



## **Appendix B**

### **South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework**

#### **Pre-Submission Development Control Policies DPD Responses to Representations**

**Special Council 15 November 2005**

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<b><i>PART B - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL POLICES DPD</i></b>				
<i>Objectives</i>				
11470 - GO-East	Object	We welcome the fact that you have produced a monitoring strategy in respect of the LDF as a whole. We consider, however, that each DPD should include its own monitoring strategy as part of the overall implementation framework and that, accordingly, the submission DPDs will need to incorporate and develop the relevant parts of the current separate monitoring document.	Agreed. All submission DPDs will include a monitoring chapter which will include the relevant indicators, drawn from the South Cambs Monitoring Strategy.	Include new Monitoring Chapters in each DPD to include relevant indicators drawn from the Monitoring Strategy.
7999 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	Provide new objective on social inclusion. DP/a "To ensure that new development is located so that it enables the maintenance and creation of a mixed and socially inclusive population for both existing and new communities."	Agree that it should be an objective to create socially inclusive communities.	Amend Objective DP/e to read: "To ensure that major new developments create distinctive, sustainable and healthy environments that meet the needs of residents and users and contribute towards the creation of vibrant socially inclusive communities."
9123 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships supports the policy objectives set out in the principle objectives. The critical objective in this context is 'place making'. The policy should emphasise the principles of connectivity, mix of uses, tenure mix, mix of densities and massing, local context and legibility as key features in developing a sense of place and identity. The policy should recognise the need to achieve a critical scale and balance of development, which will ensure balanced communities that can then contribute to the long-term viability of public and social infrastructure such as schools and local centres.	Support noted. These points are already covered by the Objectives in the Development Principles and other chapters.	
9937 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support	Support noted.	
8570 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision;  DP/1, DP/2, DP/3 and DP/8. HG/2, HG/5, HG/6, HG/7, HG/8 and HG/9. SF/1, SF/11 and SF/12. NE/4, NE/6, NE/7, NE/8, NE/11 and NE/13. CH/1, CH/2, CH/3, CH/4 and CH/5. TR/1 and TR/4.	Support noted.	
9026 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards	Support	The Boards support the objectives of development principles p29 DP/a to DP/f.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>DP/1 Sustainable Development</i>	11349 - House Builders Federation Object	<p>Criterion 5 - the provision of a Travel Plan to address the travel needs of labour during construction is neither realistically going to be practical or appropriate. No objection in principle to the submission of sustainability appraisals with planning applications. However, the specifications of labour and energy sources are not valid material planning considerations. Nor is it reasonable to dictate particular forms of sustainable provision without any regard to the costs that would arise. It is also unclear as to why a separate Health Impact Assessment will be required in addition to a Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	<p>All development must provide suitable infrastructure, facilities and services to make it acceptable in planning terms. The wording in the first paragraph of Policy DP/1 allows flexibility, recognising that not all development will need to meet every criterion as it will depend on the type of development, and where they are provided it will be of a scale and kind to the development. This accords with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. Policy DP/1 provides a checklist to developers, and many criteria cross-refer to other parts of the plan for the detailed policy. These policies accord with the latest government guidance and when considered collectively allow flexibility on a case-by-case basis to take into consideration financial viability.</p> <p>Criteria 5 begins "where practicable", which provides further flexibility. However, the provision of a Travel Plan should be considered, especially for larger developments, such as the major development locations where there will be a larger workforce. It should be feasible to make some provision to address the travel needs of their staff, which would accord with Policy TR/3 - Mitigating Travel Impact. Policy DP/1 does not specify labour and energy sources. However, developers will be expected to minimise their use of energy and maximise the use of renewable energy sources, in accordance with the principles of sustainable development and the energy policies in the Natural Environment chapter.</p> <p>Health is one of the topics covered by the Sustainability Appraisal of the policies in the LDF. Chapter 12 of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report outlines how development can impact on the populations' health, including through access to health care; a reliance on the private car limiting the ability to obtain services via walking or cycling; an insufficiently active population leading to a broad range of adverse health effects - the availability of publicly accessible open space offers opportunities for sport, play, and informal recreation, and is essential. Therefore it is justifiable to expect a Health Impact Assessment to be provided alongside planning applications for major development.</p>	Delete the word "labour" from paragraph 2.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7996 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	Change policy to ensure social inclusion is promoted in existing communities of the District.	Criteria 13 already refers to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities. This could be amended to refer to socially inclusive communities.	Amend criteria 13 to read: "Contribute to the creation of mixed and socially inclusive communities and provide for the health, education, recreation, community services and facilities, and social needs of all sections of the community."
10840 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	This policy is over elaborate. The content beyond the opening sentence is more appropriate for development briefs where design codes can be incorporated. Delete all policy text beyond opening sentence.	PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/1 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be sustainable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/1 accords with PPS12.	
9938 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	BayerCropScience supports the broad concept of sustainable development, provided the right balance is struck in interpreting policy between economic, social and environmental factors. As drafted, most of the sustainable criteria set out in DP/1 are capable of wide and subjective interpretation. This could lead to uncertainty and delay in formulating and negotiating planning proposals, contrary to the government's intention of speeding up the planning process and bringing more clarity to the system. On the other hand BayerCropScience fully expects the policy framework to rest on sustainable principles consonant with government policy guidance.	Policy DP/1 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be sustainable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis.	
10317 - Highways Agency	Object	We would suggest that Policy DP/1 includes reference to the need to produce a Travel Plan associated with the use of development, and not just to address travel needs of labour during construction of development as provided for in criteria 5.	The requirement for travel plans associated with the use of development is required in Policy TR/3.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11025 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Disappointed to see no reference to bridleways. In order not to exclude wider community, suggest in DP/1.2 after 'community transport, cycle' insert 'foot and where appropriate on horse-back'. Needs to reflect and be linked to Structure Plan policy P8/9.	Criteria 2 of Policy DP/1 refers to reducing the need to travel, and to providing access by modes other than the car. It is not appropriate to refer to horse back, as this is not a mode of travel. However, it is recognised in Policy TR/4 (and the proposed amendments in response to other representations received) as an important form of recreation.	
8991 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	Policy DP/1 sets out a number of sustainable development criteria against which proposed development will be assessed. The Policy is unduly repetitive in that most of the information contained in the criteria is duplicated in other sections of the Core Strategy DPD. Of the eighteen criteria in Policy DP/1, twelve (1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16 and 18) make reference to specific policies and text in other chapters of the DPD. This level of repetition is unnecessary and confusing and is contrary to advice in paragraphs 2.2 and 2.12.	PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/1 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be sustainable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/1 accords with PPS12.	
9617 - GO-East	Object	Further consideration should be given to whether the resultant policy is more strategic in nature and as such, would be more appropriately included in the Core Strategy DPD rather than the more detailed Development Control Policy DPD.	Whilst the sustainable development policy is clearly a policy which is overarching and applies to all development, it is very much about the details of how development comes forward and for matters considered through the development control process. It is not a key spatial policy in terms of the location of development and is therefore more appropriate in the Development Control Policies DPD rather than the Core Strategy DPD.	
7977 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	The statement 'Additional Cost will not, on its own, amount to impracticality' is not acceptable. The financial viability of a development scheme is the starting point for any developer who intends to initiate a development. The policy statement should be deleted and replaced with the following: "In seeking to achieve a high degree of sustainable development the financial viability of incorporating such development will be an important factor in assessing specific proposals".	All development must provide suitable infrastructure, facilities and services to make it acceptable in planning terms. The wording in the first paragraph of Policy DP/1 allows flexibility, recognising that not all development will need to meet every criterion as it will depend on the type of development, and where they are provided it will be of a scale and kind to the development. This accords with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. Policy DP/1 provides a checklist to developers, and many criteria cross-refer to other parts of the plan for the detailed policy. These policies accord with the latest government guidance and when considered collectively allow flexibility on a case-by-case basis to take into consideration financial viability.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9602 - GO-East	Object	Consideration should be given to reviewing all the criteria in the policy in order to reduce the overall number and particularly restricting criteria in policy DP/1 to those that are not repeated elsewhere, and rewording each retained criteria so that they are certain.	PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/1 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be acceptable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/1 accords with PPS12.	
9616 - GO-East 9601 - GO-East	Object	Some matters relate to those outside the scope of planning or relate to other matters that are delivered through alternative statutory mechanisms, or a phrased in a way as to render the criteria uncertain. If criteria relate to other matters beyond the land use planning, in accordance with the principles of spatial planning, the supporting text to the policy should clearly indicate how that criteria will be delivered and by what mechanism.	The Council considers that almost all the criteria in DP/1 are within the scope of the planning system. A case where the policy goes beyond the scope of the planning system is in criterion 6 in relation to the position of uses within buildings. This should be deleted from the policy. The other area which there could be questionable is the first part of criterion 5 concerning building methods and materials and similarly materials in criterion 6. However, this is a key issue in the achievement of sustainable development and it is helpful to retain it within the policy. The supporting text should be amended to clarify that these issues will be part of the overall consideration of the development proposal, but are not directly related to the planning system.	Revise criterion 6 of DP/1 to read:  "6. Where practicable, minimise use of energy and resources, both during construction and once implemented, through energy efficient design and materials, siting and orientation of buildings, and position of uses within buildings, in accordance with Policy NE/1;"  Add to the end of paragraph 3.4:  "It also includes references to key sustainability issues of building methods and materials, which will be part of the overall consideration of the development proposal, but are not directly related to the planning system."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10213 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	While accepting the additional cost will not in itself amount to impracticability, the wording of the policy ought to reflect the fact that excessive costs can threaten individual projects and an 'economically practicable' approach ought to be adopted to cost issues in respect of sustainability.	All development must provide suitable infrastructure, facilities and services to make it acceptable in planning terms. The wording in the first paragraph of Policy DP/1 allows flexibility, recognising that not all development will need to meet every criterion as it will depend on the type of development, and where they are provided it will be of a scale and kind to the development. This accords with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. Policy DP/1 provides a checklist to developers, and many criteria cross-refer to other parts of the plan for the detailed policy. These policies accord with the latest government guidance and when considered collectively allow flexibility on a case-by-case basis to take into consideration financial viability.	
8892 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	As written, the policy does not accord with guidance to keep plan content succinct. Rather than prescribe sustainability requirements in detail the Policy need simply state that permission will only be granted for development that is consistent with the principles of sustainable development, outlining the fundamental sustainable development principles that should be sought in line with national planning guidance. The proposed changes will help meet the following tests of soundness as set out in paragraph 4.24 of PPS12: viii and ix.	PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/1 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be sustainable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/1 accords with PPS12.	
9600 - GO-East	Object	Support is expressed for the objective of including an explicit policy relating to achieving sustainable development. However policy largely duplicates other policies by including general broad statements that are then cross-reference/defer detail to other policies in the DPD.	PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/1 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be sustainable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/1 accords with PPS12.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8937 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports this policy.	Support noted.	
9410 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
9322 - Sport England East	Support	The provision in policy DP/1 for requiring major developments to submit a Health Impact Assessment is welcomed.	Support noted.	
9722 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds	Support	<p>The RSPB supports the inclusion of an over-arching policy for development in the district to be consented only if it complies with a series of criteria representing sustainable development.</p> <p>The RSPB particularly support the inclusion of criteria that development proposals will have to comply with to get permission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <input type="checkbox"/> The use of energy efficiency and renewable energy</li> <li>- <input type="checkbox"/> Water conservation</li> <li>- <input type="checkbox"/> Minimising flood risk</li> <li>- <input type="checkbox"/> Conserving and enhancing biodiversity</li> </ul>	Support noted.	
11053 - Environment Agency	Support	We support the requirements for sustainable development in the district. The approaches towards water conservation, flood risk minimisation, SUDs, climate change, pollution prevention and biodiversity are supported by the agency.	Support noted.	
10212 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University supports the 'where practicable' approach to sustainable development set out in Policy DP/1 and the recognition that on occasions it may be impracticable to meet fully the requirements of the Policy.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
1. 10304 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We object to the Council's 'blanket' approach in applying the sequential approach to the location of new residential development, with only limited development within villages. This approach provides no flexibility to facilitate previously developed brownfield sites within village locations to come forward for development as part of a balanced scheme.	The sequence to development detailed in Structure Plan Policies P1/1 and P9/2, which clearly states that development should be accommodated through an expansion of Cambridge, the creation of a small town (Northstowe) and a limited proportion of development at the identified Rural Centres. Policy ST/1 is therefore in accordance with this approach, with the majority of development to be accommodated at the major development sites at Northstowe and the urban extensions to Cambridge. The development of these sites will include the re-use of previously developed land, such as Oakington Airfield and Cambridge Airport and the North Works site north of Newmarket Road. Policy P1/1 goes on to state that when selecting sites, consideration should be given to the reuse of brownfield sites within settlements, then on other sites within settlements, and only then on the periphery of settlements giving priority to previously developed sites. In determining the strategy for the rural area, the Council undertook an Urban Capacity Study, which provides land supply calculations, including consideration of windfall potential through sites within the village frameworks, and demonstrates that allocation of additional housing outside the Rural Centres is not required. Therefore, the Council does not need to consider the redevelopment of brownfield sites outside of the village frameworks.	
2. 11029 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Suggest DP/1.2 could be improved through the addition of the following words "and where appropriate equestrian routes" after "pedestrian and cycling".	Criteria 2 of Policy DP/1 refers to reducing the need to travel, and to providing access by modes other than the car. It is not appropriate to refer to horse back, as this is not a mode of travel. However, it is recognised in Policy TR/4 (and the proposed amendments in response to other representations received) as an important form of recreation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10305 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We consider that the text should be amended to reflect circumstances where the accessibility of a location is capable of improvement through development. We would suggest the following text is added - 'or in areas that are capable of being highly accessible by public transport...'	Agree. This would also be consistent with the approach in Policy TR/1.	Amend criteria 2 to read: "Minimise the need to travel and reduce car dependency, by locating development in areas which are (or are capable of being) highly accessible by public transport, community transport, cycle and on foot, by providing a permeable development that has an appropriate level of public transport in accordance with TR/1, and direct pedestrian and cycling routes to services and facilities."
10314 - Highways Agency	Support	The Highways Agency fully supports criteria 2 of Policy DP/1 and the objectives set out in Chapter 10, that seeks to ensure that development is located in areas highly accessible by public transport, cycling and walking thereby reducing the need to travel by car. This is of course fully in line with Government policy that seeks to reduce car use.	Support noted.	
<b>3.</b>				
7931 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	Development should use brownfield sites but the CLA is concerned that the scale of new developments should respect the density of existing developments; a drive for higher densities is sensible in many places but this should be tempered in rural communities to avoid inappropriate results. Redevelopment of derelict farmyards to achieve compact schemes with a good appearance should also be supported to sustain the rural economy.	The development strategy permits the redevelopment of brownfield sites within village frameworks, in accordance with policies ST/3 - ST/6, of a scale that accords with its location. Other policies in the plan will ensure appropriate densities of development to accord with PPG3, whilst ensuring good design that respects and is compatible with its surroundings.	
10306 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Support	We support the principle of making efficient and effective use of land by giving priority to the use of brownfield sites.	Support noted.	
<b>6.</b>				
8893 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	Without prejudice to the view that this level of detail does not need to be included in policy DP/1 the sections of the policy that relate in particular to matters dealing with renewable energy and sustainable construction recognise the practical issues that need to be addressed. The same recognition needs to be incorporated in this section of the policy. Hence section 6 should commence 'where practicable' in order to meet the following tests of soundness as set out in paragraph 4.24 of PPS12: vi, vii and ix.	Agree criteria 6 should be amended.	Amend criteria 6 to read: "Where practicable, minimise use of energy and resources, both during construction and once implemented, through energy efficient design and materials, siting and orientation of buildings, and position of uses within buildings, in accordance with Policy NE/1."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>8.</i>				
10135 - Fairview New Homes	Object	It has yet to be demonstrated that the end purchasers pay higher prices for houses as a result of the provision of a number of energy initiatives sought within the document, and as such the cost is currently borne by the developer. Such requirements potentially affect the viability of delivering development in the District and meeting primary objectives such as meeting housing targets, particularly sites which were bought some time ago, in advance of energy policies. As such Fairview object to the following requirements. □ Fairview object to the requirement in Policy DP/1 and Policy NE/15 that development should incorporate water recycling measures.	Policies DP/1 and NE/15 require the incorporation of water conservation measures, such as grey water recycling. However, it is agreed that examples of the types of measures that could be used should be part of the reasoned justification, not the policy itself.	Amend criteria 8 to read: "Incorporate water conservation measures in accordance with Policy NE/15."
8895 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	The policy should not make a commitment to grey water recycling at this stage. Suggested wordings are proposed to address particular issues, commercial and technical, surrounding the conservation of water resources.	Agreed. Examples of the types of measures that could be used should be part of the reasoned justification, not the policy itself.	Amend criteria 8 to read: "Incorporate water conservation measures in accordance with Policy NE/15."
<i>11.</i>				
8896 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	Section 6 should commence 'where practicable' in order to address the following tests of soundness as set out in paragraph 4.24 of PPS12: ix.	Agree criteria 6 should be amended.	Amend criteria 6 to read: "Where practicable, minimise use of energy and resources, both during construction and once implemented, through energy efficient design and materials, siting and orientation of buildings, and position of uses within buildings, in accordance with Policy NE/1."
