 8.74)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 7 Support: 2 Object: 5
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council – Support retail impact assessment thresholds. • Fulbourn Parish Council - Protects the intrinsic character of the village and surrounding countryside. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local thresholds will be difficult to implement. There are no defined village centre boundaries and in their absence a single local threshold should be adopted which requires all retail schemes over 250 square metres gross within the Rural Centres to be supported by a retail impact assessment. • Approach to local thresholds for impact assessment is not proportionate and places an unnecessary burden on an applicant, contrary to the provisions of the NPPF in paragraph 21. The suggested threshold set out in the NPPF requiring a retail impact assessment for stores outside a centre is 2,500sqm. • Council’s Retail Study contains flaws and underestimates retail need. It ignores overtrading. It is out of date.

Assessment	<p>With regard to the retail impact threshold, the Council considered a range of options before determining a reasonable threshold for the district. A slightly higher threshold for Rural Centres recognises that they are typically home to slightly larger stores. Due to the difficulties identifying village centres, a more qualitative approach was selected, which can be applied on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Additional retail need would be associated with the needs of major development, and would be addressed through policies in the chapter on Promoting Successful Communities.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy E/23: Retailing in the Countryside (and paragraph 8.75)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 8 Support: 0 Object: 8</p>
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overly restrictive in respect of existing retail uses. Does not support uses unsuited to a town centre location, and development of existing rural retail businesses. • Add reference to horse riding.
Assessment	<p>It would not be appropriate for a policy to support the general growth of retail in the countryside which did not need a countryside location.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Chapter 9: Promoting Successful Communities

Key facts and paragraphs 9.1 – 9.3	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Object: 2
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inter-Church Contact Group – insufficient weight given to community infrastructure needed to support development. Much space given to transport infrastructure whilst few references to cultural and community infrastructure. Experience of new developments (Cambourne and Orchard Park) show existing or new churches play vital role in supporting emerging communities – undervalued role. • Cambridgeshire County Council - Joint Strategic Needs Assessment for New Communities and Health & Housing highlights importance of green space to supporting mental as well as physical wellbeing. Should include in bullet "Sport and play space is important for supporting healthy lifestyles."
Assessment	<p>Within the plan consideration has been given to the importance of developing cultural and community infrastructure. An objective of the plan is to ensure that '<i>all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being to everyone including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space and green infrastructure</i>'. Within Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs developers are asked to make provision for a range of facilities including those for faith groups.</p> <p>The JSNA for New Communities highlights that there is a clear relationship between the amount and quality of green space in the living environment and peoples' health and well being. A minor change is proposed to recognise this in the list of key facts.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend bullet 9 to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport and play space is important for supporting healthy lifestyles <u>and improving both the physical and mental wellbeing of communities.</u>

Policy SC/1: Allocation for Open Space (and paragraph 9.4 – 9.5)

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 35 Support: 11 (including 3 Parish Councils) Object: 24 (including 2 Parish Councils)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency – support allocating land for open space as it can be available for water storage now – perhaps more formally in future. Open space provides resilience to climate change- areas that can flood with minimal effect compared to occupied property. Green spaces to store excess surface water. Cambs Surface Water Management Plan sets out known hot spots. Support designations in following locations to be future formal flood storage areas – Great Shelford; Longstanton and Swavesey. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – support policy <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – Should amend policy to refer to Natural England's ANGSt standards as advocated in Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy. • Swavesey and District Bridleways Association and six individual respondents – policy should mention importance of leisure routes such as public bridleways – promotes health, leisure and transport network. <p>Village allocations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SC/1:1a – Land east of recreation ground, Over – Objection from landowners (The Ginn Trustees) – other land adjacent to playing fields should be used instead. No objection to half site being allocated even given substantial areas have already been compulsory purchased previously for playing fields but not all used for that purpose. Site allocated for many years – opportunity for resolution of matter as no proposals by District or Parish Councils. Representation also submitted for southern half of site to be allocated for housing. • SC/1:1b - Land east of Bar Lane, Stapleford and west of the access road to Green Hedges Farm Support for allocation • SC/1:1d – Land north of recreation ground, Swavesey Objection from landowner. Site rolled forward without consideration of alternatives. Land part of larger area next to village green. Could now expand village green in alternative

	<p>directions. Need better distribution of open space within village – all at northern end. Swavesey linear village. Site unlikely to be deliverable during plan period. Should replace with alternative site to east or south of existing village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>• SC/1:1e – Land at Grange Farm, Church Street, Great Shelford Objection from landowners of field – land not accessible to public / not a village amenity. No consultation with owners by Parish Council who put forward site or District Council who included it in Issues and Option 2 consultation. Site not available. In private ownership. Objection as recreation ground is big enough- parts not fully used. Need for land for new housing. . Village in Recreation and Open Space Study 2013 found to be well provided for compared to other villages. Two new sites proposed in plan – over provision of open space Support for allocation from three respondents. (Separate representation received for site to be allocated for housing)</p> <p>• SC/1:1f – Land north of former EDF site, Ely Road. Milton Milton Parish Council support allocation.</p> <p>• SC/1:2g – Land known as Bypass Farm, west of Cottenham Road, Histon Objection to site from 7 respondents – not suitable site, too close to neighbouring properties, not needed in village, no consultation with those affected by it. Should look for alternative site. Likely to generate increased traffic on already busy road, not safe to cross road. Using green belt land. Land floods. Objection from landowners of site next to allocation – concern at that site not suitable – wrong location for village. Support proposal but as part of proposal should reduce speed limit on B1049. Site car park should not be open 24/7 to minimise disturbance to local residents. Consider light pollution at night. Support from Histon and Impington Parish Council – confirmation from landowners that willing to sell land. Shortage of open space in village. PC has leafleted near neighbours and only three adverse comments.</p> <p>• SC/1:2h – Land south of Granham Road, Great Shelford. Great Shelford Parish Council Support for allocation from 3 respondents.</p>
--	--

	<p>Separate representation received for southern part of site to be allocated for housing.</p> <p>New sites proposed in villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn New site - Field abutting existing recreation ground should be used as extension to recreation ground. Shortage of open space in village especially as much new housing proposed. • Dry Drayton Dry Drayton Parish Council - New site – Provision for a recreation ground of at least 2 acres as close to school as possible and a separate play area for community within the parish. Only village in district with no play area or recreation ground • Graveley Graveley Parish Council – New site – Need for informal recreation area in village – joint representation with Manor Farm for new housing with provision of green area.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>The policy has been updated from one that was in the Adopted Site Specific Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. Sites where a parish council was no longer pursuing a proposal were not carried forward into the new policy. New sites have been included in the plan where put to us by parish councils in the Issues and Options consultations. These allocations took into account where there is an identified shortage of existing provision.</p> <p>Objections have been received from the landowners to three of the open space allocations in the plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site 1a, Over— Site carried forward from previous plan. Allocation is located adjacent to the village recreation ground and would form a logical extension to the existing facility. The landowner has suggested that half the site should be allocated for housing however this site was considered as part of work on the SHLAA (Site 182) and rejected as having potential for residential development. 2. Site 1d, Swavesey — Site carried forward from previous plan. Allocation provides an opportunity for open space provision within the village. 3. Site 1e, Great Shelford – A new allocation which is adjacent to an existing recreation ground and would provide a convenient extension to this facility. A separate

	<p>representation has been made to allocate the site for housing. The Recreation and Open Space Study 2013 recognises that there is a shortage of such open space in Great Shelford.</p> <p>It is noted that these landowners do not support the parish councils' aspirations but the plan includes these proposals as ones to be pursued by these parish councils to meet identified local shortfalls in provision.</p> <p>A new site proposed in Histon (Site 2g) in the plan has received objections from local residents concerned about the location of the open space on the edge of the village, on a busy road and on the impact it may have to adjoining residents. There is potential to address these issues through appropriate site design and siting of any facilities. This site is being actively progressed by the parish council.</p> <p>An open space allocation proposed at Granhams Farm, Great Shelford (Site 2h) has had a representation for the southern part to be allocated for housing – although no representation was submitted objecting to the open space allocation. There is a recognised need for additional open space within the village in the Recreation and Open Space Study 2013.</p> <p>The open space policy is site specific and therefore the suggestion that public bridleways be mentioned as leisure routes is not appropriate to this policy This matter is considered in other parts of the plan notably Policy TI/2: Planning for Sustainable Transport and Policy NH/6: Green Infrastructure</p> <p>Natural England had suggested that the policy should refer to the ANGSt standards (Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard) which had been used in preparing the Green Infrastructure Strategy for county. The Council has used its own open space standard for green space in preparing the plan. A minor change is proposed to include mention within the supporting text that the Council has carried out an update of the Recreation and Open Space Study 2005. This was published in July 2013. The study investigates current quantity and quality of provision of open space within the district and how this is meeting local need, and utilises these assessments to review the local standard of provision developed from the 2005 study. This local standard was devised after considering other existing standards such as the ANGSt one.</p> <p>Dry Drayton is recognised in this study as having a lack of open</p>
--	---

	space and during the latest consultation the parish council has submitted a request that a site be found in the village. No specific site has been put forward for inclusion in the plan but the Council is happy to work with the parish council outside of the plan making process to deliver open space within the village.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend paragraph 9.4 to read: <u>'The Council has published an updated Recreation and Open Space Study 2013. This has provided information on the provision of open space within the district and how this is meeting local need. As a result of this review</u> sites for open space and recreation uses have been carried forward from the previous Plan</p> <p>Further amendments have been made to paragraph 9.31 to refer to the Recreation and Open Space Study 2013.</p>