<i>16.</i>				
8345 - CPRE	Object	Point 16 'Conserve and enhance local landscape character, in accordance with Policy NE/4;' Wish to change this to 'Conserve and enhance local and historic landscape characters in accordance with Policies NE/4 and CH/1.' NE/4 relates to the landscapes, wildlife and natural features (ref. para.8.14 Countryside Agency/English Nature). CH/1 relates to the historic landscape features relating to human activity (para.9.1) of creation of parklands, waterways, trackways, hedges, field patterns, etc.	Criteria 18 refers to the conservation and enhancement of cultural heritage and is the more applicable criteria to include reference to historic landscapes.	Amend criteria 18 to read: "Conserve and enhance cultural heritage, including listed buildings, conservation areas, historic landscapes, ancient monuments and archaeological interest, in accordance with policies CH/3, CH/5, CH/1 and CH/2."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>17.</i>				
10117 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to the requirement in Policy DP/1 paragraph 17 that the community and providers of community services should be involved in the design process. Such a policy should not be included as a development control policy, but should be a matter for the Local Development Framework's Statement of Community Involvement. There should not be a blanket requirement for community involvement in the design process of all types and scales of development. This would simply be unworkable, as much as anything else. The decision to undertake consultation and the appropriate form of consultation should be discussed with the developer based on the specific situation.	PPS1 requires more effective community involvement in the planning process to achieve sustainable development. Paragraph 41 states "Local communities should be given the opportunity to participate fully in the process for drawing up specific plans or policies and to be consulted on proposals for development." The community has the opportunity through the various public participation exercises required by the planning process to influence the policies in the development plan. It is also legitimate to require the involvement of the community in the design process in accordance with PPS1.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
8897 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	It should not be the responsibility of the applicant or developer to demonstrate the impracticability of using sustainable methods of construction. It is for the developer to demonstrate how development will achieve sustainable development taking into account commercial and socio-economic aspects as well as technical practicalities.	To be acceptable in planning terms development is required to be sustainable, which includes the way that it is constructed. Policy DP/1 seeks to achieve sustainable development, and each criterion addresses certain aspects as to how this can be achieved. If these are not achieved, it has implications for the overall sustainability of the development. Therefore applicants would need to justify why they are compromising on certain elements and not achieving a sustainable development before the application can be determined, otherwise the application could be refused for non-conforming to policy.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 3</i>				
8898 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	It is unreasonable to request that all major planning applications are required to submit a Sustainability Appraisal and a Health Impact Assessment. It is suggested that the requirement is reworded to state: 'Planning applications should be accompanied by a level of information that would enable the assessment of all the significant environmental impacts.'	The requirement for a Sustainability Appraisal and Health Impact Assessment to accompany planning applications is legitimate to ensure developers address all the relevant issues and provide a sufficient level of information to fully assess the impacts of the development on sustainability objectives, including health. Guidance is available for the preparation of both in the form of a Sustainable Communities Checklist and guidance on the preparation of HIAs on the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) website.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8330 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the imperative requiring a Health Impact Assessment, which is now a statutory requirement, to inform thinking on whether sustainability principles are achieved.	Health is one of the topics covered by the Sustainability Appraisal of the policies in the LDF. Chapter 12 of the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report outlines how development can impact on the populations' health, including through access to health care; a reliance on the private car limiting the ability to obtain services via walking or cycling; an insufficiently active population leading to a broad range of adverse health effects - the availability of publicly accessible open space offers opportunities for sport, play, and informal recreation, and is essential. Therefore it is justifiable to expect a Health Impact Assessment to be provided alongside planning applications for major development.	
8932 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Object	The requirement to provide a health impact assessment should be deleted. Without prejudice, if this is not agreed, then at the very minimum additional text needs to be inserted into Policy DP/1 to explain what a health impact assessment is intended to achieve, and what information it should encompass.	Agree more detail is required, but this should be incorporated in the reasoned justification.	Add a new paragraph after paragraph 3.6: "Guidance on the preparation of a Health Impact Assessment can be found on the 'Health Impact Assessment Gateway' on the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) website."
9004 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Support	The PCT welcomes the requirement for a Sustainability Appraisal and Health Impact Assessment to be submitted by applicants for major developments. We would be keen to work with the District Council and applicants to incorporate Health objectives into an integrated Sustainability Appraisal framework.	Support noted.	
<b>3.5</b>				
9011 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Object	To be consistent with Policy DP/1 para 3, Health Impact assessment needs to be added.	Agree, paragraph 3.5 should also refer to Health Impact Statements.	Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.5 to read: "All planning applications for major development are required to submit a Sustainability Appraisal and a Health Impact Statement to demonstrate that they have addressed sustainability issues, including impact on health, in their development proposals."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<b>3.6</b>				
9323 - Sport England East	Object	As HIAs are a relatively new concept, the reasoned justification (e.g. paragraph 3.6) should provide some guidance on what HIAs are and how to find out more about the preparation of HIAs. This would be consistent with the approach taken to sustainability appraisals and would help with the implementation of the policy by providing more clarity. For further information on what HIAs are and for guidance on toolkits, case studies etc, the NHS has a one stop shop website which can be viewed at <a href="http://www.publichealth.nice.org.uk/page.aspx?o=HIAGateway">www.publichealth.nice.org.uk/page.aspx?o=HIAGateway</a>	Agree, it would be useful to provide further reasoned justification on the preparation of Health Impact Assessments, to be consistent with the approach for Sustainability Appraisals.	Add a new paragraph after paragraph 3.6: "Guidance on the preparation of a Health Impact Assessment can be found on the 'Health Impact Assessment Gateway' on the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) website."
9217 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Support	Whilst we fully support the use of a Sustainable Communities Checklist, this has not yet been developed by Cambridgeshire Horizons. The PCT should be fully engaged in the development of this checklist.	Support noted.	Advise Cambridgeshire Horizons of the PCT's wish to be involved in developing the Sustainable Communities Checklist and support for it.
<b>DP/2 Design of New Development</b>				
11037 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Existing accesses should include those for equestrians as well - they are lawful users of public bridleways and byways as well as roads and their accesses need to be protected/enhanced also.	Policy DP/2 deals with the design of new development and criterion 5 already requires permeable development for all sectors of the community and all modes, including links to footways, cycleways, rights of way, green spaces and roads. Policy TR/4 also deals with protecting and enhancing the rights of way network.	
9604 - GO-East	Object	Some criteria read more as an objective or intent rather than a generic development control policy criteria whilst the wording of the other criteria is uncertain or whether the scope of the application of the criteria is as intended e.g. seeks to apply requirement to all development irrespective of the scale of the development.	All development must be designed appropriately to make it acceptable in planning terms. PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/2 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be acceptable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/2 accords with PPS12.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9613 - GO-East	Object	Additionally, the authority should review the scope of application of the criteria to ensure that it is appropriate and will not result in an overly onerous requirement being placed on applicants.	All development must be designed appropriately to make it acceptable in planning terms. PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/2 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be acceptable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/2 accords with PPS12.	
10839 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	Similar to DP/1 this policy is over elaborate and more suited to a development brief relevant to a particular project area. Delete all text beyond opening sentence under sub headings "Design of New Development", "Design and Landscape" and "Access Statement".	PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/2 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be acceptable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/2 accords with PPS12.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9606 - GO-East	Object	Consideration should be given to reviewing all the criteria in the policy in order to reduce the overall number and particularly restricting criteria in policy DP/2 to those that are not repeated elsewhere. All remaining criteria should be reworded so that they are certain.	PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/2 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be acceptable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/2 accords with PPS12.	
11030 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Whilst noting that the principles for design of new development do not include reference to the need to include space for the storage of recyclables, it is hoped that this can be included in supplementary planning document on design, as referred to in para 3.10.	Policy DP/3 requires the provision of screened storage of refuse, including recyclables and paragraph 3.14 refers to a Supplementary Planning Document for various aspects of development dealt with in Policy DP/3, including storage and collection of waste and recycling.	
9614 - GO-East	Object	Further consideration should be given to whether the resultant policy is more strategic in nature and as such, would be more appropriately included in the Core Strategy DPD rather than the more detailed Development Control Policy DPD.	Whilst the sustainable development policy is clearly a policy which is overarching and applies to all development, it is very much about the details of how development comes forward and for matters considered through the development control process. It is not a key spatial policy in terms of the location of development and is therefore more appropriate in the Development Control Policies DPD rather than the Core Strategy DPD.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9603 - GO-East	Object	Whilst we fully support the principle of including an explicit policy relating to design, which is a matter that PPS1 places at the centre of achieving sustainable communities, the policy in part duplicates other policies by including general broad statements that are then cross-referenced/defer detail to other policies in the DPD.	All development must be designed appropriately to make it acceptable in planning terms. PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/2 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be acceptable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/2 accords with PPS12.	
11034 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	This policy should include a reference to designing a development that maximises accessibility to the public transport and cycling /pedestrian network.	Policy DP/2 deals with the design of new development and criterion 5 already requires permeable development for all sectors of the community and all modes, including links to footways, cycleways, rights of way, green spaces and roads. In addition, policies DP/1, DP/3 and DP/4 deal with physical requirements of development, including infrastructure, requiring development to maximise accessibility to public transport and the cycling / pedestrian network.	
10214 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	The University objects to the inclusion of the word 'minimise' in relation to visual impact in Point 1 of Policy DP/2. Paragraph 3.7 points out that all development will have an impact on its surroundings. Minimising visual impact will not always be the appropriate design solution and would appear to exclude the 'interesting skylines, vistas, focal points and landmarks' referred to in point 4 of the Policy. The Policy as currently drafted would seem to discourage the design of buildings that could make a positive contribution to their surroundings but not necessarily have a minimal impact. The University would suggest that 'minimise' be replaced with the phrase 'be acceptable in terms of visual impact'.	Agree it is important to get development to be visually acceptable and not mitigate against the visual impact of a poor design, for example, through landscaping. There may be instances where a landmark building would have a visual impact on the surrounding area, but with good design this could be acceptable.	Amend criteria 1 of Policy DP/2 to read: "Preserve or enhance the character of the local area, having regard to the Landscape Character Area within which it is located in accordance with Policy NE/3, and be acceptable in terms of visual impact."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9127 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships welcomes and supports high quality design. English Partnerships requests that the policy recognises the need for design criteria to be flexible and adaptive in response to changing circumstances and requirements over time. For example; future technological advances that may improve design, affordability, socio/economic circumstances, building construction methods and materials.	Policy DP/2 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be acceptable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the design issues that will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis taking account of local circumstances and the development proposals, therefore providing flexibility.	
11056 - Environment Agency	Support	We support the principles of the Design of New Development, in particular points 2, 5 and 8 of the policy.	Support noted.	
9411 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
8938 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports this policy, particularly points 2 and 8.	Support noted.	
9021 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Support	The Trust supports the principle of providing an increased supply of smaller units; this will help meet the needs of health workers and other similar staff.	Support noted.	
<i>Second Bullet 5.</i>				
11035 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Welcome explicit reference to rights of way, a very important means of sustainable transport, and the importance of permeability and connectivity to the wider highway/rights of way network.	Support noted.	
<i>5.</i>				
9149 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Object	Need to ensure that this includes bridleways as well as footpaths.	Agree.	Amend DP2 (5) to include bridleways.
9136 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Support	Welcome inclusion of Rights of Way.	Support noted.	
<i>7.</i>				
9139 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Support	Welcome inclusion of green spaces and green corridors for recreation as public spaces.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>b.</i>				
8899 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	The requirement for an accurate site survey at outline application stage is considered unnecessary. Detailed information should be sought at the more detailed stages of approval. The Design Statement may include details of existing features without detailed survey. Such information may be required prior to detailed approvals. Section (b) should be amended to read: 'Details of the principal landscape and topographical features'.	The policy requires a Design and Landscape Statement that is compatible with the scale and complexity of the proposal. The Statement needs to provide sufficient level of detail to enable a planning application to be determined. This will vary depending on whether the application is for a small or large scale development and whether it is in outline, detailed or for reserved matters. The policy applies district wide and needs to reflect all circumstances. More detailed policy guidance is included in the Area Action Plan for the major developments.	
<i>d.</i>				
11040 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Should include equestrians - they are lawful users of public bridleways and byways as well as roads and their accesses need to be protected/enhanced also.	Agree.	Amend Policy DP/2 (d):  Existing accesses for pedestrians, cyclists, EQUESTRIANS, and vehicles.
<i>Policy Paragraph 3</i>				
8105 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	This matter is addressed under the Building Regulations and separate legislation. The requirement is therefore an unnecessary duplication of bureaucracy. Also it needs to be borne in mind that planning is often the first stage in the development process and details may not be known at the time of making applications. Remove reference to the Access Statement.	The purpose of policy DP/2 is to "mainstream" planning for inclusive design and to ensure that accessibility is considered from the outset as an integral part of the whole "design concept". Its intention is to ensure that the built environment (not just buildings) does not contain unnecessary physical barriers to employment, services, education or transport. One of the purposes of the transition to spatial planning nationally is to balance demands for development against the need to protect the environment and to achieve social and economic objectives, in terms of DP/2 this means inclusive design. The Access Statement should be proportional to the level / stage of development of the proposal, as the design develops the access statement will too, a detailed access statement would not be expected for an outline planning application. There is no conflict or duplication of regulatory regimes, the principles of built environment accessibility begins before the planning stage and does not stop once building work has finished. The access statement should progressively develop in time. The provision of access statements will help ensure that the local authority does not approve planning applications where physical features that may be open to challenge under the disability discrimination act are constructed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<b>3.7</b>				
11054 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Reference to County Council's "Public rights of way - a Guide for planners and developers" is not included anywhere and could be mentioned in this section. This document is available at: <a href="http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/environment/countryside/default.aspx">http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/environment/countryside/default.aspx</a>	Policy TR/4 deals with public rights of way, as is the more appropriate place for including a reference to this guide.	Add a new sentence to the end of paragraph 10.11 as follows: "Cambridgeshire County Council's 'Public Rights of Way - A Guide for Planners and Developers' offers guidance and advice on how adverse impacts of development on Public Rights of Way can be avoided, and how opportunities for enhancing the path network can be pursued.
<b>3.8</b>				
11047 - Cambridgeshire County Council 11045 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The second sentence should make reference to the need for more public open space.	This is unnecessary as the third sentence of paragraph 3.8 states "Higher densities and smaller gardens place added importance on the need for quality landscaping and open space in developments in order to maintain quality of life."	
<b>3.9</b>				
11057 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Will the public know what a development that is "legible" means? (paragraph 3.9) Suggest that this term is explained in the paragraph.	Legible is defined in a dictionary as clear and understandable. Therefore in paragraph 3.9 it means that the layout of development is clear and understandable to people. This is self-explanatory and does not need further explanation, especially in the wider context of PPS1.	
<b>3.10</b>				
10802 - Comberton Parish Council	Object	Comberton's Village Design Statement, when finalised, should be recognised as Planning Guidance associated to the LDF.	Noted. Paragraph 3.10 already requires consideration of individual village design statements or Parish Plans in conjunction with Policy DP/2, where these have been adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). They will only be adopted as SPD where they are consistent with policies in the LDF.	
<b>3.12</b>				
11055 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Typo in paragraph 3.12 - should be "accessible" not "accessibility".	Noted.	Change "accessibility" to read "accessible".

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>DP/3 Development Criteria</i>				
9131 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships requests that the policy makes allowance for a flexible and responsive approach to determining planning applications; the development checklist should be flexible, adaptive and act as a framework of parameters rather than a prescriptive set of criteria. Clearly it is important that planning guidance provides contextual background but this should be considered on a site by site basis with an understanding of development opportunities as presented. English Partnerships notes that many of the criteria set out in this policy are for the main part repeated elsewhere in the document, and would argue therefore that their inclusion is superfluous.	All development must provide suitable infrastructure, facilities and services to make it acceptable in planning terms. The wording "as appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposed use" allows flexibility to recognise that not all development will need to meet every criterion as it will depend on the type of development, and where they are provided it will be of a scale and kind to the development. This accords with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.	
10319 - Highways Agency	Object	<p>We have concerns that a number of future development sites being proposed in the District will potentially affect trunk road demand, and in some cases proposes new access to the trunk road network. Such new accesses would be contrary to Government policy relating to new access to the network, and the emerging Development Plan Document provides no supporting evidence to demonstrate that there is an overriding public or national need for additional junctions that could compromise the free-flow of traffic on the trunk road. The new accesses would also appear to be contrary to the objectives set out in Chapter 10 that seek 'to encourage modal shift, particularly away from private cars' as they could provide easy car access to parts of the District via the trunk road network thereby undermining the purpose of the network, which is of course primarily to serve long distance travel.</p> <p>There are several references within the 'Travel' chapter that suggest potential developers should have cognisance of Cambridgeshire County Council's current Local Transport Plan. However, there are no specific references to potential constraints in relation to the capacity and access to the Trunk road and/or the Highway Agency's policy regarding control of development adjacent to the Trunk Road network. These omissions are especially disappointing given the quantity of Trunk Roads within South Cambs.</p>	<p>The development plan seeks to reduce the need to travel, and where unavoidable, achieve access by non-car modes. Policy TR/1 will not permit development where additional travel demand is not sufficiently addressed through providing modal choice, and Policy TR/3 is concerned with mitigating traffic impact and requires a Transport Assessment be undertaken for development with 'significant transport implications', in accordance with PPG13. Policy DP/3 criteria 2 is concerned with securing "appropriate access from the highway network that does not compromise safety." Whilst not making explicit mention of the trunk road network, these policies address concerns raised.</p> <p>Historically development which came forward through policies in Local Plan 2004 made provision to mitigate their impacts, for example, development at Cambourne contributed to the dualling of the A428 and Cambridge Northern Fringe provides additional capacity at existing junctions onto the A14. Similarly, the LDF should ensure that future development adequately mitigates its impact. The Highways Agency has been fully engaged in the early work on planning the major developments at Northstowe and Cambridge East with active membership on the Transport Topic Groups. The Highways Authority is also consulted on all planning applications in the vicinity of the trunk road network and if a planning application were considered to jeopardise the trunk road network in any way, could recommend appropriate mitigation or even refusal.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7983 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	To use the word 'must' goes beyond reasonable terminology in the formulation of planning policy. The list of requirements are all material considerations which should be taken into account in the determination of a planning application. 'Must' is too emphatic and inflexible even with the caveat wording and it would be appropriate to replace it with 'should'.	All development must provide suitable infrastructure, facilities and services to make it acceptable in planning terms. The wording "as appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposed use" allows flexibility to recognise that not all development will need to meet every criterion as it will depend on the type of development, and where they are provided it will be of a scale and kind to the development. This accords with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.	
9631 - GO-East	Object	Further consideration should be given to whether the resultant policy is more strategic in nature and as such, would be more appropriately included in the Core Strategy DPD rather than the more detailed Development Control Policy DPD, or whether the remaining criteria are such that the policy is no longer required by virtue of all the matters being covered in policies elsewhere.	Whilst the development Criteria policy is clearly a policy which is overarching and applies to all development, it is very much about the details of how development comes forward and for matters considered through the development control process. It is not a key spatial policy in terms of the location of development and is therefore more appropriate in the Development Control Policies DPD rather than the Core Strategy DPD. Whilst it does involve some repetition with other policies of the plan, it is considered helpful to provide a comprehensive "checklist" for developers in preparing their planning applications.	