Policy SC/2: Health Impact Assessment (and paragraphs 9.6 – 9.8)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 14 (including 2 Parish Councils) Support: 3 Object: 11
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – support policy. Need for consistent approach across Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire. • Fulbourn Parish Council – support policy • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – support <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swavesey and District Bridleway Association and six respondents – policy should mention importance of leisure routes such as public bridleways – promotes health, leisure and transport network. • Objection – HIA adds no value to decision making process – all health related issues covered by sustainable development considerations/ other policies in the plan. Should only be required for EIA developments. • House Builders Federation – Policy unnecessary. Contrary to paragraph 122 in NPPF. Delete policy. • Unreasonable for guidance on HIA to be delayed until SPD –

	clarification needed as to whether existing SPD still valid?
Assessment	<p>The policy has been amended from a similar one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The policy has been revised to allow for two levels of HIA depending on the scale of the development proposed so that smaller developments need now only carry out a rapid HIA. An SPD on Health Impact Assessments (HIA) was adopted by the Council in March 2011 which provided additional detailed guidance on the implementation of the adopted HIA policy.</p> <p>The Council considers there is a need to provide such a policy in the plan as it provides a method of considering the impacts of development on the health of different groups in the population. The Council will review the SPD within the lifetime of the plan</p> <p>The importance of the value of public bridleways as leisure routes are too detailed a matter to include within the actual policy and is covered in other parts of the plan.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy SC/3: Protection of Village Services and Facilities (and paragraph 9.9)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 11 Support: 7 including 2 parish councils Object: 4 including 2 parish councils.</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campaign for Real Ale – pleased to see inclusion of public houses in policy. • Cambridge Past Present and Future – Support policy. Particular attention should be paid to retaining pubs. • Fulbourn Parish Council – support policy as it protects character of village • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council - support for policy. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council – supports policy. Services often focal point for surrounding community. Important that parish councils are formally consulted with respect to section 2 (a) and (b). Also as part of policy the Council should promote Community Asset Register.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrington Parish Council – policies in chapter 9 relate to large scale developments. Insufficient mention of day to day needs of Group Villages. Plan not protecting further erosion of facilities and services in villages particularly public transport, education and health services. Not considering increased demand and diminishing capacity of existing provision. • The Theatres Trust – policy does not refer to cultural infrastructure – should add cultural buildings to section 1 of policy to reflect paragraph 28 bullet 4 in NPPF. • Support policy but term ‘village service’ should explicitly cover educational provision such as local primary schools. New housing development in existing villages will generate extra burden on local schools – need for new provision to provide for that development.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>The policy has been reviewed from a similar one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. As a result of the review additional services have been included in section 1 of the policy. The list in this section gives an indication of the sort of village services that will be covered by the policy. If these services were to be lost it would cause an unacceptable reduction in provision within the village. The Theatres Trust suggests that cultural buildings should be added to comply with the NPPF however this list is not intended to include all possible services and does not need to repeat guidance already in the NPPF.</p> <p>Other respondents have requested that educational facilities; public transport and health facilities should be included in the policy. Health facilities are already listed. Education provision is the responsibility of the County Council and the plan has included a specific policy to cover education facilities. (Policy TI/9:). The future provision of public transport is being considered in the County’s Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire and it is outside the remit of the planning system to ensure future services are continued or new ones introduced to villages within the district. In allocating new housing sites in the most sustainable locations the Council has endeavoured to ensure public transport is available for the residents of these new developments.</p> <p>The policy applies to all scales of villages within the district and not just the larger settlements. Smaller villages will have few facilities which are important to be protected so that the day-to-day needs of a community can meet.</p>

	<p>The Council keeps a ‘List of Assets of Community Value’ as required under the Localism Act 2011 and this is referred to in paragraph 9.3. A modification is proposed to add to the supporting text to highlight those local facilities valued by the local community can be added to this list.</p> <p>The Council will use local knowledge including that from Parish Councils for determining the matters in section 2 of the policy.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Add to the end of paragraph 9.9: <u>‘The local community can highlight the facilities it values within its parish by applying for them to be included on the register of Community Assets held by the Council.’</u></p>

Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs (and paragraph 9.10 – 9.15) excludes paragraphs relating to sub-regional facilities including Community Stadium	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 34 Support : 6 (including 2 Parish Councils) Object: 28 (including 3 Parish Councils)</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campaign for Real Ale – support policy including public houses in list of commercial facilities important to community life (section 4 f) • Cambridgeshire County Council – welcome libraries mentioned • Fulbourn Parish Council – support policy • Haslingfield Parish Council – support policy new services and facilities in new developments must be done in timely fashion – at early stage of development / not neglected • General support for policy <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homes and Communities Agency – mismatch of policies as set out in adopted Northstowe Area Action Plan (NAAP) and draft policy. Need for clarity. Will new policy supersede older ones in NAAP? Suggested amended wording for Policy SC/4 to clarify • Cambridgeshire County Council – JSNA New Communities Report should be referenced in plan. Importance to plan for social infrastructure. Infrastructure Study in section on social infrastructure only sets out physical requirements for social

	<p>facilities and omits reference to community development resources needed to development community cohesion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – still outstanding requirement for Household Recycling Centre in area. Also need to clarify that for waste and recycling provision that this includes both HRCs and bring sites as set out in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mineral and Waste Core Strategy and the RECAP Waste Management Guide - Propose amending wording to 4(i) • Cambridgeshire County Council – amend policy to include options whereby if land is required to provide for existing or future community or education services then site may come forward for mixed- use development (including residential) where there is an enabling development argument. • Harston Parish Council – insufficient information for other needs than housing of a community – future school provision; health and social care; lack of proposals for other amenities such as shops, pubs and village halls, sports and children’s facilities; no mention of future governance – need for new parish council. • Cambourne and Caldecote Parish Councils – amend policy by adding to range of services to be provided – allotments and youth and older people’s services/facilities. Also need new section in policy about Community Governance – ‘parishing’ of new communities. • Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council – insufficient weight given to role faith facilities play in providing for needs of wider community. Key component in creating community. Little reference to a place of worship or religious instruction. • The Theatre Trust – policy does not include reference to cultural infrastructure – need to add cultural buildings to those listed in section 4 to reflect NPPF paragraph 28. • Swavesey and District Bridleway Association and eight respondents – policy should mention importance of leisure routes such as public bridleways – promote healthy, leisure and transport network. • Cambridge Past Present and Future - List of services and facilities to be provided should include adequate green open space with playing fields, green infrastructure and children’s playground. • House Builders Federation – policy conflicts with paragraphs 203 - 206 in NPPF. Council may seek financial payments to range of services listed through CIL but not planning obligation. • Requirement for new developments to provide for provision of faith groups and burials is unreasonable and unjustified. Better
--	--

	<p>provided for at district level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development must provide sufficient additional local educational infrastructure for new population. Need to consider full impact on existing schools. • Council should ensure free home shopping deliveries are provided by major supermarkets on major new developments to reduce unnecessary car journeys. • Need for doctor's surgery in Hardwick or Caldecote. <p>New policy on healthcare provision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – recommend that Cambridge City and S Cambs jointly agree policy on health care facilities. Cambridge City has explicit policy – Policy 75 which recognises the changing way in which health services may be delivered.
Assessment	<p>The policy is a new one relating to providing guidance on meeting the needs of the community for all scales of future housing development within the district – previously such guidance had only been set out in Area Action Plans (AAP) for new large scale growth areas such as Northstowe or on the extensions to Cambridge.</p> <p>Clarity has been sought by the Homes and Community Agency as to the role the existing policies in AAPs as opposed to the community needs policy in the plan. The Northstowe AAP remains part of the statutory development plan for South Cambridgeshire alongside the Local Plan. The Proposed Submission Local Plan clarifies at Appendix B that only Policy NS/3 (1g) is superseded by the Local Plan. Within the AAP Policy NS/9: Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Arts and Culture is specific to the needs of the new town of Northstowe. The Local Plan will include more recently adopted policies and the Council will weigh the appropriate weight to give to individual policies in both plans in determining any applications for Northstowe.</p> <p>Section 4 of the policy contains a comprehensive list of the range of services and facilities that should be provided for a development and already includes both education and health facilities. Some suggestions have been made for additions to this list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested by Cambourne and Caldecote Parish Councils the 'Provision of Youth and older people's services / facilities'. The policy provides a general list. Facilities needed by specific groups would be covered within this list. It would not therefore be necessary to highlight the needs of particular groups within the community. • The open space requirements including allotment and

	<p>wider leisure/ green infrastructure provision of new developments are not considered in this section as other policies within the plan set out such requirements (e.g. Policy NH/ 6:Green infrastructure and Policy SC/7: Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The needs for bridleways would be more appropriate in the transport chapter. Amendments have been made to Policy TI/2 under separate representations to incorporate the need to consider routes for horse riders • The Theatres Trust has requested that cultural buildings be included to comply with the NPPF and a minor change is proposed to meet this request. • The County Council's suggested amendment to the waste and recycling provision within section 4 is not considered necessary as the policy wording is flexible/ inclusive enough to cover this matter. <p>The Council considers that developers should make provision for faith groups and for burials as these are vital requirements for all settlements and must be included in the initial planning of a development. The requirement has been included in adopted AAPs that have been found sound through the examination process.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council are concerned that insufficient reference has been made to the role of faith facilities in providing for the needs of the wider community. The Council has recognised the importance of making provision for faith groups by including it in the list in section 4 of the policy. More details on the specific needs of such groups could be considered within the community development strategy that must be prepared for the larger scale major developments.</p> <p>The County Council has highlighted that there is a particular need for a new Household Recycling Centre within the district. In Policy SC/4 the need for a development to provide for waste and recycling facilities is listed in section 4. An allocation for such a use could not be incorporated into the policy as this is a County matter for consideration in a review of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan. The County Council is reviewing its position on HRC provision across the County which may clarify its position.</p> <p>The Council has considered the vital role of community</p>
--	--