10044 - House Builders Federation	Object	The policy begins by stating that all development proposals must provide, as appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposed use: 1. Affordable housing: this requirement applies to both residential (Policy HG/3) and employment development (Policy ET/2). The HBF would point out that not all housing or employment development will be required to provide affordable as they might be below the relevant thresholds. Furthermore, even those developments above the relevant thresholds will not always be required to provide affordable housing as they will be addressing other planning gain requirements and would not be viably able to deliver affordable housing as well. The text needs to be amended in order to reflect this.	All development must provide suitable infrastructure, facilities and services to make it acceptable in planning terms. The wording "as appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposed use" allows flexibility to recognise that not all development will need to meet every criterion as it will depend on the type of development, and where they are provided it will be of a scale and kind to the development. This accords with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. Policy DP/3 provides a checklist to developers, and many criteria cross-refer to other parts of the plan for the detailed policy. For example, criterion 1 seeks affordable housing in accordance with policies HG/3 and ET/2. Therefore, if the proposed development is not required to provide affordable housing by policies HG/3 or ET/2, it will not be a requirement for the development to provide it.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8998 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	This development control Policy results in unnecessary duplication and complication of the Core StrategyDPD. The Policy repeats polices/text contained within other sections of the DPD and is repetitive. Of the nine criteria setting out provisions for new development, six refer to other policies in the document and of the ten criteria relating to impact of proposed development, nine simply repeat policy considerations outlined elsewhere in the document. Guidance in PPS12 advises that the core strategy should contain clear and concise policies (para 2.12). The level of repetition in Policy DP3 is contrary to this advice.	PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/3 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be acceptable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/3 accords with PPS12.	
9629 - GO-East	Object	The policy largely duplicates other policies by including general broad statements that are then cross-reference/defer detail to other policies in the DPD. A key principle of the new planning system, as set out in PPS12, is that development plan documents should not be a compendium of use related policies that duplicate other policies in the LDF	PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/3 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be acceptable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/3 accords with PPS12.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9630 - GO-East	Object	Consideration should be given to reviewing all the criteria in the policy in order to reduce the overall number and particularly restricting criteria in policy DP/3 to those that are not repeated elsewhere.	PPS12 paragraph 2.2 states "the format of LDDs should be clear, succinct and easily understood by all". Paragraph 2.28 also states "the LDF should contain a limited suite of policies which set out the criteria against which planning applications for development and use of land and buildings will be considered." Policy DP/3 is a criteria-based policy providing a checklist for developers for new development to be acceptable, and should provide greater certainty to developers over the issues which will be considered in determining planning applications. It is not intended that every criteria will be applicable to every development, nor that they will each have equal weight. This will be a matter to be considered on a case-by-case basis. Other policies in the LDF provide greater detail on a number of issues to avoid an unduly lengthy and confusing policy. Therefore, the approach in Policy DP/3 accords with PPS12.	
9412 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
8939 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports this policy, particularly points f, g & i.	Support noted.	
<i>1.</i>				
10311 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Needs From Employment Development, ET/2 Meeting Housing Needs From Employment Development We object in principle to these policies which require the provision of affordable housing resulting from employment development, on the basis that it is unreasonable.	The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need and included in Policy HG/3. Therefore, to help address the shortfall, it is appropriate for employment development to contribute as they generate further demand for affordable housing over and above existing levels of demand.	
8425 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	Council strongly supports the requirement for both housing and employment land should provide affordable housing.	Support noted.	
<i>2.</i>				
11059 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	-Recommend change "appropriate access from the highway network" to "appropriate access from the highway, including rights of way, network" as many people do not realise rights of way are also highways. -Equestrian needs largely ignored in the whole document - despite recognition of growth in "horsiculture" in 5.37. Request that "cycling and pedestrian infrastructure" is changed to "cycling and pedestrian and where appropriate equestrian infrastructure".	This policy focuses on modes of transport. It adequately cross references to policies in the transport chapter dealing with pedestrian access.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>3.13</i>				
9607	Object	I found the document generally clear and well expressed. The only paragraph that I found opaque was paragraph 3.13 (on page 37), particularly the second half of the paragraph.	Agree, the paragraph could be clearer.	Amend last sentence of paragraph 3.13 to read: "To avoid an overly lengthy and complex policy, many of the criteria cross-refer to other policies in the Plan, which provide the full detail."
<i>DP/4 Infrastructure and New Developments</i>				
8900 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	Any planning contribution sought must be materially and reasonably connected to the proposed development and deemed necessary to allow development to proceed. There is no need to refer to running costs within the policy.	<p>The policy does not presume all types of planning obligations will be required from all developments. It makes clear they will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact on the surrounding area. However some obligations, relating to strategic infrastructure for the subregion, will use standard charges where appropriate. Strategic openspace is one such use being considered on a subregional basis.</p> <p>Planning Circular 05/2005 B.18 states: 'Where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance (i.e. physical upkeep). Such provision may be required in perpetuity.' Paragraph B.19 also refers to 'pump priming', to provide initial support for new facilities where necessary.</p> <p>It is therefore correct that the policy refers to the potential requirement for costs to be provided via a planning obligation, however, it is acknowledged that the policy could be clarified.</p> <p>With regard to the list of potential areas of contribution, the points in brackets provide greater clarity as to what might be expected. they should therefore be retained in the policy. contributions</p>	Amend 3rd paragraph of policy DP/4:  'DEPENDING ON THE NATURE OF THE SERVICES AND FACILITIES, contributions may also be required to meet [running] MAINTENANCE AND / OR OPERATING costs EITHER AS PUMP PRIMING OR IN PERPETUITY, [of services and facilities]provided through an obligation .'
9939 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Whilst there is no quarrel with the principle of having a 'planning obligations' policy it is not helpful to have a vague all-embracing shopping list as proposed at present. The policy should be more precise and proportionate to the impact of the development concerned. As drafted, particularly in the absence of the text of the proposed SPD, the policy gives no certainty to a developer as to what to expect and will lead to unnecessary delay and complication in the negotiation of planning permissions	Planning Circular 05/2005 paragraph B.26 states,'More detailed policies applying the principles set out in the development Plan Document (e.g. application to specific localities and likely quantum of contributions)ought then to be included in Supplementary Planning Documents.' Policy DP/4, and the supplementary planning documents proposed in the Local Development Scheme are consistent with this approach.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10045 - House Builders Federation	Object	The standards and formulae for the calculation of site development costs will be completely unknown. Furthermore, given that SPD documents will not be subject to independent public examination (which DPD documents will) there would be limited opportunity to challenge their content. There is also an absence of information about what will be covered by the Strategic Infrastructure SPD, what will be covered by the Local Infrastructure SPD, and what will be the precise relationship between the two documents. Consequently, the HBF questions whether under the new planning system SPD's are the appropriate mechanism for dealing with matters of infrastructure provision.	Planning Circular 05/2005 paragraph B.26 states, 'More detailed policies applying the principles set out in the development Plan Document (e.g. application to specific localities and likely quantum of contributions) ought then to be included in Supplementary Planning Documents.' Policy DP/4, and the supplementary planning documents proposed in the Local Development Scheme are consistent with this approach.	
11146 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Given the level of basic infrastructure provision necessary to enable the development to take place, the plan should acknowledge the potential role of a range of service providers who typically contribute to the delivery of sustainable community living, namely the public, voluntary and commercial sectors. As such Fairview object to Policy CE/12 - that planning obligations should be sought for a full range of publicly and community provided services and facilities and services and facilitates that are to be provided by the community and voluntary sector. Requirements for such provision should conform to Circular 05/2005.	The Cambridge East Area Action Plan acknowledges that not all services and facilities will be provided by the public or commercial sectors. Some facilities at Cambridge East will be best provided through the direct involvement of community or voluntary sector e.g. facilities for faith and social and sporting clubs. The service providers are collaborating to establish what services and facilities should be provided as well as how they should best be provided and the AAP includes an indicative but not exclusive list of services and facilities to be explored for the first phase of development north of Newmarket Road and Cambridge East as a whole in order to establish a vibrant and sustainable community from the outset of development.	
10215 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	<p>1. The University is a not for profit organisation which relies on public funding and as such its developments should not be liable to the level of infrastructure charges that would be expected from commercial developers. The University believes that it should be exempt from making contributions to community services and facilities that are not strictly 'necessary' to enable its developments to proceed.</p> <p>2. Circular 05/2005 sets out the tests which planning obligations must meet. The Secretary of State requires that planning obligations should only be sought when they meet all five tests. The University considers that the services and facilities listed in Policy DP/4 and for which contributions may be sought, may not meet all of those tests. Those which do not should be deleted.</p>	The policy already states that the nature and scale of any planning obligations sought will be related to the form of the development. If obligations are not appropriate they will not be required, and this can be determined at the planning application stage. The policy also makes clear that not all of the types of obligations listed will be required in all cases, however, there will be cases where any of the the types listed may be required to make a development acceptable.	
11143 - Fairview New Homes	Object	The policy should state that the need for the provision of infrastructure, community facilities and other requirements set out in the document, should be considered in conjunction with the level of services and provision that already exists and may reasonably serve the site.	Such a consideration is already included in the 1st paragraph of policy DP/4, where it states that the nature and scale of any planning obligation will relate to the potential impact of a development on the surrounding area.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10277 - Stannifer	Object	Policy DP/4 does not have regard to the advice set out in Circular 5/2005 as it sets out a 'shopping list' of potential requirements rather than make clear how developer contributions relate to various sites. In particular, the policy needs to relate to specific proposals, particularly in respect of the strategic sites, to meet structure plan requirements.	<p>Rather than creating a 'shopping list' of requirements, Policy DP/8 makes clear that obligations may be required, and the potential nature of those obligations. The policy states that the nature and scale of any planning obligations sought will be related to the form of the development, and its potential impact on the surrounding area. It also makes clear that not all of the types of obligations listed will be required in all cases, however, there will be cases where any of the types listed may be required to make a development acceptable.</p> <p>Whilst Planning Circular 05/2005 does state that local authorities should seek to include as much information as possible in their Local Development Frameworks, paragraph B.26 states, 'More detailed policies applying the principles set out in the development Plan Document (e.g. application to specific localities and likely quantum of contributions) ought then to be included in Supplementary Planning Documents.' Policy DP/4, and the supplementary planning documents proposed in the Local Development Scheme are consistent with this approach.</p>	
10700 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	It is unreasonable to suggest that contributions may be sought towards "education", "health care", "arts and cultural provision" and "community development workers". This policy wording is very imprecise and open-ended and therefore unreasonable and unacceptable. It goes beyond advice in Circular 05/2005, particularly on mitigating the impact of a development, which gives the example of the need for additional or expanded community infrastructure "such as a new classroom" as being reasonable. What the policy is proposing in relation to community development and youth workers, and potentially for education, health care and arts and cultural provision, amounts to the open-ended revenue funding on employees, which we contend is unreasonable and therefore fails the Circular's tests.	<p>Rather than creating a 'shopping list' of requirements, Policy DP/8 makes clear that obligations may be required, and the potential nature of those obligations. The policy states that the nature and scale of any planning obligations sought will be related to the form of the development, and its potential impact on the surrounding area. It also makes clear that not all of the types of obligations listed will be required in all cases, however, there will be cases where any of the types listed may be required to make a development acceptable.</p> <p>Planning Circular 05/2005 B.18 states: 'Where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance (i.e. physical upkeep). Such provision may be required in perpetuity.' Paragraph B.19 also refers to 'pump priming', to provide initial support for new facilities where necessary. It is therefore correct that the policy refers to the potential requirement for costs to be provided via a planning obligation, however, it is acknowledged that the policy could be clarified.</p>	Amend 3rd paragraph of policy DP/4: 'DEPENDING ON THE NATURE OF THE SERVICES AND FACILITIES, contributions may also be required to meet [running] MAINTENANCE AND / OR OPERATING costs EITHER AS PUMP PRIMING OR IN PERPETUITY, [of services and facilities] provided through an obligation.'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11145 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to the inclusion of requirements within the plan which are not absolutely necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and which are not sufficiently significant so that the development 'ought not to be permitted without them' (Paragraph B8). Every development is different. Some of the issues listed in the policy may not be appropriate for one development or another, for instance, contributions towards arts and cultural provision, the funding of community development workers and youth workers and any other type or extent of provision that is unreasonable and is not necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms (Policies DP/4 and DP/1 paragraph 13).	The policy acknowledges that the nature and scale of any planning obligations should be related to the form of the development and its impact on the surrounding area. It also makes clear that not all of the types of obligations listed will be required in all cases, however, there will be cases where any of the the types listed may be required to make a development acceptable.	
9025 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	This policy and the supporting text should make clear that some types of development - such as health care provision - should not be required to make financial or other provision for infrastructure or other community infrastructure requirements. These facilities are part of the community's social infrastructure and development of these services is a response to increasing population and is not a driver of population increases.	Disagree. The policy already states that the nature and scale of any planning obligations sought will be related to the form of the development. If obligations are not appropriate they will not be required, and this can be determined at the planning application stage.	
8004 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	Alter policy to take account of financial considerations. The policy omits any reference to the need to have regard to the financial viability of a development and its ability to generate contributions to an extensive shopping list of requirements. The following should be included: "The level and nature of contributions will have regard to the overall financial viability of a development...."	All development must provide suitable infrastructure, facilities and services to make it acceptable in planning terms. Policy DP/4 provides a checklist to developers as to the sorts of things the development may need to provide as part of the development or provide financial contributions towards, in accordance with other policies in the plan. The wording "the nature and scale of any planning obligations sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact on the surrounding area. Contributions may be necessary for some or all of the following." allows flexibility to recognise that not all development will need to meet every criterion as it will depend on the type of development, and where they are provided it will be of a scale and kind to the development. This accords with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9370 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Object	It will be important to ensure that for sites such as Chesterton Sidings where substantial development costs are involved, planning obligations will be applied on a fair and realistic basis. The policy should be reworded to recognise that lower contributions may be acceptable in some circumstances.	All development must provide suitable infrastructure, facilities and services to make it acceptable in planning terms. Policy DP/4 provides a checklist to developers as to the sorts of things the development may need to provide as part of the development or provide financial contributions towards, in accordance with other policies in the plan. The wording "the nature and scale of any planning obligations sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact on the surrounding area. Contributions may be necessary for some or all of the following." allows flexibility to recognise that not all development will need to meet every criterion as it will depend on the type of development, and where they are provided it will be of a scale and kind to the development. This accords with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.	
10123 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview require that the use of planning obligations as referred to in Policy DP/4 and throughout the document, should conform to the guidance issued in ODPM Circular 05/2005 (see also Policy DP/1, paragraph 13 and Policy DP/3, paragraph 9).	All development must provide suitable infrastructure, facilities and services to make it acceptable in planning terms. Policy DP/4 provides a checklist to developers as to the sorts of things the development may need to provide as part of the development or provide financial contributions towards, in accordance with other policies in the plan. The wording "the nature and scale of any planning obligations sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact on the surrounding area. Contributions may be necessary for some or all of the following." allows flexibility to recognise that not all development will need to meet every criterion as it will depend on the type of development, and where they are provided it will be of a scale and kind to the development. This accords with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.	
10568	Object	Reference should be made in the policy that any obligations sought will be in accordance with Circular 05/05, Planning Obligations.	The approach in Policy DP/4 (and other policies in the plan where there is a requirement for planning obligations) accords with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. This could be explained in the reasoned justification for clarity.	Amend the second sentence of paragraph 3.15 to read: "In such cases planning obligations will be required, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations, to make the necessary improvements, provide new facilities, or secure compensatory provision for any loss or damage created."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9036 - The Cambourne Consortium	Object	Policy DP/4 should be amended to accord with national planning policy as set out in Circular 05/2005.	Planning Circular 05/2005 B.18 states: 'Where contributions are secured through planning obligations towards the provision of facilities which are predominantly for the benefit of the users of the associated development, it may be appropriate for the developer to make provision for subsequent maintenance (i.e. physical upkeep). Such provision may be required in perpetuity.' Paragraph B.19 also refers to 'pump priming', to provide initial support for new facilities where necessary. It is therefore correct that the policy refers to the potential requirement for costs to be provided via a planning obligation, however, it is acknowledged that the policy could be clarified.	Amend 3rd paragraph of policy DP/4: 'DEPENDING ON THE NATURE OF THE SERVICES AND FACILITIES, contributions may also be required to meet [running] MAINTENANCE AND / OR OPERATING costs EITHER AS PUMP PRIMING OR IN PERPETUITY, [of services and facilities]provided through an obligation .'
8445 - English Heritage	Object	We recommend that the need for planning obligations relating to the historic environment should be included; for instance, assessment and interpretation of archaeology, repair of historic buildings or access to historic sites and features within a development site.	It is agreed that planning obligations may be used in certain circumstances to secure improvements to historic buildings, or preservation and enhancement of the historic landscape.	Add additional point to the list in Policy DP/4.  'PRESERVATION OR ENHANCEMENT OF THE HISTORIC LANDSCAPE OR TOWNSCAPE.'
10477 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The list of development principles has not been expanded to include all the planning obligations requirements as formerly requested. See representations relating to the individual bullet points of DP/4.	Points raised have been addressed in relation to the individual bullet points.	
9339 - Sport England East	Support	The principle of a policy setting out the infrastructure requirements of new developments is welcomed.	Support noted, although the policy has been modified.	
8942 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports this policy, particularly points 4, 7 & 8.	Support noted, although the policy has been modified.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
8549 - RAVE	Object	The second sentence should be amended to read: "The nature, scale and timing of the payment of any planning obligations sought..." This amendment is to try and ensure that infrastructure provision has a realistic chance of being completed before the development which will require it.	It is agreed that the timing of provision of infrastructure is an important consideration, and the policy should be amended to reflect this.	Amend 1st paragraph 2nd sentence of Policy DP/4:  'The nature, scale AND PHASING of any planning obligations sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact upon the surrounding area.'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9248 - David Wilson Homes (S Midlands)	Support	The recent circular on Planning Obligations makes it clear that excessive demands for developer contributions can potentially make a scheme unviable. Experience is showing that more and more authorities and organisations are seeking funding through this mechanism; the tests of reasonableness and relationship to the proposed development must be robustly applied. I would also like to see some commitment by the Council towards understanding the financial aspects of development and how they will be dealt with. Abnormal development costs - typically on brownfield sites - are sometimes of such a scale that S106 contributions cannot be offered.	All development must provide suitable infrastructure, facilities and services to make it acceptable in planning terms. Policy DP/4 provides a checklist to developers as to the sorts of things the development may need to provide as part of the development or provide financial contributions towards, in accordance with other policies in the plan. The wording "the nature and scale of any planning obligations sought will be related to the form of the development and its potential impact on the surrounding area. Contributions may be necessary for some or all of the following." allows flexibility to recognise that not all development will need to meet every criterion as it will depend on the type of development, and where they are provided it will be of a scale and kind to the development. This accords with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
8109 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The Development Control Policies DPD should clearly 'spell out' where contributions will be secured and the basis for calculating sums. This is preferable to SPD's.	Whilst Planning Circular 05/2005 does state that local authorities should seek to include as much information as possible in their Local Development Frameworks, paragraph B.26 states, 'More detailed policies applying the principles set out in the development Plan Document (e.g. application to specific localities and likely quantum of contributions) ought then to be included in Supplementary Planning Documents.' Policy DP/4, and the supplementary planning documents proposed in the Local Development Scheme are consistent with this approach.	
9347 - Sport England East	Object	The list of infrastructure that contributions may be sought for should include explicit reference to sports facilities. Whilst reference is made to public open space and recreation, this is not the same as sports facilities such as sports halls, swimming pools etc. As such facilities are considered to be of equal importance to education and health facilities in relation to the creation of healthy and sustainable communities, sports facilities should be added to the list in the policy to avoid the possible misinterpretation that sports facilities are not essential infrastructure in major developments. The provision of such facilities is advised in paragraph 23 of PPG17. The addition of this reference would improve the soundness of the policy in the context of it being consistent with national planning policy. It is therefore requested that "sports facilities" be added to the list of infrastructure in policy DP/4.	Agreed, this would be consistent with other policies in the Local development Framework. This can be achieved through an amendment to bullet point 4 of the policy.	Amend bullet point 4 of Policy DP/4:  'Public open space, SPORT AND recreation FACILITIES (including strategic open space)'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<b>2.</b>				
10479 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Under 2 Education add "nursery and pre-school care".	Agree.	Add to bullet point 2 of policy DP/4:  'Education (INCLUDING NURSERY AND PRE-SCHOOL CARE)'
9082 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Support	Support the need for contributions to Health Care infrastructure as part of planning obligations	Support for the inclusion of health care in the list of potential planning obligations in Policy DP/4 noted.	
<b>5.</b>				
10480 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Under 5, amend to "Provision of infrastructure for pedestrians, cyclists, highways and public and community transport (including the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway), and add "both in the vicinity of the development and with regard to other parts of the network, on which the development can be expected to have an impact, together with appropriate revenue support for public transport services (including those using the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway)".	Agree that an amendment is required to make clear that public and community transport improvements may be in the form of revenue as well as infrastructure. Specific reference to the Guided busway is not required, as issues are dealt with by policy TR/3 and associated supplementary planning documents.	Amend policy DP/5 bullet point 5:  'IMPROVEMENTS(INCLUDING infrastructure) for pedestrians, cyclists, EQUESTRIANS, highways, and public and community transport.'
9146 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Object	This should include equestrians as well as pedestrians and cyclists.	An amendment to include equestrians is agreed.	Amend policy DP/5 bullet point 5:  'IMPROVEMENTS(INCLUDING infrastructure) for pedestrians, cyclists, EQUESTRIANS, highways, and public and community transport.'
10482 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Also under 5 include after cyclists "equestrians and other lawful users of all highways".	An amendment to include equestrians is agreed.	Amend policy DP/5 bullet point 5:  'IMPROVEMENTS(INCLUDING infrastructure) for pedestrians, cyclists, EQUESTRIANS, highways, and public and community transport.'
<b>6.</b>				
10483 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Under 6 Community facilities add reference to "social care and the provision of emergency services".	Agree.	Amend bullet point 6 of policy DP/4:  'Other community facilities (e.g. community centres, youth facilities, library services, SOCIAL CARE, AND THE PROVISION OF EMERGENCY SERVICES)'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>DP/5 Cumulative Development</i>				
10125 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to the requirement in Policy DP/5 that development will not be permitted where it relates to part of a larger site where there would be a requirement for infrastructure provision if developed as a whole. It is not always possible to develop larger sites in their entirety in one go and as such smaller developments which may collectively regenerate a site should not be hindered. Requirements for infrastructure provision should conform to the tests in Circular 05/2005 referred to above, and should be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.	Where a site comes forward, which could be developed as part of a larger site, this would need to be a consideration in determining the planning application, in order to ensure appropriate infrastructure, services and facilities were considered on a comprehensive basis, and adequate provision and /or contributions secured as appropriate, in accordance with Policy DP/4 which requires contributions in scale and kind to the development in accordance with Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations. Holistic planning should also result in better design, preventing a series of self-contained developments that do not relate well to each other or their surroundings. Policy DP/5 need not prevent development on small sites provided it would not compromise development of the larger whole and its ability to deliver adequate infrastructure to make the development acceptable in planning terms.	Amend criteria 1 read: "Forms part of a larger site where there would be a requirement for infrastructure provision if developed as a whole."
7959 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Object	The overall emphasis should be to consider what public transport and local infrastructure improvements are going to be needed to meet future needs and contribute towards economic growth and to consider how continued investment will be funded. There is not a specific infrastructure provision section within the consultation documents. We consider this an important omission which should be included and would request that thought is given to adding a new provision in relation to infrastructure and S106 obligations.	All development must provide suitable infrastructure, facilities and services to make it acceptable in planning terms. Policy DP/4 requires infrastructure provision of a scale and kind to the development proposal to make development acceptable. However, to require infrastructure provision to address a wider need would not accord with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. Therefore, this is beyond the scope of the LDF and is being addressed at the regional level. Draft RSS14 recognises the infrastructure deficits and the need to address these through a variety of means, including through local delivery vehicles, such as Cambridgeshire Horizons.	
10218 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University supports this policy which reflects the approach it has taken in relation to the preparation of the Master Plan for the North West Cambridge site with regard to the provision of infrastructure. We accept that each phase of development will need to be accompanied by the appropriate infrastructure provision. Other developers should be required to act similarly.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>DP/6 Construction Methods</i>				
9635 - GO-East 8111 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The policy is uncertain and some criteria go beyond the scope of planning and / or duplicate matters addressed through alternative policy or statutory mechanisms. A spatial approach to planning policy means that policies may go beyond a narrow land-use planning approach but should be clear where alternative delivery / enforcement mechanisms along with who has the responsibility for their implementation. We therefore suggest that the Council give further consideration to the wording of the policy to ensure that it is certain and meets the principles of a spatial policy.	The objectors do not make it clear to which part of the policy they object. However, all matters that are covered by the policy will have a direct bearing on the impact of the development process and will need to be addressed by conditions/agreements to mitigate the effect of development on surrounding communities and to make sustainable use of waste arising during the development. All the matters are capable of being addressed with specificity e.g. hours of working or by requiring the express permission of the LPA to depart from any agreed measures. The only part of the policy which is likely to lie outside the scope of planning powers and to fall within the powers of other regulatory bodies is the last sentence.	Delete the last sentence of policy DP/6 which currently reads: "Adequate provision will need to be made for the storage of fuel and vehicles in a way that minimises risk of pollution to surface water or aquifers."
11062 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	If talking about haul roads affecting "the public highway" and residents and businesses, then should also include effect on "environmental amenities of biodiversity, rights of way and green spaces". Request that insert:- "Developers must employ an agreed methodology for haul roads where they cross public rights of way". Good practice developed with SCDC planners pertains.	Agree it is important that care is taken where haul roads cross rights of way to ensure the safety of users.	Amend the first sentence of paragraph 2: "Any haul roads must be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and developers must employ an agreed methodology for haul roads where they cross public rights of way".
9637 - GO-East	Object	We note that that the second to last paragraph in the policy indicates that haul routes should be landscaped. We suggest that this is overly onerous and the reference to landscaping of a haul route should be removed from the policy.	Agree the requirement for landscaping of haul roads should be appropriate to the type, scale and location of development. For example, it would be justified to require landscaping of haul roads at the major developments sites where the duration and scale of activity would justify landscaping to mitigate visual, noise and possibly dust impact.	Amend second sentence of second paragraph to read: "They must be located, designed and landscaped (where appropriate) in such a way as to avoid any noise, smell, dust, visual or other adverse impact on residents and businesses."  Add new sentence to the end of paragraph 3.21: "In some instances, it will be appropriate for haul roads to further mitigate their impact through landscaping, for example, in locations where the duration and scale of development is extensive, such as at the major development locations."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8901 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	The following minor rewordings would help clarify the policy and ensure that it is realistic and meets test of soundness ix outlined in paragraph 4.24 of PPS12: Bullet 2 - replace 'development' with 'construction'. Bullet 4 - to read 'where appropriate and practical, accommodate suitable construction spoil'.	Agree criteria 2 should refer to waste arising during construction and not development. However, criteria 4 already has the flexibility in the words "where appropriate" to determine whether construction spoil should be accommodated within the development.	Amend criteria 2 to read: "Prepare a 'Resource Re-use and Recycling Scheme' to cover all waste arising during construction."

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*Councils' Assessment*

*Change to Draft DPD*

---

*DP/7 Urban Frameworks*

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9638 - GO-East	Object	The policy is very general in stating a policy presumption in favour of development occurring within the urban framework subject to compatibility with adjoining land uses. The matters it sets out a covered by other policies in the Development Control Policies DPD or other DPDs such as the Area Action Plans. We therefore question the need for this policy as it appears unnecessary and duplicates other policies, and suggest that it should be deleted.	Agree in its present form Policy DP/7 does not state anything that is not already covered by other policies in the plan and should be deleted. A new policy should be added to the Strategy Chapter, similar to the approach for each other tier of the settlement hierarchy, allowing unlimited development within the urban framework.	<p>Delete Policy DP/7.</p> <p>Add a new policy after Policy ST/2 as follows:            "POLICY ST/3 Edge of Cambridge            The following sites are included within Urban Frameworks:            - <input type="checkbox"/> Land at Cherry Hinton            - <input type="checkbox"/> Cambridge Northern Fringe            - <input type="checkbox"/> Cambridge Airport / North Works            - <input type="checkbox"/> Land west of Trumpington Road</p> <p>Development and redevelopment without any limit on individual scheme size will be permitted within the urban framework provided adequate services, facilities and infrastructure are available or can be made available as a result of the development."</p> <p>Move the text at paragraphs 3.22 - 3.24 to follow the new policy.</p> <p>Amend heading before Policy DP/8 to read:            "DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS"</p> <p>Amend Policy DP/8 to read:            "POLICY DP/8 Development Frameworks            Outside urban and village frameworks, only development for agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside will be permitted."</p> <p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Retention of the site in its present state does not form an essential part of the local character; and            2. <input type="checkbox"/> Development would be sensitive to the character of the location, local features of landscape, ecological or historic importance, and the amenities of neighbours; and</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>DP/8 Village Frameworks</i>	<p>10807 - Cambs County Council Property &amp; Procurement Department (Landbeach, Land South of Walnut Farm)</p> <p>Object Land south of Walnut Farm, Landbeach. Despite Landbeach's designation as an Infill Village, it is considered that an area of the village framework should be corrected and should follow the line of the built-up edge of the village, as shown on the attached plan.</p>	<p>Disagree. The framework in this location correctly reflects the built up area of the village.</p>	<p>3. There is the necessary infrastructure capacity to support the development; and</p> <p>4. Development would not result in the loss of local employment, service, or facility [where there is no alternative available in the village], protected by Policies ET/7: Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses, SF/1: Protection of Village Services and Facilities and SF/11: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas.</p> <p>Amend first sentence of paragraph 3.25 to read: "the development frameworks define where policies for the built-up areas of settlements give way to policies for the countryside."</p> <p>Amend first two sentences of paragraph 3.27 to read: "Property boundaries shown on the OS map have been taken into account in defining frameworks. However, since there are many large gardens on the edge of settlements the framework boundaries sometimes cut across such gardens, especially (but not solely) if parts of those gardens relate more to the surrounding countryside than they do the built-up areas."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10822 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Fowlmere, Land West of Butts Lane)	Object	Land west of Butts Lane, Fowlmere. As a Group Village, Fowlmere can accommodate developments of up to 8 dwellings within village frameworks. There is a logical infill site, which includes an area of car parking, and which is shown on the enclosed plan. The site would help to contribute to the affordable housing needs of helping to support village facilities.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a groupvillage, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
10020 (Fulbourn, Land behind 3-7 Dogget Lane) 10019 (Fulbourn, Land behind 3-7 Dogget Lane) 10016 (Fulbourn, Land behind 3-7 Dogget Lane) 10015 (Fulbourn, Land behind 3-7 Dogget Lane)	Object	Land behind 3-7 Dogget Lane, Fulbourn. The village framework boundary in this location should be amended to provide a more logical boundary both in relation to garden boundaries and to the Conservation Area and Green Belt boundaries.	Paragraph 3.27 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that boundaries sometimes cut across large gardens, especially if part of the garden relates more to the countryside than the built up area of the village. In this case the line does follow physical features on the ground, and correctly reflects the built up area of the village. On criteria one of the policy, what constitutes an essential part of village character can be determined at the planning application stage, and utilise other guidance including supplementary planning documents.	
10714 (Girton, Land North of Girton Farm, Oakington Road)	Object	Land north of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton. Objection is raised to the exclusion of our client's two parcels of land, as indicated on the attached plan, from within the Village Framework of Girton, and within the designated Green Belt area. It is considered that the existing built form in this area justifies identification within the Village Framework and, as it more properly relates to the built up area, exclusion from the Green Belt.	Disagree, this site does not form part of the built up area of the village. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. The site is also designated as green belt.	
10440 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd (Histon, Land between Mill Lane and Impington Lane) 10450 - Centex Strategic Land (Histon, Land between Mill Lane and Impington Lane)	Object	Land between Mill Lane and Impington Lane, Histon. A number of concerns regarding the soundness and appropriateness of the Council's approach to the emerging housing strategy. Particularly concerned as to the ability of the proposed housing allocations to deliver the requisite dwelling numbers during the plan period, and consider that unless additional housing allocations are proposed through the plan process, there is likely to be a material shortfall in housing completions to 2016 in accordance with Structure Plan requirements. Client's land at Histon fronting Impington Lane to the south and Ambrose Way, connecting to Mill Lane with Water Lane beyond, should be allocated in the emerging LDF to help meet the likely shortfall in housing land supply to 2026 and beyond.	Part of this site is within the village framework. The remainder of the site, comprising open fields and designated as green belt, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10199 (Melbourn, Land South of Carlton Rise)	Object	Land south of Carlton Rise, Melbourn. The village framework boundary should be amended to include land at New Road, Melbourn, as the proposed boundary is illogical and anomalous particularly in view of the planning consent for affordable housing granted on adjoining land to the south.	Disagree. The land is open, and not part of the built up area of the village. Although it will be partly adjoined by a rural exception site for affordable housing, this is an appropriate countryside use. The framework should not be moved out to meet it.	
10715 (Girton, Land South of Girton Farm, Oakington Road)	Object	Land south of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton. Objection is raised to the exclusion of our client's two parcels of land, as indicated on the attached plan, from within the Village Framework of Girton, and within the designated Green Belt area. It is considered that the existing built form in this area justifies identification within the Village Framework and, as it more properly relates to the built up area, exclusion from the Green Belt.	The site is separated from the built up area of Girton by some distance. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included.(removal from green belt have been addressed through other representations: 10702)	
7860 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Girton, Littleton House School, Land between the Framework and the Green Belt)	Object	Littleton House School, Girton. Village framework boundary at Girton should be adjusted to coincide with the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of Littleton House School. The area between the presently defined village boundary and the green Belt has been largely developed by buildings and hardstanding. The village framework as presently shown represents an anomaly in this location that can be rectified through the LDD process.	Although there is hardstanding and carparking on part of the site, the land does not form part of the built up area of the village, and has correctly been designated as outside the village framework. There have also been a number of mobile classrooms on the site, but these are temporary uses.	
10725 (Stow-cum-Quy, Land off Church Road)	Object	Land off Church Road, Stow-Cum-Quy, should be included within the village framework. The site does not project into the open countryside, nor would it be very visible owing to the fact that there is residential development on two sides of the site. The significant hedge between the Church and no. 15 Church Road, effectively restricts views across our client's land from the defined 'Important Countryside Frontage'. The site could be developed without material visual detriment to the area. There is a strong case for including the site based on the site's proximity to Cambridge (with good cycle links) and the park and ride.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It comprises open, agricultural land, and is designated as green belt.	
10413 - Davison & Co (Barford) Ltd (Elsworth, Land North and West of Elsworth School)	Object	Land north and west of Elsworth School, Elsworth. Objection is raised to the fact that our client's land, edged red on the attached plan, is not in the Village Framework for Elsworth. It is proposed that the land, which partly comprises unattended allotments, could be used to provide additional housing for the Village in addition to providing extra car parking area for use by the school and an additional playing field / recreational area if desired. It is considered that this development could be incorporated within the Village without detriment to the overall setting of the Village.	Not accepted. This land is not part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It consists of agricultural land and some allotment gardens.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7834 (Whaddon, Land at The Close, Meldreth Road)	Object	Land at the Close, Meldreth Road, Whaddon. Amend village framework at Whaddon to include land at The Close, Meldreth Road. Historic maps show the area was one of the earliest parts of the village. Area should be included to give the village better balance, as similar properties at the other end of the village are included in the framework. Additional land is required to provide opportunities for affordable housing in the village. If the whole site cannot be included then inclusion of the site excluding the northern paddocks is still sought.	Whilst the site includes one dwelling, it is well screened by vegetation and relates better to the surrounding countryside than the built-up part of the village. The site does not form part of the built-up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	No change.
10307 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Duxford, Land South of Rectory Road)	Object	Land south of Rectory Road, Duxford. We object to the exclusion of our client's site from the Village Framework, and seek an amendment to the existing Village Framework to include our client's site.	This site has a distinctly different character from the main built up area of the village, and does not warrant inclusion within the village framework. It is proposed to be designated as an Established Employment Area in the Countryside.	