	<p>development by including section 8 within the policy. The County Council is concerned about the future funding of social infrastructure in new communities and wants reference to the JSNA New Communities Report (2010) with its key theme of the need to promote social infrastructure in new communities within the plan. The plan has taken into account the findings of this JSNA in the evidence base and therefore does not need to refer it further.</p> <p>A number of parish councils have highlighted the omission in the policy of the consideration of future governance of the proposed new settlements. Whilst this is not a planning matter the Council recognises that governance arrangements are an important issue when major new developments come forward. This will involve working with local parish councils to explore their preferences and could include the creation of a new parish council or extending the role of a neighbouring / existing council if appropriate. This can help in creating a sense of place in a new community and achieving early cohesion and implementation of policies. A minor change is proposed to the supporting text to highlight this issue.</p> <p>The Council does not consider it appropriate to include within the plan a new policy on healthcare as the need for such facilities is taken into account within other policies in the plan notably Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs. It is for the relevant health body to consider the existing and future needs for health provision throughout the district. The Council recognises that within the lifetime of the plan the provision of healthcare is likely to change with the need for smaller scale clinics as doctors carry out more local procedures. This will have consequences within the rural communities in South Cambs which can be positively addressed through the policy framework included within the plan and in the planning of future communities.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Add '<u>j. cultural buildings</u>' to the list in section 4 of Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs.</p> <p>Add new paragraph after 9.13 which states: <u>'As part of the development of a new community the Council recognises the importance of working with local parish councils to consider at an early stage the form of governance that would be most appropriate for major developments such as new settlements. Similar consideration may also apply where developments are physically an extension to one village but lie within an adjoining parish.'</u></p>

Paragraph 9.16- 9.18 Consideration of Sub-regional facilities including Community Stadium and Sawston Stadium.	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 15 Support : 8 (including 5 Parish Councils specifically supporting non- inclusion of Community Stadium) Object: 7 (including 1 Parish Council objecting to non- inclusion of policy for sub-regional facilities)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grantchester Parish Council - support decision not to further consider Community Stadium at Trumpington Meadows. Need for stadium on green belt not been demonstrated and 900 signature petition against demonstrated local opposition. Community Stadium should be sited amongst population it is intended to serve so supporters can walk to games. Green Belt not appropriate location for stadium. • Harlton and Haslingfield Parish Councils – support rejection of stadium at Trumpington • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – support rejection of stadium proposals • Great Shelford Parish Council – no compelling case for allocating community stadium or other facilities in green belt • General support for no inclusion of community stadium at Trumpington – would conflict with new country park; would undermine viability of Trumpington facilities; site poorly served by public transport. • Cambridge Past Present and Future – support for emphasis that provision of sub regional facilities in Green Belt would only be allowed if exceptional circumstances. <p>Object</p> <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trumpington Residents Association – Support Councils’ assessment that green belt location for community stadium not appropriate. Fundamentally opposed to such a stadium. Policy does not include way the Council would respond to proposals for sub-regional community, sports and leisure facilities – should include specific reference to Council’s policy consistent with City Council Policy 73. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – object to plan not including site for ice rink. A suitable site would be the rowing lake at Waterbeach. Object that plan does not include a

	<p>concert hall – suitable site at Northstowe or off A428 near Cambridge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge FA – growing demand for football and to deliver FA strategy need improved facilities. <p>Community Stadium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grosvenor/ Wrenbridge Ltd - Plan fails to respond to evidence base and sporting needs of Cambridge and surrounding area. Land west of Hauxton Rd, Trumpington and at Abbey Stadium, Newmarket Rd should be allocated for community football stadium, indoor and outdoor sports and residential development to fund delivery. Release 15 hectares from green belt west of Hauxton Rd. to accommodate residential development and built sports facilities. Land between new green belt boundary and M11 provide outdoor sport and ancillary features. Proposed wording for policy and supporting text. • New policy for Community stadium – should be new policy as stadium is absolute priority for area. Surely one of nine sites proposed was sufficient. With planned growth and resulting increased population need for adequate sporting facilities to meet community needs. Both Cambridge United and City need stadium. Benefits clear. <p>Sawston Stadium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for new policy to allow for football stadium in Sawston – village would benefit from additional sporting facilities and green space proposed by club. Potential traffic issues overstated. Proposed site is brownfield site not greenfield.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>There was support for the non-inclusion of a policy allocation for a community stadium from parish councils. The promoters for a Community Stadium on a site south west of Trumpington Meadows have requested that an allocation be made in the plan and have included both sites at Trumpington Meadows and the Abbey Stadium within the city which would leave open where different facilities would be proposed. Whichever site is proposed for a community stadium the Councils remain unconvinced that there is a compelling case of need to change their plans.</p> <p>The Councils explored issues regarding sub regional facilities, and in particular a Community Stadium, through the issues and options process, including consideration of potential site options.</p> <p>There are potential benefits to a community stadium scheme, highlighted by previous studies, but the Councils have to make a judgement whether the need has been demonstrated such that it would provide exceptional circumstances for a review of the Green</p>

	<p>Belt boundary. It is not considered that the commercial demand for football amounts to a need that is sufficient to justify a further green belt boundary change, particularly given the harmful impacts on Green Belt purposes identified of the sites tested.</p> <p>There was concern that the Council has not included a policy as to how it would consider new sub-regional facilities. The Cambridgeshire Football Association highlighted the need to provide increased sports facilities to meet the growing demand from the existing and future residents. Opportunities may arise for sub-regional facilities to be incorporated into the new growth areas when master planning is carried out. The Council will consider proposals for such facilities on their merits through the planning application process against a range of relevant policies of the plan and therefore a specific policy is not proposed.</p> <p>Only one respondent has requested that the plan include a site for a football stadium at Sawston for Cambridge City and no change is proposed to the plan. No representations were submitted by the promoters who have subsequently submitted a planning application.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy SC/5: Hospice Provision (and paragraph 9.19)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Support: 0 Object: 2
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arthur Rank Hospice – Welcome policy but concerned policy fails to understand hospice requirements, locating close to acute hospital, and increasing role in community healthcare. • Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust – Policy should be upgraded to include wider healthcare facilities. Suggest change of wording in policy and supporting text by replacing ‘hospices’ with ‘community healthcare facilities’.
Assessment	This new policy was brought forward following a request by the Arthur Rank Hospice Charity for help in finding a site for a new hospice as part of the plan making process. The policy goes as far

	<p>as is appropriate in the plan, without specific evidence supporting a particular site, which has not been forthcoming through the plan making process. The plan cannot imply where exceptions will be made to Green Belt policy. Any proposals in the Green Belt can be treated on their merits through the application process.</p> <p>The Council does not consider it appropriate to widen the scope of this policy to consider wider healthcare facilities as this use does not specifically fit into this category. The issue of including a specific policy relating to healthcare is considered in discussions in Policy SC/4: Meeting Community Needs.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy SC/6: Indoor Community Facilities (and paragraphs 9.20 – 9.22)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 5 Support: 2 (including 2 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 3</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn PC – Support to ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support Policy SC/6. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Builders Federation – contrary to national policy paras 203 and 206.(3 tests for planning obligations) May seek payments through CIL but not planning obligations. Demonstrate tests met and not already charging. • Requirements onerous and unjustified having regard to evidence base. Unclear how CIL would affect requirement since contributions would be superseded by CIL charge. Costs in relation to viability and cumulative impact not properly tested. Suggest rewording of policy to exclude mention of an appropriate standard and also reference to it in paragraph 9.22 – each development should be determined based on local circumstances.
Assessment	<p>The policy is a new one to reflect need recognised in the district for indoor community facilities. An assessment was commissioned in 2009 and the standard was extracted from the need identified in this report. The Council is keen to seek developer contributions to the provisions of this facility as the Council considers such facilities</p>

	<p>vital to creating successful local communities.</p> <p>Policy SC/6 clause 3 states that ‘developments will contribute of off-site provision, through planning obligations or through the Community Infrastructure Levy as appropriate’. It is wholly appropriate to have a policy where it is explicit that infrastructure will be funded through one instrument or the other (i.e. CIL or planning obligations) in the event that one is no longer available to the Council.</p> <p>The Council's Infrastructure List under CIL Regulation 123 will define what CIL receipts will be spent on and therefore how planning obligations will be limited following the implementation of CIL. The list is currently being worked up and will be subject to consultation and form part of the CIL examination.</p> <p>Any request for a financial contribution under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act will automatically be subject to the 3 tests in accordance with CIL Regulation 123.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy SC/7: Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Developments (and paragraphs 9.23 – 9.30 including Figure 11)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 11 Support: 6 (including 5 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 5
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Support ensuring adequate play areas available in new developments to promote safety and well being of children. Many new developments infill and omit space. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Welcome reference to “informal open space suitable for play” in para 9.24 – keen to see variety of spaces. • Fulbourn PC – Support to ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands. • Great Abington PC – Pleased to see recognition of importance of allotments and community orchards. Developments proposed in village include both. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support Policy SC/7 and

	<p>Figure 11.</p> <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Welcome reference to creative design approach, but recognise these are places adults want to spend time in too. • English Heritage – Provision of fixed structures associated with outdoor recreation should be appropriately located as not to intrude on sensitive areas e.g. setting of heritage assets. • Natural England – Would like reference to ANGSt standards as advocated through Green Infrastructure Strategy for provision of multi-functional green infrastructure. • Sport England – Support principle but recommend robust assessment of need using Sport England methodology and action plan be developed which identifies priorities for new open space provision. Do not support principle of providing for new development through a standard of provision. New housing developments should make provision for community indoor sport. • Support objective, but space standards not always appropriate. Development should take account of provision in immediate area not whole district.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>The policy is similar to one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. It has been revised to include the open space required to be provided by housing for the elderly and to include a standard for allotments and community orchards.</p> <p>The County Council has requested that the policy should recognise the needs of adults who may wish to use open space – not just areas for play. The Council considers that informal open space would meet this requirement and this is already referred to in paragraph 9.32.</p> <p>English Heritage is concerned that new open space should not impact on sensitive areas such as the setting of heritage assets Policy NH/14: Heritage Assets already covers this issue.</p> <p>Sport England object to the use of open space standards, but they provide a key mechanism for ensuring new developments deliver new open spaces to meet the needs required. Following their inclusion in the Local Development Framework the standards have proved effective in delivering new open spaces in range of new developments. The Council updated its open space study to support the local plan. This involved a comprehensive survey of existing provision, quality, and identified needs, in consultation with</p>

	<p>stakeholders. It indicated that the standards remain appropriate, with the addition of a specific standard for allotments.</p> <p>The Local Plan remains sound, but to move the issue forward to support implementation, the Council has now started working with Cambridge City Council, Sport England, and other stakeholders to prepare a Playing Pitch Strategy and action plan for the wider Cambridge area, to help implement the Local Plan proposals and the continued development of sport in the area by stakeholders.</p> <p>A minor change is proposed to highlight the availability of the Recreation and Open Space Study 2013.</p> <p>The Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) mentioned by Natural England helped inform the preparation of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure and the plan includes a policy to assist in implementing this strategy – Policy NH/6 As this standard has not been used in the drafting this plan no change is proposed to refer to it.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend paragraph 9.24 as follows: ‘.... These are primarily owned and operated by parish councils, although the use of management companies is becoming more common within new developments. <u>The Council published a Recreation and Open Space Study (2013) which has provided information on the quantity and quality of the open space across the district.</u></p>

Policy SC/8: Open Space Standards (and paragraph 9.31 – 9.33)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 5 Support: 3 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 2
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Support ensure adequate open space for communities. Strongly support provision of allotments. Currently large demand and many new developments have small gardens. • Fulbourn PC – Support to ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support Policy SC/8

	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Builders Federation - Unsound, contrary to national policy paras 203 and 206. May seek payments for outdoor space through CIL but not planning obligations. • Homes and Communities Agency – Support provision of open space but Northstowe AAP establishes (lower) provision required. Change to provision will affect viability. Clarify.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>The policy is similar to one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The standard for open space has been amended to include a standard for allotments and community orchards and further defines the standard for children’s playspace to include both formal and informal play space.</p> <p>Clarity has been sought by the Homes and Community Agency as to the role the existing policies in AAPs as opposed to the community needs policy in the plan. The Northstowe AAP remains part of the statutory development plan for South Cambridgeshire alongside the Local Plan. The Proposed Submission Local Plan clarifies at Appendix B that only Policy NS/3 (1g) is superseded by the Local Plan. Within the AAP Policy NS/9: Community Services, Facilities, Leisure, Arts and Culture is specific to the needs of the new town of Northstowe. The Local Plan will include more recently adopted policies and the Council will weigh the appropriate weight to give to individual policies both plans in determining any applications for Northstowe. The open space provision in the Local Plan now includes the need to provide allotments and the agreed Development Framework Document for Northstowe (August 2012) already includes allotments and orchards</p> <p>The Council considers the necessity for new developments to make provision for open space is an acceptable obligation to help to promote the well being of the whole community and for creating better places to live and work.</p> <p>The supporting text for policy SC/7 states that ‘developments will contribute of off-site provision, through planning obligations or through the Community Infrastructure Levy as appropriate’.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Policy SC/9: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas, Allotments and Community

Orchards (and paragraph 9.34 – 9.37)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 7 (including 4 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 2
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Support as complements Policy SC/10 in providing some protection against inappropriate infilling. Great demand for allotments in parish and finding suitable land is difficult. • Fulbourn PC – Protects intrinsic character of the village and surrounding countryside. • Natural England – Welcome protection of existing recreation areas, allotments and community orchards. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support Policy SC/9. • Protect existing open spaces of value to local communities. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport England – Support principle but suggested amendments, including final criteria should note there is no up to date playing pitch assessment for district. Urge SCDC to carry out such an assessment as soon as possible. • Council should promote new community orchards, woodland and allotments. New site at end of Manger’s Lane, Duxford for community orchard and residential.
Assessment	<p>The policy is similar to one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The existing adopted policy protects only recreation areas whereas the new one extends the protection to allotments and community orchards. The Council does not consider that a revision is necessary to the policy to mention that a playing pitch strategy should be carried out as requested by Sport England. The update of the Recreation Study provides evidence of what facilities exists within the district and could be used to assess any recreation areas under threat from development proposals. The Council has now started working with Cambridge City Council, Sport England, and other stakeholders to prepare a Playing Pitch Strategy and action plan for the wider Cambridge area, to help implement the Local Plan proposals and the continued development of sport in the area by stakeholders</p> <p>The Council is encouraging the provision of new areas of open space for community use within other policies in the plan notably Policies SC/7 and SC/8 and therefore does not need to modify the</p>

	proposed policy as suggested by one individual respondent.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy SC/10: Lighting Proposals, (and paragraph 9.38 – 9.43)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 8 Support: 5 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 3
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Support as it will help contain the problem of light pollution in the district. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Support subject to appropriate constraints being applied to developments in or close to sites of natural and built heritage and Green Belt. • Fulbourn PC – Support policy for protecting the intrinsic character of the village and surrounding countryside. • Natural England - Welcome policies to ensure development addresses potential for adverse environmental effects through lighting, noise and emissions to air. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council – Support control of lighting but bearing in mind cross-boundary sites and benefits of a coordinated approach, policy could benefit from mention of ecological impact. Include an additional bullet in policy as follows - "<i>Impact on wildlife is minimised, particularly in countryside areas.</i>" • English Heritage – Floodlighting for sports pitches can conflict with amenity and appreciation of heritage assets. Floodlighting heritage assets can have positive and negative impacts. Amend text to reflect need for sensitivity in relation to heritage assets and their settings. • Home Builders Federation – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters.
Assessment	<p>The policy is similar to one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination.</p> <p>The suggestion from Cambridge City Council that the ecological impact should be included in the policy is already considered in the</p>

	<p>plan within the supporting text to the policy.</p> <p>Floodlighting is mentioned in the supporting text where it is recognised that lighting should not have a significant impact on the amenity of surrounding properties. Such properties could include heritage assets and therefore it is not necessary to emphasise the particular impact on the setting of such buildings.</p> <p>In response to the House Builders Federation a similar policy has been previously adopted in LDF and has provided a valuable tool when new development proposals are submitted to Council. The NPPF in paragraph 125 states that by encouraging good design planning policies can limit the impact of light pollution.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy SC/11: Noise Pollution (and paragraphs 9.44 – 9.53)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 7 Support: 4 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 3</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Support but is concerned it must be complemented with an effective enforcement regime. • Fulbourn PC – Support policy for protecting the intrinsic character of the village and surrounding countryside. • Natural England - Welcome policies to ensure development addresses potential for adverse environmental effects through lighting, noise and emissions to air. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council – Support aims of policy but consider bullet 4 should be amended to ensure no worsening of noise beyond site boundary. Replace existing text in Policy SC/11 clause 4 which reads "Noise level at nearby existing noise sensitive premises..." with "<i>Noise level at the boundary of the premises subject to the application and having regard to noise sensitive premise...</i>" • IWM Duxford – Support need to ensure appropriate noise control, but concerned may restrict aviation and F1 testing

	<p>activities. Amended wording to paragraph 9.53 is proposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Builders Federation – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters.
Assessment	<p>The policy is similar to one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination.</p> <p>The City Council suggested an amendment to the policy to ensure that there is no worsening of noise beyond site boundary. The Council considers that the policy is already flexible enough to take this into account and the amendment would make the policy too precise. The clause is identical to that within the existing adopted policy which has successfully provided guidance to date in the planning application process.</p> <p>The IWM are concerned that the noise control policy may restrict activities at Duxford airfield. However it is appropriate to protect the health and quality of life of those living and working in the area surrounding the airfield from unacceptable noise. The policy would allow for other activities as long as they did not have an unacceptable adverse impact on those communities that are located near to the airfield.</p> <p>In response to the House Builders Federation a similar policy has been previously adopted in LDF and has provided a valuable tool when new development proposals are submitted to Council. The NPPF in paragraph 123 states that planning policies should aim to avoid noise from giving rise to adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy SC/12: Contaminated Land (and paragraphs 9.54 – 9.56)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 4 Support: 2 (including 2 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 2</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn PC – Support policy for protecting the local community's health and amenities. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support.

	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency – Support inclusion of policy, but will need redrafting either prior to submission or through modifications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggest change policy title to '<i>Land Contamination</i>'. Contaminated land has strict definition in Environment Protection Act. ○ Need to address development affected by landfill gas - append to existing policy /new policy? - NPPF leaves it for local policies to address when formally covered by PPS23. ○ Need to cover water pollution (groundwater) in policy – as it stands only relates to health and amenity. This area depends on groundwater for majority of drinking water so important. Many chalk aquifers vulnerable to water pollution. ○ Policy needs to address approaches to development on aquifers as well as EA designated Source Protection Zones. ○ Support Environmental SPD concept but question title as being vague – danger of being side lined. Landfill gas and land contamination could command their own SPD • Home Builders Federation – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>The adoption of a contaminated land policy at a local level is supported by the NPPF in paragraph 121 and therefore the House Builders Federation are incorrect in stating it is not a planning matter. The Environment Agency (EA) has suggested that the policy should be retitled Land Contamination as contaminated land has a strict definition in the Environment Protection Act. A minor change is proposed to amend the policy title</p> <p>The policy considers contaminated land. Landfill gas is one of many different types of contaminant and therefore the Council does not consider it appropriate for additional detail to be included in the policy to cover all aspects of pollution .</p> <p>The EA has asked that the policy be amended to cover concerns about water pollution and a change is proposed to the policy to address this issue by including mention of the need to assess the risks to human health and the environment. Water pollution is also addressed by Policy CC/7.</p> <p>The title for the proposed Environment SPD is considered</p>

	appropriate for the matters that it will include.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend policy to read:</p> <p>Policy SC/12: Contaminated Land <u>Land Contamination</u>.</p> <p>Where development is proposed on contaminated land or land suspected of being impacted by contaminants the Council will require developers to include as assessment of the extent of contamination and any possible risks <u>to human health and/or the environment</u>. Proposals will only be permitted where land is, or can be made, suitable for the proposed use.</p>