8088 (Oakington, Land at the The Drift)	Object	Land at The Drift, Oakington. The Oakington Village framework in the vicinity of Whitehall Farm and the Drift should be reviewed and extended to take into account (include) the houses that exist down The Drift and to include the 1-acre field at the end of Mead View, that used to be the site of the buildings of a pig-farm (Whitehall Farm). This should be considered as brownfield land, and so making this available would contribute to POLICY ST/2. It has excellent existing road access from Mead View, but there is also additional road access from the Drift.	Brownfield land is defined in Annex C of PPG3 as "previously-developed land is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure (excluding agricultural or forestry buildings)." As agricultural use, this land is not considered brownfield. The majority of this site consists of green field land in the countryside. It does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	No change.
10561 - Vogan & Company (Fulbourn, Land East of disused Railway Station)	Object	Land east of disused railway station, Fulbourn. The village framework boundary on the north eastern edge of Fulbourn is illogical and follows no physical or visual boundary in relation to the eastern end of the site curtilage at the Fulbourn silo site. The boundary should be amended to follow the tree / landscaped site boundary.	The village framework boundary is currently tightly drawn around the rear of buildings, the built-up part of the site. This is a clear boundary, and given that landscape features will continue to change over time, it is a more permanent feature. The site does not form part of the built-up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	No change.
11036 - Foregreen Developments Ltd (Waterbeach, Land down Gibson Close)	Object	Land west of Gibson Close, Waterbeach, should be included within the village framework and positively allocated for housing under Policy SP/1. This could be in isolation or in conjunction with adjacent parcels of land, all of which (in common with the subject site) are excluded from the Green Belt. This would accord with the recommendation of the previous Local Plan Inquiry Inspector, whose recommendation was unjustifiably rejected by the Council.	Harding Close and Vicarage Close were allocated for residential development in the 1982 Waterbeach and Landbeach District Plan. The small parcels of land between them were specifically excluded from development to provide land either side of a network of rural public footpaths which run from Green Side and Cambridge Road to Ely Road. Including these areas within the Village Framework and allowing development would make development very prominent and substantially change the character of this public footpath. (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 9158)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10912 - Ely Diocesan Board (Waterbeach, Land between Vicarage Close and Harding Close)	Object	This land to the north of Glebe Road, Waterbeach should be included within the village framework. It is not within the Green Belt, would not encroach on open countryside, has scope for access and can form an integral part of the village. Development would allow for significant improvements in access to the countryside in this part of the village.	Harding Close and Vicarage Close were allocated for residential development in the 1982 Waterbeach and Landbeach District Plan. The small parcels of land between them were specifically excluded from development to provide land either side of a network of rural public footpaths which run from Green Side and Cambridge Road to Ely Road. Including these areas within the Village Framework and allowing development would make development very prominent and substantially change the character of this public footpath. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a minor rural centre, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
10889 - Ashdale Land & Property Consultants (Waterbeach, Land North of Poorsfield Road)	Object	Land to the north of Poorsfield Road, Waterbeach. The land is well located to the existing built-up area of Waterbeach, and will not encroach beyond the westerly extent of the village envelope. Its inclusion within the framework is entirely logical. The site is located outside the Green Belt, the boundary of which would represent a more sensible boundary. The land was recommended for inclusion within the framework by the Local Plan Inspector in 2002.	Harding Close and Vicarage Close were allocated for residential development in the 1982 Waterbeach and Landbeach District Plan. The small parcels of land between them were specifically excluded from development to provide land either side of a network of rural public footpaths which run from Green Side and Cambridge Road to Ely Road. Including these areas within the Village Framework and allowing development would make development very prominent and substantially change the character of this public footpath. (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10890)	
8116 (Impington, Land South of Clay Close Lane)	Object	Land south of Clay Close Lane, Impington. The site is largely surrounded by existing residential development and bounded by Clay Cross Lane. It is within 150m of a secondary school and associated sports centre and within walking distance of the village centre. The site is located within a settlement with good public transport links, shopping, other local services and employment opportunities which is designated as a Rural Centre. The site is within the physical structure of the settlement and fulfils none of the purposes of Green Belts as set out in PPG2. It should be included in the Village Framework and allocated for residential development.	The site, comprising trees and open field, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It does not warrant inclusion despite some dispersed development north of the site.  (allocation for development and removal from green belt have been addressed through other representations: 8115, 8117)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10562 (Fulbourn, Land at Home End)	Object	Land at Home End, Fulbourn. Objections are raised to the omission of Lane at Home End, Fulbourn from within the Village Framework and also for the proposed designation of Important Countryside Frontage and the designation within the Cambridge Green Belt. The site is suitable for small scale residential development, as it is within the core of the Village and adjoins a residential development both to the north and south and existing development on the opposite side of Home End.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It comprises an area of open grassed land on the edge of the village.  (allocation for development, removal from green belt and important countryside frontage have been addressed through other representations: 10563, 10564, 10567)	
7830 (Elsworth, Rear of garden at 6 Brockley Road) 7829 (Elsworth, Rear of garden at 6 Brockley Road)	Object	Land at rear of 6 Brockley Road, Elsworth. Re-align village framework to encompass the total area of garden. The proposed village framework boundary in the area of Avenue Meadow allows for the inclusion within the framework of all land which has recently been purchased by the owners of neighboring properties that was previously part of Avenue Meadow. This creates an anomaly with the positioning of the framework. Of the five properties sharing garden boundaries with Avenue Meadow this is the only one that does not have its entire garden included within the framework.	Paragraph 3.27 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that boundaries sometimes cut across large gardens, especially if part of the garden relates more to the countryside than the built up area of the village. The position of the framework in this case acknowledges the fact that development to the south would result in an extension of the built up area into the countryside along Brockley Road frontage.	
10259 (Willingham, Land at Preist Lane)	Object	Land at Priest Lane, Willingham should be included within the village framework boundary, to provide a logical boundary and enable its development for a modest housing scheme.	The site, comprising an open field, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a minor rural centre, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. On criteria one of the policy, what constitutes an essential part of village character can be determined at the planning application stage, and utilise other guidance including supplementary planning documents.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11039 (Oakington, Land behind 64 Water Land and the School)	Object	Land behind 64 Water Lane and the school, Oakington. The village boundary should be amended to include the proposed allocation (see other rep). In addition the whole of the school site should be included within the village boundary as it clearly has a much greater link with Oakington than surrounding countryside.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The site is also designated as green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
9327	Object	Policy too inflexible given pressure on the need to identify land for housing, especially small scale low cost housing which could be affordable to local people. Arbitrary decisions regarding the line for the village framework, sometimes through someone's garden, are unrealistic and unreliable. The opportunity should be provided in this policy to develop small plots of land at edges of village frameworks, especially where these are not related to the countryside, for small developments which could help to provide support to the village services and keep villages alive. Without the opportunity for modest growth villages stagnate.	Drawing frameworks tightly around villages is an essential policy tool to protect the countryside from gradual encroachment at the edges of villages. Paragraph 3.27 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that boundaries sometimes cut across large gardens, especially if part of the garden relates more to the countryside than the built up area of the village. The plan does provide mechanisms for the delivery of affordable housing, including policy HG/5, exceptionally allowing developments of purely affordable housing outside village frameworks. Small amounts of development do not significantly support the delivery of additional services in small villages, and benefits may be outweighed by the disproportionate number of additional journeys created.	
10216 - Scotsdales Garden Centre (Great Shelford, Scotsdales Garden Centre)	Object	Scotsdales Garden Centre, Great Shelford. Scotsdales Garden Centre should be removed from the green belt and included within the village framework to enable the company to operate its successful retail business more efficiently and so contribute further to the local economy.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly states that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004, therefore a further review at this location would be contrary to PPG2. Therefore the site should remain in the Green Belt and not included within the village framework.	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7820 (Whittlesford Bridge, Land behind 1 - 23 Royston Road)	Object	<p>Land East of Moorfield Road between Station Road and the A505 has been included in the village framework as the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector recommended that this land has no connection with the countryside South of the A505.</p> <p>Request that land West of Moorfield Road and North of A505 also be included in village framework as this land must also have no connection with the countryside to the South of the A505.</p> <p>Topography of the land is flat and well drained and benefits from existing vehicular access onto Moorfield Road.</p>	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The circumstances of this site are different to those of the site included in the framework on recommendation of the Inspector of the Local Plan 2004 Inquiry. That comprised land within the residential curtilage. This site does not, and is separate from the built up area of the village.</p>	
8001 - David Reed Homes Ltd (Shepreth, Land rear of 20 High Street)	Object	<p>The framework at Shepreth to the rear of 20 High Street has been moved in the past closer to the house. The previous line seems to follow a more natural line of the village and the framework line should be moved back to where it was.</p>	<p>The framework line in this location is consistent with the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans. The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.</p>	
10804 - Lighthouse Developments (Steeple Morden, Land North of Bogs Gap Lane)	Object	<p>Land North of Bogs Gap Lane, Steeple Morden represents a logical extension to the village framework as there are already residential properties on the land; it is well surrounded by mature hedges and trees around the site; and the site relates to the built-up village.</p>	<p>The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated.</p>	
10666 - Atkins Property Development Ltd (Barhill, Land West of Bar Hill)	Object	<p>Land west of Bar Hill. Bar Hill is rightly classified as a Rural Centre (see attached report of evidence). However, Urban Capacity Study of June 2005 demonstrates that Bar Hill has no sites available within the currently defined development boundary to allow for redevelopment opportunities. Given the unique issues relating to Bar Hill there is a strong planning argument to realign the settlement boundary to enable Bar Hill to absorb development growth. This action will make available important 'services', 'facilities' and 'infrastructure' as required by the Rural Centre Policy.</p>	<p>Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the Housing Trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. Therefore there is no need to allocate any further sites. It is proposed to downgrade Bar Hill to a Minor Rural Centre as it only meets two of the Structure Plan criteria, in terms of village facilities and local employment opportunities (as detailed in the Rural Centres Preferred Option Report). Bar Hill is presently contained within the perimeter road, and any further development would result in development in an unsustainable location, on land which is currently very open and exposed with long distance views.</p>	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9897 (Barrington, Land between 29 & 39 Shepreth Road)	Object	Redundant grazing land between 29 & 39 Shepreth Road, Barrington is a 2 acre site within the natural boundary of the village and should not be excluded from the village framework. The current boundary is arbitrary and out of date unreasonably restricting modest natural growth of the village. The site is not in open countryside or the flood plain. It is less than one mile from Shepreth Railway station and is on a bus route.	The site, comprising a field, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for an infill village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
10674 - Atkins Property Development Ltd (Barhill, Land West of Bar Hill)	Object	Land west of Bar Hill. Objection is made to Inset 5 for Bar Hill as it does not currently include land at north west Bar Hill within the settlement boundary. It is suggested Inset 5 be amended as per the attached plan. (see separate representation to Policy ST/1).	The site, comprising arable fields, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. (allocation for development addressed with other representations).	
10824 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Sawston, Hill Farm)	Object	Land at Hill Farm, Sawston. Sawston is designated a Rural Growth Centre, where larger-scale development is permitted. The framework should be continued across from the cemetery, to take into account the existing built area of Hill Farm. These areas are shown marked on the enclosed plan.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	
10599 (Shepreth, Land at Frog End) 10598 (Shepreth, Land at Frog End)	Object	Land at Frog End, Shepreth. Objections are raised to the omission of the extension of the Village Framework to include development along the Dunsbridge Turnpike in Shepreth.	The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. The area should remain outside the village framework.	
8016 (Whittlesford Bridge, Land behind 1 - 23 Royston Road)	Object	Land behind 1-23 Royston Road, Whittlesford Bridge. Change the village boundary in the Whittlesford Bridge area to include the Land West of Moorfield Road and North of the A505 that is not currently part of the village framework.  This land cannot be considered as 'countryside' due to its proximity to the A505. Its inclusion in the village framework would not negatively impact upon the character of Duxford village, and would provide an opportunity for future development.	The site, comprising a grass field, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8342 - The English Courtyard Association (Whittlesford, Walled Garden North of Church Lane)	Object	Please adjust village policy framework to include the land identified within the village. There is no reason to include the walled garden which is brownfield land as land within the greenbelt. The plan should be altered to include this land as lying within the village policy framework.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Paragraph 3.27 of the Development Control Policies DPD notes that frameworks often cut across large gardens on the edge of villages, if those gardens relate more to the countryside than the built up area of the village. This is the case with this site. It acknowledges the fact that development would effectively extend the built up area of the village into the countryside. A correction to the framework is therefore not required. The site is also designated as green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
10809 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Oakington, Land SW of 92 Water Lane)	Object	Land SW of 92 Water Lane, Oakington. Within the Group Village of Oakington, a site close to the centre of the village is shown marked on the attached plan, which is considered to form an area of logical infill development between two built-up areas. It is therefore proposed that the site be included within the village framework, and the designations preventing it coming forward be reviewed.	The objection lies in the Cambridge Green Belt at a point where the countryside penetrates to a main village street and as a consequence contributes to the rural character of the village.	No change.
9223 (Longstanton, Land between Clive Hall Drive & Mills Lane)	Object	Land between Clive Hall Drive & Mills Lane, Longstanton. We are seeking a minor amendment to the existing village framework as drawn around Longstanton, on land adjacent to Clive Hall Drive and the existing caravan site off St Michaels Lane (see enclosed plan). The land in question relates to the existing built up area of Longstanton and not the proposed Green Belt or green separation area beyond the existing mature hedge, which forms a natural barrier to the village. The parcel of land in question would have no impact upon the overall proposed Green Belt or green separation between Longstanton and the proposed new town of Northstowe.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It comprises undeveloped land on the edge of the village, the development of which would effectively extend the built up area of the village into the countryside.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10845 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Waterbeach, Land between Waterbeach and railway)	Object	Land between Waterbeach and railway, Waterbeach. Waterbeach should be a Rural Centre. Land south of Bannold Road, Waterbeach to the east of the village should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development. The Inset Boundary for the village should follow the line of the railway line. The floodplain map should be re-evaluated.	The site, comprising mainly agricultural fields, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. (allocation for development and removal from green belt have been addressed through other representations: 10843, 10846)	
8327 (Duxford, Land at back of gardens 8-11 Green Acres)	Object	Land at back gardens of 8-11 Green Acres, Duxford. The Duxford village framework needs to be amended to reflect the fact the gardens of properties off Greenacres have been extended (Planning Permission S/0279/05/F).	Paragraph 3.27 of the Development Control Policies DPD notes that frameworks often cut across large gardens on the edge of villages, if those gardens relate more to the countryside than the built up area of the village. This is the case with this site. It acknowledges the fact that development to the rear would effectively extend the built up area of the village into the countryside. A correction to the framework is therefore not required.	
10786 (Meldreth, Site at Whitcroft Road)	Object	The land at Whitcroft Road, Medreth should be included within the village framework. Land consists of previously unused land and is well connected to the existing village framework. The site is well constrained by existing development and other defensible boundaries (Station Road and the railway line). The site, which partly sits within the village framework, is more closely related to the existing built up area than the open countryside.	This representation proposes the extension of the village framework to include an area of undeveloped land south of the village. Development of this land would effectively extend the built up area of the village into the countryside. The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	
8363 (Longstanton, Built Area South of Woodside)	Object	Built area south of Woodside, Longstanton. The land shown on the attached map should be included within the village framework for Longstanton and not as an area of Green Separation. The land falls within the existing Parish of All Saints and has properties adjoining on each side boundary and a property directly facing to it. There are also existing farm buildings along the frontage. The Longstanton Village Framework should be extended to include the built form of the existing current buildings and the remaining paddock and copse should be removed from the extended Cambridge green belt.	The area has a distinct rural character. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. This may include farm buildings. The site also forms an important part of the separation between Longstanton St.Michaels and the main part of the village, reflected in its designation as important countryside frontage, and the extension of the Cambridge Green Belt.	
10834 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Sawston, cemetery S of Hill Farm)	Object	Cemetery south of Hill Farm, Sawston. Sawston is designated a Rural Growth Centre, where larger-scale development is permitted. The village framework on the northern boundary of Sawston has omitted a part of the existing cemetery (the majority is included within the framework), an dthis should be corrected.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. The land is within the Green Belt. The agricultural and cemetery uses are appropriate uses in the green belt, and should remain outside the village framework.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9923 - Old Road Securities Plc (Waterbeach, Land at Denny End)	Object	Land at Denny End Road Waterbeach. Waterbeach can accommodate additional growth outside the current settlement limits. Land at Denny End Road, whilst in the Green Belt, provides a sustainable development site being adjacent to existing employment opportunities. The village framework boundary should be amended accordingly.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10274)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7821 (Hauxton, Land North and South of High Street)	Object	Land north and south of The High Street Hauxton should be allocated for housing. The land south of the High Street can also provide a landscape belt to reduce noise disturbance from the M11 and contribute towards a new village hall. Objection is therefore raised to the non inclusion of these areas of land within the village inset boundary.	The northern part of the site comprises farm buildings. the larger southern part of the site comprises open fields. Both do not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the framework. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 7826)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7873 (Histon, Land adjoining 59 & 61 Cottenham Road)	Object	Land adjoining 59 & 61 Cottenham Road, Histon. The Village Framework for Histon should be altered to include the land shown red and green on the attached plan. The sites make no justifiable contribution to the green belt given their location to the north of the village; their development would be wholly in accordance with policies for sustainable development.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
10827 (Waterbeach, Land adjacent to Pieces Lane)	Object	Land adjacent to Pieces Lane Waterbeach represents a logical rounding off of the village framework of Waterbeach by the inclusion of land which is contiguous with existing residential development on three sides.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. (allocation for development and removal from green belt have been addressed through other representations: 10828, 10830)	
10703 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	<p>The first paragraph of this policy is unreasonable and is not in accordance with Government policy in PPG2, in relation to villages within the Green Belt, or PPS7, in relation to those that are not.</p> <p>In relation to the preferred approach to development within village frameworks, Criteria 1 if applied too subjectively, will be unreasonably restrictive. Clarification and qualification of what is to be considered "essential" is required as an amendment of this policy wording. Criteria 4, also, needs qualification to the effect that, if it can be shown that there is no current market demand for the employment service or facility, then its loss can be accepted. The alternative is that the site will become disused and unattractive and also represent a wasted land resource.</p>	Policy DP/8 needs to be considered in conjunction with other policies in Development Control Policies DPD which cover appropriate development in the Green Belt and countryside more generally, and accord with PPG2 and PPS7. What is considered to form an essential part of the village character will vary on a site-by-site basis and will therefore be subjective. However, additional guidance may be found, for example in Conservation Area Appraisals and other Supplementary Planning Documents, which would be taken into consideration where applicable. Criteria 4 cross-refers to other policies in the Development Control Policies DPD and the detail of their application is dealt with there, therefore there is no need for duplication.	No change.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8917 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Object	Wm Morrison notes that Cambourne is defined as a Rural Centre within the District retail hierarchy, however there is no indication of the actual extent of the centre on the Proposals Map. In our client's view the boundaries of the retail centre should be defined on the Proposal Map to ensure that is safeguarded from inappropriate uses, and to indicate where it will be appropriate to direct future development proposals for retail uses. We suggest that an appropriate boundary of the centre could be the extent of the commercial uses shown on the original Masterplan for the settlement.	Policy SP/19 requires development to accord with the approved master plan and design guide. This provides sufficient clarity with which to determine development proposals. It would not be appropriate to designate a primary retail are in a village centre.	