Policy SC/13: Air Quality (and paragraphs 9.57 - 9.62)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 6 Support: 4 (including 2 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 2
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council – Represents comprehensive and effective policy, incorporating all necessary protections and promotes low emission strategies. Site specific air quality issues for major sites can be addressed through this policy in tandem with site specific policies. • Fulbourn PC – Support policy for protecting the local community's health and amenities. • Natural England – Welcome policies to ensure development addresses potential for adverse environmental effects through lighting, noise and emissions to air. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Builders Federation – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters. • Needs expanding to cover air quality from vehicle emissions as well as development – cause serious health problems. Need to work with City and County to ensure buses meet European emissions standards. Suggest include following: <i>'Measures will be taken to extend the Quality Bus Partnership beyond 2015. Buses accessing towns and cities where air quality is an issue must conform to European emission Code Level 5 as a minimum requirement'</i>.
Assessment	In response to the House Builders Federation a similar policy has been previously adopted in LDF and has provided a valuable tool

	<p>when new development proposals are submitted to Council. The NPPF paragraph 109 establishes that to prevent new and existing development contributing or being put at unacceptable risk from unacceptable levels of air pollution it is therefore clearly a planning matter to include a policy about air quality in the plan.</p> <p>The policy does not need to be amended to address the emissions from vehicles as this is already covered by the policy.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy SC/14: Hazardous Installations (and paragraphs 9.63 -9.65)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Support: 1 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 1
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn PC – Support policy for protecting the local community’s health and amenities. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Builders Federation – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters.
Assessment	In response to the House Builders Federation a similar policy has been previously adopted in LDF and has provided a valuable tool when new development proposals are submitted to Council. Within South Cambridgeshire there are 9 installations handling hazardous substances and 11 high-pressure natural gas transmission pipelines.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy SC/15: Odour and Other Fugitive Emissions to Air (and paragraphs 9.66 - 9.69)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 5 Support: 4 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 1

Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – Welcome policies to ensure development addresses potential for adverse environmental effects through lighting, noise and emissions to air. • Bourn PC – Support but is concerned it must be complemented with an effective enforcement regime. • Fulbourn PC – Support policy for protecting the local community’s health and amenities. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Home Builders Federation – Contrary to paragraph 122 of NPPF and should be deleted. Not planning matters.
Assessment	<p>In response to the House Builders Federation a similar policy has been previously adopted in LDF and has provided a valuable tool when new development proposals are submitted to Council. The impact of odour (a form of air pollution covered by NPPF paragraph 109) on new and existing development is clearly a matter for consideration when assessing proposals, and is therefore a planning matter.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Chapter 10: Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure

Paragraphs 10.1 - 10.8	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 6 Support: 0 Object: 6 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC))
Main Issues	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage – Priority should be given to solutions that take account of the historic environment. • Ickleton PC – Include new cycle and footpaths to the village. • St Edmundsbury BC - Plan weakened by lack of reference to delivering aspirations of emerging Transport Strategy. • Growth strategy reliant on significant improvements in public transport and deliverability depends on availability, level and timing of public funding. Large gap in funding and cost. Identify sites less reliant on improvements to ensure deliverability. • Little about railways, except Chesterton Station. • Little money for roads or to address congestion on A505.
Assessment	<p>The Transport Strategy and Local Plan were prepared in parallel to ensure development is located in sustainable locations and mitigation and infrastructure requirements necessary to promote sustainable travel are included in the Local Plan. Concentrating new development can also help address existing transport conditions, including congestion, by maximising developer funding.</p> <p>Policy TI/2 encourages travel by all sustainable modes, including rail, and outlines a series of measures to facilitate this. It is not appropriate for the Local Plan to list specific schemes, which would be a matter for the Local Transport Plan. Protection of the historic environment is addressed by other policies in the Plan, notably in Chapter 6.</p> <p>Minor changes are proposed to acknowledge the importance of rail, and to delivering the aspirations of transport plans / strategies.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Add to the end of paragraph 10.2: <u>'...The Local Plan will assist with the delivery of requirements and aspirations within current and emerging transport plans and strategies.'</u></p>

	<p>Add an additional paragraph after 10.4 (and renumber the remaining paragraphs):</p> <p><u>‘A few rural parts of the district are well served by rail, for example the A10 corridor both north and south of Cambridge, while others rely on the markets towns and Cambridge for access to the railway network. Improved access to stations and interchanges, for example improved cycle access via cycle path networks or quiet routes, can help encourage more people to cycle and more people to travel by train rather than car. In Cambridge, the new Science Park Station and Interchange will contribute to the growth of rail use and will be essential to provide interchange facilities.’</u></p> <p>Add a new bullet to the key facts after the 5th bullet:</p> <p><u>‘A few rural parts of the district, for example the A10 corridor both north and south of Cambridge, are well served by rail, while others rely on the markets towns and Cambridge for access to the railway network.’</u></p>
--	--

Policy TI/1: Chesterton Rail Station and Interchange	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 5 Support: 5 Object: 0
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England – Welcome the requirement for development to protect Jersey Cudweed. • New station is fundamental to redevelopment of the Northern Fringe East and will benefit all of northern Cambridge / region. • Opportunity to enable greater use of the railway, an underused means of transport, and a corridor capable of carrying an increased modal share in the area.
Assessment	Representations support the policy.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy TI/2: Planning for Sustainable Travel	
Proposed	Total: 45

Submission Representations Received	Support: 21 (including 2 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 24 (including 6 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Location of development important to ensure distance and need for travel is reduced and maximises opportunity to travel by sustainable modes. All sites in plan can achieve appropriate access from network, but need comprehensive Transport Assessment to fully assess. • Fulbourn PC - Support this policy to encourage and support cycling and use of public transport. • Great Chesteford PC – Strong support. Fits well with footpath / cycle path project to link villages. • Natural England – Support protection and enhancement of routes and linkages between villages, Northstowe, Cambridge, market towns and wider countryside. Pleas developers will be required to mitigate environmental impacts. • Rampton PC – Criterion 2b - important for small infill villages, to provide access without car. Need cycleway to Willingham. • Most effective way of achieving is by ensuring correct spatial strategy is chosen - focus on edge of Cambridge/close to jobs. • Naïve to assume edge of town is more sustainable than rural area if effective and reliable public transport can be provided. • Travel by car is becoming increasingly unsustainable and a blight. Roads too busy. Reality is people will continue to use their cars. • Against development that would lead to large increase in car use due to lack of public transport facilities within a village. • Support extending cycleways, particularly in villages along the Guided Busway to give good access for all. • Necessary to prevent transport infrastructure in the region becoming so overburdened it has negative economic impact. • List commendable but should not be used to bribe communities into accepting inappropriate levels of development. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrington PC – Does not address sustainable provision for the needs of Group Villages. Focus on walking, cycling and public transport at odds with reality. • Bourn PC – Support but lacks detail on timescales for attaining “sufficient integration”. “Significant transport implications” does not consider distance from employment / service centres, as excludes cycling / walking as option. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Support but add reference to Transport Assessments being agreed with the local highway

	<p>authority and encourage travel planning activities from smaller schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dry Drayton PC – Request network of off-road cycle paths along each road in / out of village. • Haslingfield PC — No direct / safe all weather cycling route to Cambridge. Uncertainty about public transport provision – essential for ageing population some of whom do not drive. • Ickleton PC – Policy will only succeed if new routes link with established settlements. Cycle path between Ickleton and Great Chesterford would link station, facilities and NCN11. • Madingley PC – Welcome development that reduces traffic and speeds, provides cycle / footpaths. Need new Park and Ride at Bar Hill, car park at Oakington Guided Bus stop, direct link to M11, A428 / A14 link, improved junction at Cambridge Road, Madingley and A1303. • Royston Town Council - Development at Cambourne already had significant effect on Royston. Bourn Airfield / Cambourne West and other developments should mitigate traffic impacts on Royston / pressure on station car park. • Suffolk County Council – Policy should secure appropriate improvement in accordance ‘with the aims of relevant local transport plans or strategies’. • Add policy to include bus services / park and ride. • Radial roads clogged during rush hour and major developments will exacerbate. • Objective will not be achieved with the development strategy. Different travel patterns achieved in City, urban fringe and new settlements - evidence supports sites on urban fringe. • Fails to acknowledge parts of district not adequately served by public transport, yet these areas still have development needs. • Protect and enhance Rights of Way for all users (horse riders). Bridleways as default – good value for money.
Assessment	<p>Policy combines policies from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, found sound through the examination. The Local Plan seeks to facilitate journeys by sustainable modes; locating development in sustainable locations where the need to travel can be minimised and opportunities to travel by sustainable modes maximised. Evidence shows more people are switching to sustainable modes, but the car will continue to have a role. Concentrating new development should also assist with addressing existing transport conditions, including congestion, by maximising developer funding available.</p> <p>Assessing transport impacts considers the number of trips generated per dwelling / land use and takes account of existing</p>

	<p>conditions locally. It does not consider where trip destinations are, which may influence choice of mode rather than number of trips.</p> <p>Cambridgeshire County Council seek the addition of a clarification that Transport Assessments should be agreed with the local highway authority and encourage travel planning activities from smaller schemes. A minor change is proposed as this reflects current practice.</p> <p>New development must integrate into existing networks to encourage non-car use. This can be delivered through planning conditions, S106 and/or CIL and timescales will vary, depending upon measures being implemented and by whom.</p> <p>Criterion 2 outlines measures how sustainable travel by walking, cycling and public transport can be achieved. It is not appropriate for the Local Plan to list specific schemes, such as new cycle routes, which would be a matter for the Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>Suffolk County Council suggest the policy should secure improvements in accordance with the transport plans / strategies. This has been addressed in the preceding section, where a minor change is proposed to paragraph 10.2.</p> <p>Minor changes are proposed in response to representations from Cambridgeshire County Council and to include reference to horse riders.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend criterion 2b to read: ‘Provision of new cycle and, walking <u>and horse riding</u> routes...’</p> <p>Amend criterion 2c to read: ‘Protection and improvement of existing cycle and, walking <u>and horse riding</u> routes,...’</p> <p>Amend paragraph 10.18 to read: ‘...how they will be addressed, and how sustainable travel will be delivered in the long term. <u>These should be agreed with the highway authority.</u> For smaller developments with lower impacts, a simpler ‘Transport Statement’ is required, <u>which should demonstrate how it will encourage travel planning activities...</u>’</p>

Policy TI/3: Parking Provision (paragraphs 10.23-10.25 and Figure 12)

Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 15 Support: 6 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 9 (including 3 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Support - defines standards for car parking and garage sizes. Support promotion of cycle parking to encourage more people to cycle. Current developments have insufficient car and cycle parking spaces leading to inappropriate parking. • Oakington & Westwick PC – support criterion 4 – specify minimum size dimensions for garages so large enough for modern cars, cycles and other storage needs. • For the share of cycling to grow, adequate facilities have to be provided over and above current level of demand. The number of spaces defined in this policy will help achieve this. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Footnote 2 – specify minimum height for MPVs or 4 wheel drive vehicles? Figure 12 – unclear as to allocation of parking for multiple residential properties such as flats. • Caldecote & Cambourne PCs – Change ‘minimum’ to ‘indicative’ to ensure flexibility in accordance with Travel Plan. Review after 1 year. Undue costs on community buildings. • Homes and Communities Agency – Object to 1 cycle space per bedroom - excessive. Seek flexibility, including communal parking. Is the standard for A2 uses an error (2m²)? • Oakington & Westwick PC – remove all car parking standards and adopt design-led approach. • Wording of policy contradicts supporting text - policy advises standards should be met but text advises indicative standards.
Assessment	<p>New policy providing much more flexibility through a design-led approach, in keeping with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p><u>Cycle Parking</u></p> <p>Many households have numerous occupants and may own several cycles, and some people own more than one cycle, for on- and/or off-road use. As such one space per bedroom is not excessive, particularly in an area where cycling levels are higher than the national average and rising. There is sufficient flexibility for how to accommodate cycles within developments, e.g. within garages that meet the minimum size, therefore the standard is not onerous.</p> <p>The minimum garage size ensures sufficient floor space for modern cars and storage, including for cycles. The average height</p>

	<p>of garage doors (7') is capable of accommodating most modern cars, including sport utility vehicles (just over 6').</p> <p>Car Parking Supporting text makes clear that the provision, design and allocation of car parking should be tailored to each development. It may not be appropriate to allocate car parking to individual flats; as within accessible locations, close to services and facilities, flats may not need to provide 1 space per dwelling, and/or parking may be provided in a shared-use car park to serve a mix of uses at different times of day and night.</p> <p>Policy TI/3 requires car and cycle parking to be provided in accordance with standards in Figure 12. Policy criteria and supporting text explain a design-led approach should be applied using the indicative car parking standards on case-by-case basis. Cycle parking standards are minimum and development is required to meet these to ensure adequate provision to facilitate cycling and help address aspirations of transport plans / strategies.</p> <p>Minor change proposed to car parking standards to correct a typo.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend the indicative car parking standard for A2 Uses to read: '1 space per <u>25</u>m²'</p>

Policy TI/4: Rail Freight and Interchanges	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Support: 1 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 1
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourn PC – Strongly in favour of shifting more freight from road to rail given the strains on local road infrastructure. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support proposals concerning rail freight and protection of sidings. Should require construction items to come by rail to Chesterton sidings for A14 / construction of new settlements.
Assessment	Policy combines two policies carried forward from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD and Site Specific Policies DPD, found sound through the examination. Policy CC/6 addresses

	construction methods, and requires a Construction Environmental Management Plan, or similar, to set out the management measures builders will adopt, which may include on-site recycling of materials. It will be for developers to demonstrate they have complied with Policy CC/6 and it is not appropriate to require construction materials be brought in by rail, which may not always be the most sustainable option.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy TI/5: Aviation-Related Development Proposals	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 11 Support: 3 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 8 (including 2 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn PC – Being regularly over-flown by aircraft from Cambridge Airport support this policy to protect amenities of local residents. • Natural England – Welcome requirement to take into account effects on nature conservation and landscape. • Cambridge Airport not suitable for further expansion - close proximity to city. Increase in flights will create major disturbance - night flying should not be permitted. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote & Cambourne PC – Preserve Bourn as a flying facility for commuting / recreation. Close to employment. Would decrease need for expanding other airfields. • IWM Duxford – Support criteria-based policy and tests include economic advantages / recreation opportunities. Criteria could impact on viability of business - historic aircraft (noise). Clarify that there are a variety of different airfields in South Cambs. • Marshall of Cambridge – Cambridge Airport makes positive contribution to economic well-being of area. DfT emphasises need to make best use of existing runways. Positively worded policy would accord with NPPF. • Cambridge Airport - significant impacts warrant separate policy • Lack of formal procedures to ensure development / change of activity complies with legislation - most development under permitted development rights. Not enforced.

Assessment	<p>The policy has been carried forward from the adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination.</p> <p>The proposal to redevelop Bourn Airfield as a new village is addressed in the Strategy Chapter - loss of the airfield was taken into consideration in the site selection process.</p> <p>Although Cambridge Airport is larger and more frequently used than other airfields, the impacts should be considered and addressed in the same way. The policy is flexible enough to consider the merits as well as environmental and amenity impacts.</p> <p>Criterion 3 considers different types of activities and aircraft that may be used at different airfields and references historic aircraft.</p> <p>Minor change is proposed in response to a representation, acknowledging the different flying activities at IWM Duxford.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend the first sentence of paragraph 10.29 to read: '<u>...aerodromes and smaller airfields in the district, including IWM Duxford with its large collection of flying historic aircraft.</u>'</p>

Policy TI/6: Cambridge Airport Public Safety Zone	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 3 Support: 1 Object: 2</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marshall of Cambridge – Support policy which is firmly based on advice by central government to seek to minimise risk. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defence Infrastructure Organisation – Statutory safeguarding / consultation zones around MOD aerodromes to ensure structures do not obstruct air traffic movements, compromise operation of air navigational transmitter, birdstrike. • IWM Duxford – Support but the Plan should include reference to the IWM Duxford Aerodrome Safeguarding Map.
Assessment	<p>The policy has been carried forward from the Adopted Site Specific Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination.</p>

	<p>Airport Safeguarding is the process established by the Department for Transport to ensure that all appropriate measures are taken to secure the safety of aircraft when taking off, landing or flying within the vicinity of an airport. To ensure that an airport's operation is not restrained by development in the vicinity of the airport, the airport operator is responsible for producing a safeguarding map and providing this to all Local Planning Authorities whose boundaries fall within a 15km radius of the airport. The Local Planning Authority will use this safeguarding map to determine the implications of development for the airport. It is a procedural issue that is already dealt with through the planning application process, however it would be helpful to include reference to it in the Local Plan to make potential applicants aware.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Add a new section after paragraph 10.33: <u>'Air Safeguarding Zones</u></p> <p><u>10.34 Applications for development within Cambridge Airport's Air Safeguarding Zones (shown in Figure 12a) will be the subject of consultation with the operator of the airport and the Ministry of Defence. Restrictions in height, or changes to the detailed design of development may be necessary to mitigate the risk of aircraft accident and maintain the operational integrity of the airport.</u></p> <p><u>10.35 The purpose of airport safeguarding is to take the measures necessary to ensure the safety of aircraft, their passengers and crew while taking off or landing or while flying in the vicinity of Cambridge Airport. This is achieved by assessing proposed development so as to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>protect the air through which aircraft fly;</u> • <u>protect the integrity of radar and other electronic aids to air navigation;</u> • <u>protect visual aids, such as approach and runway lighting, by preventing them from being obscured, or preventing the installation of other lights; and</u> • <u>avoid any increase in the risk to aircraft of a birdstrike.</u> <p><u>10.36 A similar Aerodrome Safeguarding Zone applies to the Imperial War Museum Duxford (shown in Figure 12b). Applications for development within Duxford's Air Safeguarding Zones will be the subject of consultation with the aerodrome operator.'</u></p>

	<u>Maps will be included in the schedule of Minor Changes</u>

Policy TI/7: Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 2 Support: 1 Object: 1
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of Univ. of Cambridge – Lord's Bridge is internationally important, and the policy to protect its operational viability is supported. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion in this chapter inappropriate as radio telescope is not public infrastructure. Suggest it is included in chapter 8.
Assessment	The telescope is a piece of infrastructure and therefore most relevantly sits in Chapter 10.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy TI/8: Infrastructure and New Developments (and paragraph 10.36)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 17 Support: 5 (including 3 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 12 (including 3 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote & Cambourne PCs – Criterion 1 is vital for the proposals of new development. • Fulbourn PC – support this policy to ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands. • Hertfordshire County Council – Where development is proposed close to Royston may require contributions to mitigate impacts on Royston schools. • Natural England – Support requirement for developers to demonstrate improvement or provision of infrastructure. Note contributions may also be required towards future maintenance and upkeep in accordance with Government guidance.

	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote & Cambourne PCs – Criterion 2 should read “will” not “may” - contributions towards maintenance are essential to allow communities to take on the infrastructure necessary. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Key infrastructure provision to be supported through CIL should include community assets. Support for Green Infrastructure. • Harlton PC – Insufficient information in the proposals for the needs of a community and adjacent communities. No reference to availability of public utilities. • Highways Agency - No reference to A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet improvement within Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS). Clarify how it will be taken forward and whether it has implications on deliverability of Local Plan. IDS includes improvement to A14 Histon Interchange, but no costs or funding gap specified. Further information needed in update. • Middle Level Commissioners – Costs for flood defence works and SuDS do not need to be included in tariff, but may need to include maintenance. • Require funds for infrastructure to be met by S106 and CIL money. Provision of essential infrastructure must be in place before house building starts. Provide critical mass of residents faster so essential facilities and services are put in earlier. • Policy does not address deliverability of sites where new infrastructure required. NPPF clear that reliance should not be placed on major infrastructure to deliver sites. • Council should ensure viability and deliverability. Sites in plan should not be subject to scale of obligations / policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is compromised.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>Policy based on policy from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, found sound through the examination. Policy TI/8 requires suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of infrastructure necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. It provides flexibility over their nature, scale and phasing, related to the form of the development and its potential impact upon the surrounding area.</p> <p>Contributions may be needed towards future maintenance and upkeep of facilities, depending upon their nature and future ownership. It may not be appropriate to require such contributions in all instances.</p> <p>Planning obligations will still be sought where a particular impact specific to an individual development needs to be mitigated. Wider</p>

	<p>infrastructure improvements that enable more development to take place, but not necessarily attributable to one particular development, will be funded through CIL receipts.</p> <p>This approach is compliant with (i) CIL Regulations which seek to prevent tariff style planning obligation policies and (ii) National Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>Timing of infrastructure is of significant importance, although this needs to be balanced by ensuring the ability to develop viably is not threatened. Local authorities often assist by forward funding infrastructure on the basis of future section 106 contributions.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Study is a live document, subject to regular review; at such time new schemes and detail can be added, such as in relation to the A14 Histon interchange and A428 improvement. Transport infrastructure is high on the agenda with recent changes meaning the LEP (Local Enterprise Partnership) will be making decisions on transport priorities and funding in future. Current discussions on a City Deal, if agreed, will mean the local area keeping a share of the additional tax income that will be generated as a result of future growth.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Paragraphs 10.45 & 10.46 Waste Infrastructure	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 3 Support: 2 Object: 1 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC))
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Welcome inclusion of reference to Minerals and Waste Plan and policies regarding areas of search, safeguarding and consultation zones. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn PC – Concerned that Policies Map Inset 11 for Bourn – mineral classification is incorrect.
Assessment	Information shown on the Policies Map accurately shows the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework produced by Cambridgeshire County Council.

Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change
--	------------------

Policy TI/9: Education Facilities	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 10 Support: 4 (Including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 6 (including 1 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Policy is appropriate and encouraging that educational facilities are being supported in locations that are accessible and experience growth. Proposals within Plan have potential for appropriate mitigation, where required. Coherent approach with less disruption for schools. • Fulbourn PC - Ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands. • Suffolk County Council – Welcome recognition of the need to secure cross-border contributions as appropriate. • Should also cover all housing developments where education facilities have not been explicitly mentioned. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harlton PC – Insufficient information in the proposals for the needs other than housing of a community and adjacent communities. No reference to future school provision to be provided by Cambridgeshire County Council. • Sport England – No objection in principle, but development on educational sites should minimise impact on sports facilities. • More schools needed if there is to be a big population growth. Must tackle problem before it arises and reduce traffic problem by preventing children being driven to school. • Criterion 3 is insufficiently strongly stated, merely ‘suggesting’ developers work with the CSA to ensure timely provision.
Assessment	<p>New policy to assist in the provision of education facilities. Together with Policy TI/8, Policy TI/9 ensures appropriate mechanisms are in place to mitigate the impact of housing on schools provision, which goes beyond merely providing capital funding due to the constraints on some existing schools sites.</p> <p>Policy SC/9 seeks to protect existing recreation areas therefore it is not necessary to repeat this in Policy TI/9.</p>

	Minor change to strengthen criterion 3, requiring consultation with the Children's Services Authority.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	Minor change Amend criterion 3 as follows: 'Developers should must engage with the Children's Services Authority at the earliest opportunity...'

Policy TI/10: Broadband	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 5 Support: 3 (including 2 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 2 (including 1 from PC)
Main Issues	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn PC – Support this policy to ensure facilities are enhanced to meet increased demands. • Great Abington PC – Support policy and recognise high speed infrastructure is essential to maintain our community as a desirable place to live. Current speeds is limiting self employed people working from home. • Support as fast and reliable access to the internet will soon be essential for citizens to fully participate in the community. Object <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ickleton PC – Want to see solid proposals for broadband improvement in Ickleton Parish coming forward. • Mobile Operators Association – New clear and flexible criteria based telecommunications policy should be included.
Assessment	New policy arising from representations to the Issues and Options consultation to assist in the implementation of the broadband. Many premises in Ickleton are included within the Connecting Cambridgeshire programme. By the end of 2015, there will be improvements that will enable many homes and businesses to receive superfast broadband speeds (minimum 24Mbps) or fibre broadband speeds of between 2Mbps and 24Mbps. No need to include a specific Telecoms policy - proposed wording does not add anything to the existing guidance contained in section 5 of the NPPF and/or other policies within the Local Plan, such as Policy HQ/1: Design Principles.
Approach in	No change

Submission Local Plan	
----------------------------------	--

Appendix A Supporting Studies and Evidence Base
Appendix C - Glossary

<p>Appendix A Supporting Studies and Evidence Base Appendix C - Glossary</p>	
<p>Proposed Submission Representations Received</p>	<p>Total: 1 Support: 0 Object: 1</p>
<p>Main Issues</p>	<p>Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council - Suggest Building for Life standards for well designed homes and neighbourhoods should be referenced.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>Agree, the Building for Life standard should be added. Further minor changes are proposed for clarification.</p> <p>A number of hyperlinks to evidence documents included in the chapters in the plan are not listed in Appendix A and should be. A minor change is proposed to include these documents in the appendix.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Add 'Building for Life standard' to the glossary with the following definition: <u>Building for Life is a useful tool for gaining an indication of how well-designed homes and neighbourhoods are.</u></p> <p>Add 'Cambridge Area' to the glossary with the following definition: <u>The area covered by Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council.</u></p> <p>Add 'General Permitted Development Order' to the glossary with the following definition: <u>Provides permitted development rights which allow certain types of development to proceed without the need for a planning application.</u></p> <p>Add 'Green Corridor' to the glossary with the following definition: <u>Area of open land which penetrates into an urban area for</u></p>

amenity and recreation.

Add 'High Quality Public Transport' to the glossary with the following definition (source: adopted Local Development Framework) :

Generally service frequencies of at least a 10 minutes peak / 20 minutes inter-peak. Weekday evening frequencies of ½ hourly until 11pm, Saturday ½ hourly 7am - 6pm, then hourly and Sunday hourly 8am - 11pm. Also provides high quality low floor / easy access buses, air conditioning, prepaid / electronic ticketing, Real Time information and branding to encourage patronage.

Add 'Local Needs' to the glossary with the following definition:

The definition varies depending on the circumstances in which it is used. Where talking about types of housing or employment provision in the district it will often relate to the needs of the wider Cambridge area. Where talking about local needs as identified through the Strategic Housing Market Assessment it refers specifically to the needs of the housing market area. With regards to exception sites for affordable housing it refers to the needs of the village / parish.

Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment

Sustainability Appraisal - Draft Final Sustainability Report	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 14 Support: 2 Object: 12
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England - the methodology, assessment and recommendations in the report generally meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations in assessing the effects of the Plan on environmental, social and economic objectives. The Sustainability Appraisal identifies appropriate mitigation to offset adverse effects and this appears to have been implemented through the relevant Plan policies. • Support the inclusion of the land north of West Street, Comberton within the village framework <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge South: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requirements of SA have not been adhered to. Ignores presumption in favour of Sustainable Development. ○ A Joint SA has not been undertaken with Cambridge City Council. ○ Sites on edge of Cambridge were rejected (at issues and options 2) before full impacts were known. ○ High level alternative of no development on edge of Cambridge should have been assessed jointly. Adverse effects of decision are not fully identified, therefore cannot be mitigated and monitored.' ○ A joint SA has not been undertaken of the approach agreed in the memorandum of understanding regarding housing distribution in the sub region. ○ Cumulative and residual effects of rejecting the edge of Cambridge are not known. ○ Ignores SCDC initial SA that edge of Cambridge is most sustainable. ○ The Plan is made without thorough knowledge of the likely effects of the Development Strategy on the Sustainability Topics and Objectives. Consultation is therefore flawed. ○ SA criteria do not give enough weight to walking and cycling opportunities for short journeys. The Air Pollution criteria does not address effect of minimising

	<p>car journeys.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No measures have been envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects. ○ Green Belt has taken precedence over other sustainability issues. Green Belt is only one of twelve sustainability issues in NPPF. ○ Green Belt review was flawed. ○ Sites have been rejected before consideration of offsetting adverse effects. ○ Joint site proforma mixes planning and sustainability criteria. ○ Green Belt is not a landscape issue, and should not have been linked to these objectives. ○ Rejection did not have due regard to Cambridge South Masterplan. ○ Has not assessed a 'no plan', or 'business as usual 'option' ○ Plan will set in place a framework for development, infrastructure and other projects in the Plan period, with increased commuting, use of fuel, production of CO2 which will have cumulative and residual effects beyond the Plan period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cambridge South East should be reassessed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Green Belt has been prioritised over other objectives, resulting in less sustainable sites being chosen, despite Green Belt not being included in SCDC framework. No explanation for this is given. ○ Not chosen most sustainable option regarding housing numbers. Higher numbers identified as more sustainable in the SCDC SA. ○ Failed to consult on joint site testing proforma. ○ SCDC have not followed their own SA which highlights sustainability of edge of Cambridge. The have allocated others sites which will require substantial mitigation measures. ○ Failed to consider measures to mitigate Green Belt impacts. ○ Does not acknowledge edge of Cambridge provides best access to employment. ○ On transport SAs of Major sites at issues and options highlight lack of road capacity, but at later stages that they are most sustainable. ○ Councils Inner Green Belt Review document is flawed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fulbourn – Land at Cow Lane and Teversham Road.
--	--

	<p>Designation as Local Green Space not properly assessed. Should be allocated for residential development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Shelford – Land at Cambridge Road – Should have appeared in all packages of site options, as is top of the settlement hierarchy. • Fowlmere - Land west of High Street - SA fails to consider site conditions, including landscape impact, or acknowledge potential for mixed use, and an employment use buffer between site and industrial units. • Harston - Land to the rear of 98 - 102 High Street – SA fails to consider site conditions, including landscape and townscape impact, and impact on listed buildings. • Objections to Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West, that developments are not sustainable.
Assessment	<p>Issues raised in objections are shown in <i>italics</i> below, followed by the Council’s assessment.</p> <p><i>‘Requirements of SA have not been adhered to.’</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sustainability Appraisal process has followed government guidance on SA and the requirements of the SEA Regulations. <p><i>Ignores presumption in favour of Sustainable Development.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable Development encompasses a full range of economic, social and environmental issues. The Councils consider that they have taken an appropriate approach to balancing the potential benefits and adverse effects of development on the edge of Cambridge, by permitting a significant scale of development, but avoiding a scale of development that would cause significant harm. <p><i>A Joint SA has not been undertaken with Cambridge City Council.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A joined up approach to sustainability appraisal was taken with Cambridge City Council. Joint working began early in the plan making process, at the issues and options stage. This included a review of the sustainability implications of potential development strategies, and a joint approach to reviewing sites on the edge of Cambridge. This was followed by an appraisal of strategic development options (the general locations growth could take place at in the development sequence), and potential development site packages was considered by the Joint Planning and Spatial Planning Group on 22nd May 2013. This was included in the Draft Final Sustainability Report. <p><i>Sites on edge of Cambridge were rejected (at issues and options 2) before full impacts were known.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the Issues and Options 1 stage consideration of the

sustainability implications of development strategy options was provided in the Initial Sustainability Report which accompanied the consultation. The Councils also considered the sustainability implications of development in 10 broad locations around Cambridge. At the Issues and Options 2 stage, the Cambridgeshire Joint Strategy Unit undertook a Sustainable Development Strategy Review, highlighting key themes for consideration through the plan making process. Having completed a joint SA of individual land parcels on the edge of Cambridge, a number of sites were identified as options, and a larger number identified for rejection. The reports provided clear reasons for their proposed rejection. All were included in the consultation.