10154 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd (Over, Land at 23 Fen End)	Object	Land at 23 Fen End, Over. We request that the village framework boundary be amended in this location to follow a much more logical line and to allow for the successful redevelopment of this site, as indicated on the attached plan, thus facilitating the business relocation to a more appropriate and sustainable site.	Disagree. The framework in this location was amended through the preparation of the Local Plan 2004 to include the element of previously developed land on the site. A further revision to bring in undeveloped land to the rear, and potentially extend the built up area of the village, is not justified.	
10815 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Histon, Land South of Manor Park)	Object	Land south of Manor Park, Histon. The County Council own a site in the proposed Rural Centre of Histon and Impington, which is surrounded by development on three sides, and the route of the proposed Guided Bus Route on the other. In addition, the site is currently "white land", outside the Green Belt, and free from other potential environmental constraints. The site would be made available for employment or housing, and given the potential benefits associated with including this land within the framework, it should be included as a sustainable site within the Rural Centre.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. With regard to specific allocation for development. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
7998 (Oakington, Land at rear of Manor Farm Close)	Object	Land at rear of Manor Farm Close, Oakington. This land is suitable for residential development use, perhaps for affordable housing or a mixture of private and affordable housing. It should therefore be included within the village framework. You will note the land immediately to the south is being developed and a scheme on our land would be complimentary to this.	The objection site lies in the proposed gap between Oakington village and Northstowe and forms an essential part of the land that must be kept free from development to provide green separation in order to maintain the village character of Oakington.	No change.
8319 - Brook Trading Ltd (Willingham, Land between Over Road & Station Road)	Object	The site to the south of Over Road, Willingham, was included in the Local Plan produced in 1999 but was omitted by the inspector in his report on objections. The site included following the report (land at Manor Farm) is in the course of development and will be completed during the Local Plan period. We request this site be included in the local plan review as it is an enclosed area within the ambit of the village and would have no impact upon the surrounding countryside and it is surrounded on three sides by residential development. The access to the development has been agreed in writing by the highway authority.	This site mainly comprises open agricultural land, and buildings associated with agriculture. It does not form apart of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study, existing commitments and the remaining development at Cambourne that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7797 (Streetly End, Land East of 32 Streetly End) 7796 (Streetly End, Land East of 32 Streetly End)	Object	<p>Land east of 32 Streetly End, Streetly End. Request the land be considered for inclusion in the Streetly End village framework. The land forms part of the village, lying between two of the village framework boundaries. The site meets the CS3 Village Frameworks Preferred Approach as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site does not form an essential part of the village character. Originally there were dwellings on the site. Houses presently line the road opposite. The land lies between two village boundaries.</li> <li>2. Any development would be sensitive to the village character and only for family housing.</li> <li>3. The site is connected to mains sewerage, water, electricity, has good road frontage and access.</li> <li>4. No local employment or service facility is involved.</li> </ol>	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Whilst it includes one dwelling, it is predominately agricultural uses and open fields.	
8176 - D H Barford + Co Limited (Castle Camps, Land near Owls Hoot Haverhill Road)	Object	<p>Land near Owls Hoot, Haverhill Road, Castle Camps. The Village Framework for Castle Camps should be amended to reflect the planning permission that has been granted and implemented for the change of use of buildings to Class B1 and B8 at Homers Lane, Castle Camps (Planning Permissions Nos. S/2430/F and S/1550/04/F).</p>	Whilst permission was granted for change of use of the buildings, they remain relatively isolated rural buildings, and do not form part of the main built up area of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included.	
10553 (Fulbourn, Land either side of Hinds Loder (Track))	Object	<p>Land either side of Hinds Loder (track), Fulbourn. Objections are made to the fact that the Village Framework of Fulbourn has not been extended so as to facilitate significant further growth, appropriate to the sustainable position of Fulbourn not only in relation to Cambridge but to local services and facilities. It is considered this decision is contrary to the recommendations of Central Government with regards to the sustainability of future development, as promoted in both the RPG and the adopted Structure Plan.</p>	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It comprises open fields in the green belt, separated from the village framework.	
10780 (Meldreth, Site at back of 1 Whitcroft Road)	Object	<p>The land at Whitcroft Road, Medreth should be included within the village framework. Land consists of previously unused land and is well connected to the existing village framework. The site is well constrained by existing development and other defensible boundaries (Station Road and the railway line). The site, which partly sits within the village framework, is more closely related to the existing built up area than the open countryside.</p>	Although containing built development, this site has a distinct countryside character and has a linear nature, stretching into the countryside. It is not appropriate to include this land within the framework of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8015 (Meldreth, Land at 90 High Street)	Object	Land at 90 High Street, Meldreth. The proposed line of the village framework at 90, High Street, Meldreth, is not in accordance with the policy as stated in Para 3.25 of the Draft Core Strategy, which says 'Frameworks have been defined to take into account the present extent of the built-up area'. The substantial structure in our garden just to the west of the river Mel was built as a workshop approximately 50 years ago, on the site of even earlier buildings, so should be included within the framework.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated. Although there is a building on the site, it clearly does not form part of the built up area of the village.	
11452 - Weston Colville Parish Council	Object	Weston Colville's current village framework is very tightly drawn and excludes sites which may normally be defined as infill has no sensible further opportunities for development. It is the policy of the Weston Colville Parish Council to support the extension of the village framework to allow the building of 15/25 houses by 2016. Such development will help sustain services in the village and provide low cost housing.	With regard to specific allocations for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for an infill village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study, existing commitments and the remaining development at Cambourne that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. Policies are included in the Development Control Policies DPD for affordable housing exceptionally on sites outside village frameworks.	
9979 (Fulbourn, 9 Dogget Lane)	Object	Land at 9 Dogget Lane, Fulbourn. The village framework boundary in this location should be amended to provide a more logical boundary both in relation to garden boundaries and to the Conservation Area and Green Belt boundaries.	In this location the framework reflects the built up area of the village. Paragraph 3.27 of the Development Control Policies DPD notes that frameworks often cut across large gardens on the edge of villages, if those gardens relate more to the countryside than the built up area of the village. This relatively isolated site reflects this principle. It acknowledges the fact that further development would effectively extend the built up area of the village into the countryside. A correction to the framework is therefore not required. The designation of green belt is based on different characteristics to the designation of frameworks, hence the existence of areas of 'white land' across the district. On criteria one of the policy, what constitutes an essential part of village character can be determined at the planning application stage, and utilise other guidance including supplementary planning documents.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8119 - Freshwater Estates Ltd. (Sawston, Land at 41 Mill Lane)	Object	Land at Mill Lane Sawston should be included in the village framework. Site is surrounded by existing development, no history of flooding, outside green belt, within 650m of secondary school/sports centre. Site is occupied by existing dwelling and outbuildings, and constitutes previously developed land defined in PPG3 and its development is in accordance with policy ST/2 of the draft core strategy. Site is located in settlement with good public transport links, good shopping and other services and good employment opportunities, designated as a rural centre.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included.	
10511 (Swavesey, Proposed recreation ground West of Middlewatch)	Object	West of Middlewatch, Swavesey. Objection is raised to the omission of our client's land, from within a comprehensive extension to the Village Framework of Swavesey. The incorporation of a rectangular extension to the Village Framework, extending from the south of Wooton Close to Rose and Crown Road, would round off the Development Framework of Swavesey and would not extend the development boundary into open countryside in visual terms. The comprehensive development area would enable a mix of housing/employment/public open space to be provided and any other facilities which might be identified. It is considered that Swavesey is a sustainable settlement in which further growth should be encouraged, especially in view of the proposed rapid transit linkage to Cambridge.	The site, comprising a field, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.(allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10512)	
10779 10785	Object		Village frameworks in South Cambridgeshire have been defined in the local plan, and refined in the recent local plan review. A full review of frameworks at this stage is unnecessary.	
10938 (Sawston, Deal Grove)	Object	Objections are made to the omission of Land at Deal Farm, including nos. 64 and 62 Cambridge Road, Sawston from inclusion within the Village Framework. The land comprises two farm dwellings together with the extensive outbuildings associated with Deal Farm. It would appear logical if this built form was incorporated within the Village Framework to which it more properly relates. In addition, it is considered the land should be released from the Green Belt for the same reasons.	The larger part of the site comprises open arable fields, woodland, and pasture. It does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The built elements of Deal Farm also do not form part of the built up area of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included.(allocation for development and removal from green belt have been addressed through other representations: 10939, 10940).	
7822 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Shepreth, Land North of Meldreth Road)	Object	Land in Shepreth bordered by the railway line to the north, John Breay Close to the west and Meldreth Road to the south be included in the village envelope and identified for housing.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 7821)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10713 (Girton, Land South of Girton Farm, Oakington Road)	Object	Land south of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton. Objection is raised to the exclusion of our client's two parcels of land, as indicated on the attached plan, from within the Village Framework of Girton, and within the designated Green Belt area. It is considered that the existing built form in this area justifies identification within the Village Framework and, as it more properly relates to the built up area, exclusion from the Green Belt.	Disagree, this site does not form part of the built up area of the village. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. The site is also designated as green belt.	
9927 - Old Road Securities Plc (Linton, Land North of Bartlow Road)	Object	Land north of Bartlow Road, Linton. An objection is made to the non-inclusion of Linton as a Rural Centre. Linton is a sustainable location with a good level of employment opportunities and service facilities. It can accommodate additional growth without detriment to existing services and facilities outside the village development limits. Additional external growth should be identified at Linton at land north of Bartlow Road and south of Horseheath Road. Development in these locations could be well served by public transport. The village framework should be amended accordingly.	The site consists of an agricultural field. The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	
8085 (Longstanton, Land between Longstanton and proposed Longstanton Bypass)	Object	We object to the line of the Village Framework for Longstanton on the western side of the village and propose realignment along the line of the proposed Longstanton Western Bypass.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10269 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge (Girton, Land North of Woodlands Park and West of High Street)	Object	<p>Land north of Woodlands Park and west of High Street, Girton.</p> <p>The University considers that the land west of High Street and North of Woodlands Avenue, Girton, has long term development potential that could meet the future needs of the local community for market and affordable housing, open space and community facilities.</p> <p>The long term development potential of this site should be considered in the context of the current proposals for Girton village.</p>	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The site is designated as green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.</p>	
9925 - Old Road Securities Plc (Linton, Land South of Horseheath Road)	Object	<p>Land south of Horseheath Road, Linton.</p> <p>An objection is made to the non-inclusion of Linton as a Rural Centre. Linton is a sustainable location with a good level of employment opportunities and service facilities. It can accommodate additional growth without detriment to existing services and facilities outside the village development limits. Additional external growth should be identified at Linton at land north of Bartlow Road and south of Horseheath Road. Development in these locations could be well served by public transport. The village framework should be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>The site, comprising an arable field on the edge of the village, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.</p> <p>(allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10276)</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10069 (Swavesey, Land at 31 Blackhorse Lane) 10066 (Swavesey, Land at 31 Blackhorse Lane)	Object	Land at 31 Blackhorse Lane, Swavesey. In relation to our clients land at Swavesey, as identified on the attached plan, this is a site which is surrounded by existing residential development on three sides and is not in active agricultural use nor has it formed any part of any agricultural holding for many years. Access is readily available to the site from an existing vehicular access on Taylors Lane with a secondary access from Black Horse Lane. The site is therefore able to accommodate a modest housing scheme, well related to the villages existing facilities and in particular to adjoining development. We therefore request that the village framework boundary be amended in this location to follow a more logical line and to allow for the development of this site.	The site, comprising a field on the edge of the village, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
10200 (Melbourn, Land South of Carlton Rise) 10201 (Melbourn, Land South of Carlton Rise)	Object	Land south of Carlton Rise, Melbourn. The village framework boundary should be amended to include land at New Road, Melbourn, as the proposed boundary is illogical and anomalous particularly in view of the planning consent for affordable housing granted on adjoining land to the south.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The affordable housing to the south is an exception site, and is thus considered as a countryside use. The framework has been correctly drawn to identify the built up area of the village. Paragraph 3.27 of the Development Control Policies DPD notes that frameworks often cut across large gardens on the edge of villages, if those gardens relate more to the countryside than the built up area of the village. This is the case with this site. It acknowledges the fact that development to the rear would effectively extend the built up area of the village into the countryside.	
10067 - Bellway Homes (Swavesey, Land South of School Lane)	Object	Land south of School Lane, Swavesey. Bellway seek the identification of land south of Fen Drayton Road and north of Swavesey Village College for 5 acres of the land to be offered to the Village College, with the remainder of the land being developed for housing. This would incorporate open space and a proportion of affordable housing, as required by LDF policies.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10711 (Girton, Land North of Girton Farm, Oakington Road)	Object	Land north of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton. Objection is raised to the exclusion of our client's two parcels of land, as indicated on the attached plan, from within the Village Framework of Girton, and within the designated Green Belt area. It is considered that the existing built form in this area justifies identification within the Village Framework and, as it more properly relates to the built up area, exclusion from the Green Belt.	The site is separated from the built up area of Girton by some distance. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included.(removal from green belt, and allocation for employment, have been addressed through other representations: 10697, 10699)	
10897 - H C Moss (Builders) Ltd (Melbourn, Land at East Farm)	Object	Land at East Farm, Melbourn. Objection is raised to the omission of land at East Farm, Melbourn, from within the Village Framework of Melbourn. Melbourn is considered to be an extremely sustainable location, not only with regard to existing facilities and services within Melbourn itself, but owing to its close proximity to Royston. Bearing in mind the entirely different character of the site in question from the surrounding agricultural countryside, it is considered appropriate to include it within the Village Framework.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included.  (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10898)	
8104 (Great Wilbraham, Rolph Land at Toft Lane) 8102 (Great Wilbraham, Rolph Land at Toft Lane)	Object	Amend boundary at Toft Lane Great Wilbraham. With pressure for development in the area, now would be an opportune time to remove this land from the green belt, allowing much needed and sustainable housing.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  (The site also forms part of the Green Belt, see response under separate representation 8103, 8102).	
10629 (Arrington, Land north of Church Farm, Church Lane) 10621 (Arrington, Land north of Church Farm, Church Lane)	Object	Land (north of Church Farm, Church Lane) at Arrington should be included within the village framework and allocated for residential development. The inclusion of the site represents a logical extension to the village framework. It is pertinent to note that the designation of the Important Countryside frontage was removed at the suggestion of the Local Plan Inspector in 2000, in recognition that the land is in no way connected to the Open Countryside. Sites in smaller villages can benefit the amenity of the village in terms of services and provide much needed affordable housing.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. This land is an open field associated with agricultural uses. Paragraph 3.25 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that buildings with associated countryside uses, such as farm buildings, are not normally included within the framework. (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10630, 10631)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9448 - Tebbit & Son (Toft, Land at end of Glebe Close)	Object	Land at end of Glebe Close, Toft. We are seeking an amendment to the existing village framework as drawn for Toft on land adjacent to Hardwick Road (see enclosed plan) to permit small-scale residential development, to include a mix of market housing and affordable housing. There are no other known suitable sites for further development within the village due to the constraints of the Cambridge Green Belt.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for an infill village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
10628 (Arrington, Land at Church Farm, Church Lane) 10622 (Arrington, Land at Church Farm, Church Lane)	Object	Land at (Church Farm, Church Lane) Arrington should be included within the village framework and allocated for residential development. The inclusion of the site represents a logical extension to the village framework. It is pertinent to note that the designation of the Important Countryside frontage was removed at the suggestion of the Local Plan Inspector in 2000, in recognition that the land is in no way connected to the Open Countryside. Sites in smaller villages can benefit the amenity of the village in terms of services and provide much needed affordable housing.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.(allocation for development and removal from green belt have been addressed through other representations: 10625, 10626)	
8334 - Barker Parry Town Planning (Willingham, Land north of SP/1f)	Object	Land north of SP/1(f), Willingham. The village framework at Willingham should be altered to include land to the west of High Street George Street Willingham. The land which is bounded to the west by the Dockhell ditch and to the north by the Lords Ground ditch is a logical physical extension of the existing housing allocation. The land is located very close to the core of the village, is not in agricultural use, falls outside the areas of flood potential, is capable of being accessed and in all other respects is available for development.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a minor rural centre, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10485 (Caldecote, Land at 44 East Drive)	Object	Land at 44 East Drive, Caldecote. Although the District Council's response to previous representations was that the Village Framework would be amended to incorporate the garden of my client's property, as indicated in the attached plan, the amendments made are only exceedingly marginal. Given that the majority of properties along East Drive have their total residential curtilage included within the Village Framework, it seems unreasonable to exclude those parts of my client's land which are used in association with the dwelling house on a day to day basis. It does not comply with the stated criteria for including land within the framework.	Paragraph 3.27 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that boundaries sometimes cut across large gardens, especially if part of the garden relates more to the countryside than the built up area of the village. Following the Preferred Options Public Participation, a change was made to the Local Plan 2004 village framework in this area, to better reflect the situation on the ground. It is considered that this is still sound.	