A joint SA has not been undertaken of the approach agreed in the memorandum of understanding regarding housing distribution in the sub region.

- Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire are both planning to meet their objectively assessed needs for housing and jobs, having considered a range of alternative approaches.

Cumulative and residual effects of rejecting the edge of Cambridge are not known.

- The SA compares the impacts of different development strategies, and identifies cumulative impacts of the plan.

'Ignores SCDC initial SA that edge of Cambridge is most sustainable.' 'Green Belt has taken precedence over other sustainability issues. Green Belt is only one of twelve sustainability issues in NPPF. "SCDC have not followed their own SA which highlights sustainability of edge of Cambridge. They have allocated others sites which will require substantial mitigation measures.'

- The initial SA highlighted potential benefits to some objectives, and negative impacts to others. It also highlighted uncertainties regarding impact on some objectives, including landscape and townscape. The impacts were explored further at later stages of the assessment process. As highlighted in the SA (page 26), 'The edge of Cambridge is the most sustainable location when tested against a range of objectives for growth in the development sequence in South Cambridgeshire, but the SA identifies the importance of balancing the accessibility aspects of sustainable development and the environmental and social benefits it brings, with the significant harm to the landscape and setting environmental aspects of sustainability that development on land in the Green Belt would have, with the resulting irreversible adverse impacts on the special character

and setting of Cambridge as a compact historic city and the risks that could have to the economic success of the Cambridge area, which is in part built on its attractiveness as a place to live and work.'

The Plan is made without thorough knowledge of the likely effects of the Development Strategy on the Sustainability Topics and Objectives. Consultation is therefore flawed.

- Each stage of the plan making process was accompanied by sustainability appraisal information. The impacts of the plan on sustainability objectives have been explored. A high level joint assessment of development strategies was undertaken, as well as more detailed assessments of sites and policies. The cumulative impacts of the plan as a whole have also been explored.

SA criteria do not give enough weight to walking and cycling opportunities for short journeys. The Air Pollution criteria does not address effect of minimising car journeys.

- Rather than including it within other themes, sustainable transport was drawn out into a separate theme to assess impacts in more detail, rather than including it in air quality theme, allowing this theme to focus on air quality issues. Therefore, the effects of minimising car journeys are addressed under the sustainable transport objective.
- Accessibility of sites has been considered in great detail, and full details of the measurements against individual criteria has been provided as well as using a scoring mechanism. Under the 'Access to Services' objective distance to local services and facilities is measured. Scoring is focused on short distances, supporting walking or cycling opportunities (beyond 1000m is scored as a significant negative). Access to public transport is also an important issue for longer journeys, and is also assessed.

No measures have been envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects.

- Mitigation measures are specifically identified in Part 3 section 4.2 and Appendix 5 of the Draft Final Sustainability Report. It should be noted that at this later stage in plan-making and SA the Local Plan had already taken included substantive mitigation measures identified earlier in the SA process. Several further enhancements to policies were proposed in Appendix 5.

'Green Belt review was flawed.' 'Councils Inner Green Belt Review

document is flawed.’

- The Inner Green Belt Study provided an effective review of the impact of development on the qualities and purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.

‘Sites have been rejected before consideration of offsetting adverse effects.’ ‘Failed to consider measures to mitigate Green Belt impacts.’

- The review of sites considered whether mitigation measures would be possible. Where sites were rejected it was determined that significant impacts were not capable of effective mitigation.

‘Joint site proforma mixes planning and sustainability criteria.’ ‘Failed to consult on joint site testing proforma.’

- Links to the sustainability criteria in the joint proforma are clearly established in the Sustainability Appraisal. Criteria in the joint proforma were reviewed to ensure they addressed all the sustainability objectives of both authorities. The Issues and Options Reports and Initial Sustainability Appraisals were also subject to consultation with the statutory environmental authorities before the Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal was prepared. All bodies commented through the consultation, and did not raise concerns with the form or methodology of assessment.

‘Green Belt is not a landscape issue, and should not have been linked to these objectives.’ ‘Green Belt has been prioritised over other objectives, resulting in less sustainable sites being chosen, despite Green Belt not being included in SCDC framework. No explanation for this is given.’

- The Scoping process makes clear that Green Belt issues relate to the ‘Maintain and enhance the diversity and distinctiveness of landscape and townscape character’ objective. Impact on the purposes of the Green Belt relate to impact on this objective (identified in the Joint Interim Sustainability Appraisal Appendix 1). The Green Belt purposes recognise the landscape and townscape qualities important to the edge of Cambridge. It is sound to use these as a guide for considering landscape and townscape impacts. Paragraph 80 of the NPPF clearly acknowledges that preserving the setting and special character of historic towns is a Green Belt purpose. Where there is a significant impact on the Green Belt there would be a consequent significant impact on the Landscape and Townscape objective.
- All edge of Cambridge sites were subject to a full assessment,

not just the level one criteria which highlighted key strategic issues. Decisions to reject sites were therefore taken in light of full information on their potential merits and impacts.

'Rejection did not have due regard to Cambridge South Masterplan.'

- The site was rejected following a robust assessment process.

'Has not assessed a 'no plan', or 'business as usual' option''

- The SEA regulations require 'the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme and the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.' This is addressed in Part 2: Scoping Report, Section 6, and the topic Appendices 1-12 and Appendix 13 which sets out the characteristics of the European sites designated under Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC. The SEA Directive and Regulations do not require that a 'business as usual' or 'no plan' option be assessed, only that reasonable alternatives are assessed. UK Government guidance on SEA and SA also advises against creating alternatives for the sake of it.

'Not chosen most sustainable option regarding housing numbers. Higher numbers identified as more sustainable in the SCDC SA.'

- The initial sustainability appraisal identified the complex relationship between housing targets and various sustainability objectives. The Council has explored the impacts of different options before determining that an option based on the objectively assessed needs was the best choice for the district.

'Does not acknowledge edge of Cambridge provides best access to employment.'

- The sustainability appraisal of strategic approaches recognises that development in Cambridge would deliver housing closest to the highest concentration of jobs, and that edge of Cambridge sites is the next closest option. Proximity of employment is also acknowledged in individual site assessments.

'On transport SAs of Major sites at issues and options highlight lack of road capacity, but at later stages that they are most sustainable.'

- The individual site assessments highlight the current lack of road space to accommodate the scale of development that a new settlement would bring. They also highlighted the potential for significant improvements to public transport

	<p>networks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sustainability appraisal of strategic approaches recognises that highway capacity issues are considered capable of mitigation, and there is potential for investment in public transport infrastructure which performs better than more dispersed development strategies. <p><i>'Of the major settlements, housing only scores as significant positive on Northstowe extension.'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact is differentiating the potential scale of delivery during the plan period, with Northstowe delivering a larger number in the plan period.. <p><i>'Not clear why packages 6 and 7 do not score well in terms of access to employment'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment is of the package as a whole. The packages include development away from Cambridge which does not score so highly in terms of this objective. Individually, the accessibility to employment of sites on the edge of Cambridge has been acknowledged. <p><i>'Plan will set in place a framework for development, infrastructure and other projects in the Plan period, with increased commuting, use of fuel, production of CO2 which will have cumulative and residual effects beyond the Plan period.'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SA acknowledges that further development on edge of Cambridge would have benefits for some objectives, including sustainable travel. However, this must be considered against the impact against other objectives. The potential cumulative impacts of this decision are highlighted by table 4.5. <p>Local Green Space was subject to a general SA and an assessment against criteria relevant to the designation. The site in Fulbourn was considered for residential development and was rejected.</p> <p>Great Shelford – Land at Cambridge Road was considered in development packages through the iterative process of plan making, but was eventually discounted due to site specific reasons documented in the audit trail.</p> <p>Fowlmere - Land west of High Street and Harston - Land to the rear of 98 - 102 High Street - Land west of High Street were tested in the SA, including considering site conditions, but rejected.</p>
Approach in	No change

Submission Local Plan	
----------------------------------	--

Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 1 Support: 1 Object: 0
Main Issues	Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England - We are satisfied with the conclusion of the assessment which identifies significant effects are unlikely alone or in combination with the four Area Action Plans identified. We note that Local Plans for neighbouring authorities will be reviewed with relation to specific potential impacts if considered appropriate; Natural England advises that to fulfil the requirements of the Conservation Regulations (2010) consideration of the in-combination effects with other relevant plans and projects should be included within the screening report.
Assessment	Neighbouring plans were scoped from an early stage of plan making, and identified in the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report. For the reasons established in the assessment of protected sites, no in combination effects were identified for further assessment at the initial assessment stage that accompanied the Issues and Options Report, or the draft Final HRA report that accompanied the Proposed Submission Local Plan. This has been clarified in the final report to accompany the submission plan.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change