10816 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Over, Land South of Willingham Road)	Object	Land south of Willingham Road, Over. Over is capable of accommodating further small-scale growth, and within the village there is a site surrounded by residential development on 3 sides and by an access road on its eastern side. The site forms a logical infill site within Over, helping to support village facilities.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It is also proposed to be designated as green belt. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
10503 (Swavesey, Land North of Rose & Crown Road)	Object	Land north of Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey. It is considered that land north of Rose & Crown Road, should be included within the Village Framework of Swavesey and allocated for mixed development purposes. Swavesey is a significantly sized, sustainable settlement whose accessibility to Cambridge will be significantly enhanced with the proposed rapid transport system linking Swavesey to Cambridge. As a consequence, it is considered that Swavesey can accommodate further growth and that our client's land represent a logical infill, especially bearing in mind that vehicular access could be obtained onto Rose and Crown Road as well as a separate pedestrian/cycle access onto Boxworth End.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10504)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10624 (Dry Drayton, Land East of Cotton's Field)	Object	<p>Land east of Cotton's Field, Dry Drayton. It is required that:</p> <p>(i) The site as identified is deleted from its Green Belt designation, and instead is allocated within an amended village framework. The Proposals Map for Dry Drayton (Inset Map 26) should be modified in line with the enclosed plan.</p> <p>(ii) The site be allocated for residential development (up to 8 dwellings as per Policy ST/5) and the remainder of the site area to provide public open space, already identified as deficient in the village in the South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study (2002).</p>	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It comprises open land, designated as green belt.</p>	
10716 - Cambridgeshire Recycling (Gamlingay, Industrial Land SW of Gamlingay)	Object	<p>Industrial land SW of Gamlingay. We object to the proposed framework boundary for Gamlingay which is drawn too tightly around the existing built-up area and does not provide for any small village extensions. [see also representations on ST/1, ST/4, and DP/8] We request that the village framework boundary be amended to provide for this, as indicated on the enclosed plan.</p>	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that frameworks have not been defined around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated in the countryside or detached from the main concentration of buildings in a nearby village.</p>	
10460 - Girton Golf Club (Cambridge) Ltd (Girton, Girton Golf Club Old Practise Area)	Object	<p>Old practise area, Girton Golf Club, Girton. We feel our land is no longer on the edge of the Green Belt and is ideally placed for future housing needs without detriment to the rural scene. The housing need is still there particularly for first time buyers. There have been developments in Girton especially towards the Huntingdon Road end of Girton and the Oakington Depot has now been redeveloped notably with three/ four bedroom units. Also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The cycle path has been extended to connect to Oakington.</li> <li>- The 30mph speed limit has been extended beyond the site boundary.</li> <li>- Traffic calming has been introduced past our boundary.</li> <li>- Planning permission has been granted beyond our boundary inside the Green Belt for stables, house with stables and warehousing unit.</li> </ul>	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The site is also designated as green belt. Its development for housing would and compromise the purposes of the green belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study, existing commitments and the remaining development at Cambourne that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10823 - Messrs J and P Dossett (Arrington, Former GPO Telephone Exchange)	Object	Former GPO Telephone Exchange, Arrington. A Village Framework should also be defined around the group or development along Ermine Way to the South of the main village, as indicated on the attached plan. It is more appropriate for policies for this area to relate to one within a Village rather than policies relating to the open countryside. There are a mix of uses in the area, comprising residential units, a garage, farm and the former GPO Telephone exchange. The inclusion of the area within a framework would enable the change of use of the former GPO telephone exchange to be considered in relation to Policies relating to Infill Villages (Policy ST/6). This would enable planning permission to be forthcoming for an alternative use for these buildings, which to date has not been possible as countryside policies relate to this area.	Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. This site comprises a small group of buildings, some distance from the built up area of a village. It would be inappropriate to define a framework around it.	
10813 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Fulbourn, Land in front of The Windmill School)	Object	Land in front of The Windmill School, Fulbourn. Given the future closure of Windmill School in Fulbourn, there will be a brownfield site in a prominent road frontage position. This site currently falls on the very edge of a major developed site within the Green Belt, although it is considered there are sound reasons for including it within the village framework. This will allow the proper redevelopment (and therefore proper planning) of this important site.	This site forms part of a major developed site in the Green Belt, and should remain outside the village framework. Policy GB/5 provides a framework for any redevelopment of the site. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10535 - The W Scambler Trust (Dry Drayton, Land North of Pettitt's Close)	Object	Land north of Pettitt's Close, Dry Drayton. Objection is raised to the inclusion of our client's land within the Green Belt and outside the defined Village Framework of Dry Drayton. The site represents a logical one for residential development, as it adjoins recent residential development both to the south east and south west, and is defined by a footpath connecting to the rest of the Village along the north eastern boundary. The inclusion of this land in the Village Framework would represent a logical rounding off of a development in this vicinity, without detriment to the village form or significant incursion into the Green Belt. It is considered that further limited growth within Dry Drayton would support the local facilities whilst at the same time providing needed affordable housing in the locality.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	
10814 - C & A Locke (Whittlesford, Land at Granta Cottage, Mill Lane)	Object	Land at Granta Cottage, Mill Lane, Whittlesford. This representation relates to the omission of land adjoining Swan's corner, Mill Lane, Whittlesford from within the Village Framework, and its inclusion within the Green Belt designation. It is considered that, since the construction of Swan's Corner and the erection of a stable on the land in question, the character of the area has changed so that it now properly relates to the built form of the Village more than it does to the surrounding countryside from which it is now divided by a fence and planting. It is differentiated also by means of usage.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The land is also designated as green belt.	
10613 - Dixon International Group Ltd (Pampisford, Land North of Brewery Raod)	Object	Land north of Brewery Road, Pampisford. The Dixon International Group site at Brewery Road, Pampisford, as previously developed land, has qualities suitable to promote it as a housing allocation. Its proximity and close association with Sawston, the largest village identified as a Rural Centre renders it appropriate for consideration. Previously developed land should take precedence over greenfield allocations and the site presents a clear and logical solution to meet the housing land supply targets in the rural area and address the identified shortfall to 2016.	This site is within the village framework of Pampisford. Issues raised are addressed in response to 10608.	
10929 - Carter Jonas (Melbourn, Land North of Melbourn Science Park)	Object	Land north of Melbourn Science Park, Melbourn. There is an incorrect boundary to the Village Framework for Melbourn. This should have been corrected in the previous Local Plan and the Village Framework erroneously passes through an existing building. Supporting information, including previous correspondence with the Council, is provided to prove the case.	It is agreed that a slight amendment is required to the village framework to go around the outside of the building. However this change does not need to be as significant as proposed in the representation, which would unnecessarily bring open land into the framework.	Amend the village framework of Melbourn to follow the outside of the building at the northern most end of the Science Park.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10271 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge (Madingley, Burnt Farm, High Street)	Object	<p>Land at Burnt Farm, High Street, Madingley. The University considers that the village framework for Madingley should be redrawn to include the farmyard at Burnt Farm which is considered to have development potential.</p> <p>A mixed development here comprising market and affordable housing, together with some small scale employment use, would help to conserve the existing buildings on the street frontage and, if developed sensitively, the recycling of this brownfield site could bring positive benefits to the village and its community.</p>	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Paragraph 3.25 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that buildings associated with countryside uses, including farm buildings, are not normally included in the framework. The definition of previously developed land in PPG3 also generally excludes agricultural uses. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for an infill village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. Employment policies relating to buildings in the countryside provide an appropriate framework for considering future uses.</p>	
10883 (Little Gransden, Land behind 11-47 Primrose Hill)	Object	<p>Land behind 11-47 Primrose Hill, Little Gransden. This objection identifies a site (green) which is part of the adjoining field where additional development could be accommodated away from the sensitive areas in Little Gransden.</p>	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.</p> <p>With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for an infill village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.</p>	
10572 - The W Scambler Trust (Swavesey, Land South of Whitton Close)	Object	<p>Land south of Whitton Close, Swavesey. Objection is raised to the omission of Land to the south of Whitton Close, Swavesey, from within the Village Framework. It is considered that this land represents a logical extension to the Village Framework of the settlement, to which access could be obtained from Whitton Close following the demolition of one property. In addition, the land could form part of a larger rectangular allocation extending to Rose and Crown Road to the south, which could accommodate a mixed development beneficial to Swavesey, without extending the Village Framework to detriment to the setting of the Village.</p>	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10573)</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10506 - The W Scambler Trust (Swavesey, Land South of Whitton Close)	Object	Land south of Whitton Close, Swavesey. Objection is raised to the omission of our client's land, from within the Village Framework of Swavesey. It is considered that this land represents a logical extension to the Village Framework of the settlement, to which access could be obtained from Whitton Close following the demolition of one property. This arrangement has already been discussed and already agreed as feasible with your Council. In addition, our client's land could form part of a larger rectangular allocation extending to Rose and Crown Road to the south, which could accommodate a mixed development beneficial to Swavesey, without extending the Village Framework to detriment to the setting of the Village.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10507)	
10415 - Martin Grant Homes Ltd (Cambourne, Proposed extension North of Cambourne)	Object	Proposed extension north of Cambourne. A number of concerns regarding the soundness and appropriateness of the Council's approach to the emerging housing strategy. Particularly concerned as to the ability of the proposed housing allocations to deliver the requisite dwelling numbers during the plan period, and consider that unless additional housing allocations are proposed through the plan process, there is likely to be a material shortfall in housing completions to 2016 in accordance with Structure Plan requirements. Client's land at Cambourne, north of the A428, should be allocated in the emerging LDF to help meet the likely shortfall in housing land supply to 2026 and beyond.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the Housing Trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. Therefore there is no need to allocated additional land. Indeed, the site on land north of Cambourne is not well related to the rest of Cambourne, separated by a busy dual carriageway, and is characterised by a very open and sweeping, slightly rolling, landscape which is highly visible over a wide area.	No change.
11371 (Waterbeach, Land between Cambridge Road and Car Dyke Road)	Object	Objections are raised to the omission of our client's land, edged red on the attached plan, from within the Village Framework of Waterbeach and its designation within the Cambridge Green Belt.  It is considered that Waterbeach is a highly sustainable settlement with a good range of facilities which could accommodate further growth without detriment to the form of the settlement, impact on the countryside or the general attractiveness of the Green Belt.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10970 - Mrs A J Johnson and Mr B Moore (Great Shelford, Land East of Hinton Way)	Object	Land east of Hinton Way, Great Shelford. The Village Framework should be amended and further residential land included. Land to the east of Hinton Way Great Shelford is considered to be most appropriate for residential development, as it is very well related to the existing settlement form adjoining existing development on three sides.	The site comprises an open field. The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. (allocation for development and removal from green belt have been addressed through other representations: 10969, 10963). (Representations on removal from special policy area also addressed through Southern fringe Area Action Plan). (Also considered as part of larger site through other representations)	
10525 - Mrs A J Johnson and Mr B Moore (Great Shelford, Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way)	Object	An Additional Site Allocation For Development: Land to the east of Hinton Way, North of Mingle Lane and Gog Magog Way, Great Shelford/Stapleford. Despite Great Shelford being identified as a Rural Growth Centre, Policy SP1 allocates no additional housing sites within the settlement. This is considered illogical given the considerable number of additional houses to be provided, and the fact that Great Shelford must be one of the most sustainable locations for further development in the District. It is, therefore, recommended that the Village Framework should be amended and further residential land included.	The site comprises mainly open arable fields, as well as a small cemetery. The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  (allocation for development and removal from green belt have been addressed through other representations: 10521, 10963). (Representations on removal from special policy area also addressed through Southern fringe Area Action Plan)	
10991 (Stapleford, Land at Gog Magog Way)	Object	Land at Gog Magog Way, Stapleford. Objections are raised to the omission of Land at the north of Gog Magog Way, Stapleford from within the Village Framework for Stapleford. It is considered the land represents a logical rounding off of the Village, and would provide a pleasing framework and increased surveillance over the proposed recreation ground over the southern side of Gog Magog Way.	This site forms the frontage of a much larger open, arable field. The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  (allocation for development and removal from green belt addressed through other representations: 10991, 10527).(Removal from special policy area addressed through representations on Southern Fringe Area Action Plan)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7855 (Cottenham, Land between 117 & 123 Histon Road)	Object	Land between 117 & 123 Histon Road, Cottenham. Amend village framework to include an acre of land between 117 and 123 Histon Road, Cottenham in order that it is no longer classified as greenbelt, as this is an infill plot, bounded by houses, and is only 45ft wide. Virtually all of this side of the road is built on, unlike the opposite side of the road.	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The site forms part of an area of sporadic development in the green belt south of Cottenham. The site itself stretches some distance from the road frontage. It is separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved".</p> <p>Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7856 (Cottenham, Land between 108 & 122 Histon Road)	Object	Land between 108 & 122 Histon Road, Cottenham. The Cottenham Village Framework has not been changed for some considerable time and this should now be expanded on the Histon Road side of the village to take in small pockets of land that are suitable for infill, this will protect all land at the rear from being used for unsuitable habitation should they come up for sale.	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The site forms part of an area of sporadic development in the green belt south of Cottenham. The site itself stretches some distance from the road frontage. It is separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved".</p> <p>Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8198 (Cottenham, Land South of Cottenham up to Appletrees Close)	Object	Extend the village framework on the SE side of Histon Road in Cottenham, to Appletree Close, the end of built up area. Virtually all of this side of the road is built on, unlike the opposite side of the road.	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The site forms part of an area of sporadic development in the green belt south of Cottenham. The site itself stretches some distance from the road frontage. It is separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved".</p> <p>Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10156 (Cottenham, Land South of Cottenham, Histon Road)	Object	Land south of Cottenham, Histon Road, Cottenham. In Cottenham, the current boundary doesn't reflect the present extent of the built up area. A number of houses have been built on infill sites beyond the boundary of the currently defined village framework along the Histon Road. No demonstrable harm would result as a consequence of redefining the boundary which would merely be redrawn to reflect development that has taken place in recent years. It is recommended that the village framework for Cottenham be redefined.	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The site forms part of an area of sporadic development in the green belt south of Cottenham. The site itself stretches some distance from the road frontage. It is separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved".</p> <p>Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10467 - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust (Fulbourn, Fulbourn MDS Area 4)	Object	Fulbourn MDS Area 4, Fulbourn. An objection is raised to the fact that one policy area has been designated to the west of Fulbourn, this area comprising the Fulbourn Hospital site, Capital Park, the Ida Darwin site together with a smaller area referred to as Addenbrooke's Laundry Site. It is considered that, by reason of usage, ownership and future plans, the 'Major development site in the Green Belt' designation should reflect the significant subdivisions within the one site. It is more appropriate to include the developed area within the Village Framework of Fulbourn rather than being identified as proposed. Site 4 - Addenbrookes Laundry Site - This is a distinct area on which separate representations are being submitted on behalf of Capital and Counties.	The site fits the definition in annex C of PPG2, and should remain designated as a major developed site in the Green Belt. The policy creates a framework for future development on the site. It would be inappropriate to include the site within the village framework of Fulbourn.  Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
10466 - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust (Fulbourn, Fulbourn MDS Area 3)	Object	Fulbourn MDS Area 3, Fulbourn. An objection is raised to the fact that one policy area has been designated to the west of Fulbourn, this area comprising the Fulbourn Hospital site, Capital Park, the Ida Darwin site together with a smaller area referred to as Addenbrooke's Laundry Site. It is considered that, by reason of usage, ownership and future plans, the 'Major development site in the Green Belt' designation should reflect the significant subdivisions within the one site. It is more appropriate to include the developed area within the Village Framework of Fulbourn rather than being identified as proposed. Site3 - Ida Darwin - This area provides specialist mental health services for children and young people, together with NHS Management and administrative support services.	The site fits the definition in annex C of PPG2, and should remain designated as a major developed site in the Green Belt. The policy creates a framework for future development on the site. It would be inappropriate to include the site within the village framework of Fulbourn.  Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10426 - Harcourt Developments Ltd. (Cambourne, Proposed extension North of Cambourne)	Object	Proposed extension north of Cambourne. A number of concerns regarding the soundness and appropriateness of the Council's approach to the emerging housing strategy. Particularly concerned as to the ability of the proposed housing allocations to deliver the requisite dwelling numbers during the plan period, and consider that unless additional housing allocations are proposed through the plan process, there is likely to be a material shortfall in housing completions to 2016 in accordance with Structure Plan requirements. Client's land at Cambourne, north of the A428, should be allocated in the emerging LDF to help meet the likely shortfall in housing land supply to 2026 and beyond.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the Cambourne, and is separated from it by the A428. It should remain outside the village framework.  (allocation for development addressed through other representations)	
10464 - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust (Fulbourn, Fulbourn MDS Area 1)	Object	Fulbourn MDS Area 1, Fulbourn. An objection is raised to the fact that one policy area has been designated to the west of Fulbourn, this area comprising the Fulbourn Hospital site, Capital Park, the Ida Darwin site together with a smaller area referred to as Addenbrooke's Laundry Site. It is considered that, by reason of usage, ownership and future plans, the 'Major development site in the Green Belt' designation should reflect the significant subdivisions within the one site. It is more appropriate to include the developed area within the Village Framework of Fulbourn rather than being identified as proposed. Site 1 - Fulbourn Site - This site presently provides adult and elderly mental health in-patient services.	The site fits the definition in annex C of PPG2, and should remain designated as a major developed site in the Green Belt. The policy creates a framework for future development on the site. It would be inappropriate to include the site within the village framework of Fulbourn.  Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
10580 (Foxton, Beech Tree Farm, Shepreth Road) 10577 (Foxton, Beech Tree Farm, Shepreth Road)	Object	Land at Beech Tree Farm, Shepreth Road, Foxton. Objections are raised to the fact that the Village Framework does not incorporate any of the rear garden of Beech Tree Farm House, Shepreth Road, Foxton. This would seem to be at variance with the Local Plan definition for Village Frameworks as the land is the long established garden area used in connection with the dwelling house.	Paragraph 3.27 of the Development Control Policies DPD notes that frameworks often cut across large gardens on the edge of villages, if those gardens relate more to the countryside than the built up area of the village. This is the case with this site. It acknowledges the fact that development to the rear would effectively extend the built up area of the village into the countryside. A correction to the framework is therefore not required.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10166 - Christ's College (Cottenham, Land South of Oakington Road)	Object	<p>Christ's College believe the land in their ownership, south of Oakington Road at the south western edge of Cottenham village, as shown on the attached Plan, has some long term development potential which should be included within the village framework on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>This site, which is close to the centre of the village, could provide the required land to meet some of the long term development needs of the village including, market and affordable housing, small scale employment opportunities, community facilities and open space.</p>	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It mainly comprises of an open arable field, with some allotment type uses on the northern part of the site. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a minor rural centre, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.</p>	
10102 (Willingham, Highgate Farm, Over Road)	Object	<p>Land at Highgate Farm, Over Road, Willingham. The village boundary should be amended to include land at Highgate Farm, Over, to enable the rationalisation and improvement of employment uses in the village as an attractive "business park".</p>	<p>Part of the site has developed out of countryside uses, whilst the remainder is agricultural land. Despite the partial development of this site, it still relates better to the countryside than the adjoining built-up area of the village. Further development in this exposed and unsustainable location would be undesirable. It should not become part of the built-up area of the village.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10544 (Bassingbourn, Land South of the cemetery, The Causeway)	Object	Land to the south of the Causeway, Bassingbourn. It is considered that the land should be located within the village framework, which would represent a logical extension of the village boundary. The land is ideally suited for residential or employment development. Employment land would help balance additional residential development and help create a more sustainable community. The village has a good range of local facilities including a primary school and village college, and is located just 4km from Royston. The land at north Brook Road, if accessed from Poplar Farm Close, would ensure that the important Countryside frontage is not affected. The site is located in a very sustainable location.	The site, comprising an arable field, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10545, 10546)	
10382 (Cottenham, Land North of 14 Ivatt Street)	Object	Land north of 14 Ivatt Street, Cottenham. We object to the boundary line for the framework for village development DP/7 and DP/8, inasmuch as it should include an extension of land to incorporate land west of High Street, along Ivatt Street. The land has been used, in accordance with previous consents, for residential caravans and is also used for storage. Circumstances have substantially changed since a previous appeal in 1982, particularly PPG3 and the inclusion of land for housing that is underused and partly "brownfield". The land at 15 & 17 Ivatt Street forms a logical extension for development of underused land. The site is surrounded by both commercial and residential development and the proposed development would effectively round off built development at the end of Ivatt Street.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	
10836 (Waterbeach, Land at Rosalind Franklin House, Bannold Road)	Object	Land adjacent to Bannold Road Waterbeach should be included within the village framework. It is just as suitable for residential development as proposed allocation SP/1D. The site is surrounded by development. Its development would relate well to the existing ribbon of development along Bannold Road.	The site, comprising an arable field and relatively isolated building, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10835)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10634 - Munro Group Ltd (Waterbeach, Land North of Cambridge Road)	Object	Land is to the north of Cambridge Road, Waterbeach. The land represents a logical rounding off of the village framework of Waterbeach given its proximity to Cambridge Road.	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated.</p> <p>The site is also within the Cambridge Green Belt. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10634)</p>	
10771 (Fen Ditton, Land off Horningsea Road)	Object	Land off Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton. Objections raised to the omission of Land between no. 28 and 12 Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton from within the Village Framework, and its designation within the Cambridge Green Belt and as an important Countryside Frontage. Bearing in mind the sustainability of the settlement in relation to Cambridge, to which it is very accessible by foot, bicycle and the nearby park and ride, it is considered that it is an ideal settlement in which to incorporate further sustainable development. The site comprises a gap in an otherwise built up frontage which is bounded by a broken down post and wire fence which has no associated planting.	<p>The site, comprising a field, does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.</p> <p>(allocation for development and removal from green belt and important countryside frontage have been addressed through other representations: 10772, 10773, 10774)</p>	
10641 - Munro Group Ltd (Waterbeach, Land between Bannold Road/Burgess Road)	Object	Land between Bannold Road and Burgess Road, Waterbeach. The land represents a logical rounding off of the village framework of Waterbeach by the inclusion of land which is contiguous with existing residential development on three sides. It is anticipated that the principal access can be achieved from Bannold Road, a secondary access could connect to Pieces court to the west, and Burgess Road could be used essentially for cycle and pedestrian use.	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.</p> <p>(allocation for development and removal from green belt have been addressed through other representations: 10642, 10643)</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10153 (Cottenham, South along Histon Road)	Object	<p>Land along Histon Road, Cottenham.</p> <p>In Cottenham, the current boundary doesn't reflect the present extent of the built up area. A number of houses have been built on infill sites beyond the boundary of the currently defined village framework along the Histon Road. No demonstrable harm would result as a consequence of redefining the boundary which would merely be redrawn to reflect development that has taken place in recent years. It is recommended that the village framework for Cottenham be redefined.</p>	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The site forms part of an area of sporadic development in the green belt south of Cottenham. It is separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved".</p> <p>Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10465 - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust (Fulbourn, Fulbourn MDS Area 2)	Object	Fulbourn MDS Area 2, Fulbourn. An objection is raised to the fact that one policy area has been designated to the west of Fulbourn, this area comprising the Fulbourn Hospital site, Capital Park, the Ida Darwin site together with a smaller area referred to as Addenbrooke's Laundry Site. It is considered that, by reason of usage, ownership and future plans, the 'Major development site in the Green Belt' designation should reflect the significant subdivisions within the one site. It is more appropriate to include the developed area within the Village Framework of Fulbourn rather than being identified as proposed. Site 2 - Capital Park - This area comprises office accommodation in both conversions and new build.	The site fits the definition in annex C of PPG2, and should remain designated as a major developed site in the Green Belt. The policy creates a framework for future development on the site. It would be inappropriate to include the site within the village framework of Fulbourn.  Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
10604 (Swavesey, Land North of Taylors Lane)	Object	Land north of Taylors Lane, Swavesey. Objection is raised to the omission of Land to the north of Taylors Lane, Swavesey, from within the defined Village Framework of Swavesey. The land currently comprises the longstanding garden area of nos. 22 and 24 Taylors Lane, Swavesey, together with the builders yard for which planning permission has been granted. It is, therefore, inappropriate to include this area within the Village Framework.	The framework in this area correctly reflects the built up area of the village. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included.	
10920 (Kneesworth, Land North of Kneesworth Site B)	Object	Land north of Kneesworth Site B, Kneesworth. Objections are raised to the omission of land to the north of Chestnut Lane from within the Village Framework of Kneesworth. Site would accommodate additional housing land, in a sustainable position in relation to the facilities both within Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, and the nearby centre of Royston. Site could also provide needed public open space together with residential/employment	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10923)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8792 - D H Barford + Co Limited (Hardwick, Land near 279-345 St Neots Rd)	Object	<p>The Hardwick Village Framework should be extended to incorporate properties along St. Neots Road.</p> <p>The Framework excludes a number of properties that have a clearly defined built character and their inclusion is logical.</p> <p>The character of the area will be further consolidated as a result of the redevelopment of the cafe site now granted planning permission.</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated. This is the case along St. Neots Road where the linear development is some distance from the built up area of the village.</p>	
10806 - Lighthouse Developments	Object	To achieve the desired number of windfall sites, adjustments are required to the village framework.	<p>Disagree. The South Cambridgeshire Urban Capacity Study provides a realistic assessment of windfalls in the plan period within village framework boundaries. Minor amendments to the frameworks are not required to boost this element of land supply in order to meet housing land supply requirements.</p>	
10164 (Over, Land off Randalls Lane)	Object	Land off Randalls Lane, Over, should be included within the village framework.	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It has the characteristics of an open field, and cannot be classified as previously developed land under the definition of PPG3.</p> <p>With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.</p> <p>On criteria one of the policy, what constitutes an essential part of village character can be determined at the planning application stage, and utilise other guidance including supplementary planning documents.</p>	
10853 (Caldecote, Land rear of 104 West Drive) 10847 (Caldecote, Land rear of 104 West Drive)	Object	<p>Land at the rear of 104 West Drive, Caldecote.</p> <p>Representations are made in respect of the omission of land to the rear of 104 West Drive, Caldecote from within the Village Framework of Highfields Caldecote. Site formerly comprised part of Grafton Pig Farms. Site also adjoins residential development which has been recently implemented, and from which vehicular access into the land has been retained.</p>	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.</p> <p>(allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10849, 10854)</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10653 (Over, Land East of Recreation Ground)	Object	Land east of recreation ground, Over. Objections are raised to the fact Land at the Doles, New Road, Over, has been omitted from the Village Framework for Over and allocated as an extension to the existing recreation ground. It is considered more appropriate for the additional recreational facilities to be located on the outskirts of the Village, whilst facilitating further residential development land more conveniently situated for all facilities.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  (allocation for development and addressed through other representations: 10657)	
8328 - The Trustees of Mr Maurice Barker (Over, Land behind 2-10 West Street)	Object	Land behind 2-10 West Street, Over. The village framework on the south side of West Street should be altered to follow a more rational and consistent basis.	The framework differentiates between the built up area, and the area where countryside policies should apply. Parts of long gardens relate more to the countryside than the built up area. The framework in this location does follow features on the ground. To the rear of No.2, the line follows the built up area of the dwelling and buildings. The line is then be drawn across to the shorter gardens of no.8 & 10, which are backed by a tree line.	
9183 - David Wilson Homes (S Midlands)	Object	The delineation of village frameworks should, in all cases, reflect their potential housing capacity. Modest extensions may well be acceptable, environmentally, socially and economically, and in order to provide essential opportunities for local housing in the rural areas.	Disagree, the delineation of frameworks is not based on housing capacity, but what constitutes the built up area of the village. It defines where policies for the built up areas of settlements give way to those policies for the countryside.  Permitting modest extensions for the purposes of development in most villages would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
8157 (West Wrattling, Land north of the common)	Object	Land north of the common, West Wrattling. 6 houses for sale and 6 social/shared ownership units and a village shop with residential accommodation above. D'Abo Family Trusts own five sites. We have consulted local Parish Councils and have their support for proposed developments. We strongly support limited expansion of these villages in order that community services are maintained and improved. Our development plans provide many benefits for local community, including provision of much needed social housing, village shop and post office, new car parking facilities, dedicated playground, new cricket pavilion and more.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for an infill village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10791 - Jesus College (Cambridge) (Harston, Beech Farm Church Street)	Object	It is considered that land at Beech Farm, Harston should be included within the Harston Village Framework.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included within the framework. The site mainly comprises of farm buildings. The exclusion from the green belt is not incompatible with remaining outside the framework, as the two designations are not determined on the same criteria.	
10765 - Deal Farms Ltd. (Barrington, Land North of Glebe Road)	Object	Land north of Glebe Road, Barrington. Objections are raised to the omission of Land to the north of Glebe Road, Barrington from within the Village Framework and being retained within the designated Cambridge Green Belt. It is considered that residential development on the land could be accommodated without detriment to the village form, as it would represent a rounding-off of the existing development in Barrington and would be adjoined on three sides by existing residential development. Owing to the relationship of the land to the existing built form, there would be no detriment to the openness of the Green Belt should the land be developed.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  (allocation for development and removal from green belt have been addressed through other representations: 10766, 10767)	
8018 (Willingham, Land East of Rampton Road)	Object	Land East of Rampton Road, Willingham. Correction of framework east of Rampton Road on eastern edge of village. Site is well defined by existing well established planting, buildings and electricity line. Proposed land different in character to open agricultural land surrounding the village.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included.	
10610 (Swavesey, Land North of Taylors Lane)	Object	Land north of Taylors Lane, Swavesey. Objection is raised to the omission of area of land to the north of existing premises along Taylors Lane, Swavesey from within the Village Framework. It is considered that a comprehensive development within this area, which already has an extant planning permission for the erection of a tennis club and associated courts, would be to the benefit of the village. Part of the land could be developed for residential purposes at the same time as facilitating public access to part of the scheduled Ancient Monument which forms part of this site. It is pertinent to note that Swavesey is identified as currently being short of public open space which this proposal would address.	The framework in this area correctly reflects the built up area of the village. The area has a distinct rural character separate from the main part of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD makes clear that the frameworks have not been drawn around areas of scattered development where buildings are isolated, and that buildings associated with countryside use are normally not included.  (allocation for development has been addressed against representation number 10612)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9798 (Caldecote, Land at 72 West Drive)	Object	Land at 72 West Drive, Caldecote. I request that land at 72 West Drive, Highfields Caldecote (currently outside the village framework) be included as development land for residential purposes. Or, that the current approach outlined in CS3 should be modified to permit residential development outside the current village framework. (Land marked on the attached plan).	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.</p> <p>With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.</p> <p>Development in the countryside is restricted to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, outdoor recreation and other uses which need to be located in the countryside. Permitting general residential development outside village frameworks would be contrary to PPG3, PPS7, and policies in the Regional Spatial Strategy, the Draft regional Plan and the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan.</p>	
8172 - Stamford Homes Limited (Over, Land between New Road & Station Road)	Object	Land between New Road & Station Road, Over. Seek alteration of Village Framework at Over to accommodate new housing allocation in the interests of accommodating natural village growth and the promotion of social inclusion. Registered as DP/8 village framework.	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.</p> <p>With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.</p> <p>Development would also have a signifiant impact on the character of this are aof the village.</p>	
8092 (Little Gransden, Land NW of 20 Primrose Walk)	Object	Land NW of 20 Primrose Walk, Little Gransden. This objection identifies a site (red) of about 0.2 hectares of brownfield land which relates well to the built up framework and existing development along Primrose Walk.	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. Additionally, it does not comprise of previously developed land. The Definition in PPG3 states 'Also excluded is land that was previously developed but where the remains of any structure or activity have blended into the landscape in the process of time...'. The site primarily has the characteristic of woodland.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10917 (Kneesworth, Land North of Kneesworth Site A)	Object	Land north of Kneesworth Site A, Kneesworth. Objections are raised to the omission of Land to the North of Nightingale Avenue from within the Village Framework of Kneesworth. Site would accommodate additional housing land, in a sustainable position in relation to the facilities both within Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, and the nearby centre of Royston.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	
10906 - Humo Holdings (Great Abington, Land at Strawberry Farm)	Object	Strawberry Farm Great Abington should be included within the Village Framework. It is dissimilar in all facets to the traditional Land Settlement areas, and for this reason it should be excluded from the Special Policy Area.	The site is at the edge of the village and has the characteristics of agricultural uses. It does not warrant inclusion in the village framework. Despite fronting onto Pampisford Road, it retains the characteristic of a site in the Land Settlement Association area, and should remain part of the countryside.	
9893	Object	It appears you have made a blanket decision not to extend any village framework, without giving any consideration to any individual merits or injustices.	Disagree. All representations requesting a change to the village framework are considered thoroughly. They are tested against the policy and reasoned justification, to see if an amendment is warranted, and whether the land should be classed as part of the built up area.  The allocation of land for development is a separate issue. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. The search sequence for housing land in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan, must also be considered. It requires that development be focused on the most sustainable locations.	
8180 - The Hardwick Group of Residents (Hardwick, Land on St Neots Road West of Hardwick)	Object	Land on St Neots Road, west of Hardwick. The village framework for Hardwick should be amended to include our clients' site as indicated on the plan (to be sent to you under separate cover). The village framework should include land to the south of St Neots Road and incorporate the Enterprise Cafe site which has already been granted for residential redevelopment and the intervening land which comprises our clients' site. The site should be allocated either for residential purposes or employment purposes.	Although the site contains some development, it is separated from the main built up area of the village. Paragraph 3.26 of the Development Control Policies DPD states that frameworks have not been defined around areas of scattered development detached from the main concentration of buildings in a nearby village. This is such a case.	
8179 - Messrs Mailer & Sharp (Bassingbourn, Land behind Manor Farm)	Object	Land behind Manor Farm, Bassingbourn. The village framework for Bassingbourn should be amended to include our clients' site as indicated on the plan.	This site consists of agricultural land. The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10747 - Latent Land (Balsham, Land East of Fox Street)	Object	Land to the east of Fox Road, Balsham should be included within the village framework and allocated for residential development.	The majority of this site consists of green field land in the countryside. It does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. The development at Orchard Close is an affordable housing exception site, and should remain outside the village framework.	
8158 (West Wrattling, Land North of the Causeway)	Object	Land north of the Causeway, West Wrattling. This site is one third within the village envelope and remaining two thirds outside. Wish to move the boundary to the rear of the site to correspond with boundaries of all the neighbouring properties. Single dwelling to be erected. D'Abo Family Trusts own five sites. We have consulted local Parish Councils and have their support for proposed developments. We strongly support limited expansion of these villages in order that community services are maintained and improved. Our development plans provide many benefits for local community, including provision of much needed social housing, village shop and post office, new car parking facilities, dedicated playground, new cricket pavilion and more.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for an infill village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	
8019 (Weston Green, Land North of Mill Hill)	Object	Land north of Mill Hill, Weston Green. 8 new market houses of different sizes, 8 social housing/shared ownership units, a new expanded car park for the Reading Room, a new playground and a new cricket pavilion to replace the current one. D'Abo Family Trusts own five sites. We have consulted local Parish Councils and have their support for proposed developments. We strongly support limited expansion of these villages in order that community services are maintained and improved. Our development plans provide many benefits for local community, including provision of much needed social housing, village shop and post office, new car parking facilities, dedicated playground, new cricket pavilion and more.	This site consists of a large open field north of the village. The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for an infill village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7831 - Sawston Parish Council (Sawston, Land near Sawston Church) 7825 - fdgdsf (Sawston, Land near Sawston Church)	Object	There is a site of triangular shape facing onto Church Lane, behind nos 2 4 and 6 St Mary's Road and adjacent to the grounds of Sawston Hall. At the present time this site is in Green Belt and included in the Village Framework. This plot is an oddity within Sawston and the Parish Council would very much like it to be removed from the constraints of Green Belt to allow a small single story property to be built on this land which would fit well into the street scene of the already residential area.	<p>This site is currently outside the village framework, designated as Green Belt and Historic Park and Garden.</p> <p>Although it is acknowledged that the site has become overgrown, this does not justify a change to its designation. It does not form part of the built up area of the village.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p>	
10742 - Latent Land (Balsham, Land North of High Street)	Object	Land to the rear of 108 High Street, Balsham should be included within the village framework and allocated for residential development.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.	
10661 (Over, Land East of Recreation Ground)	Object	Land east of recreation ground, Over. Objections are raised to the fact Land at the Doles, New Road, Over, has been omitted from the Village Framework for Over and allocated as an extension to the existing recreation ground. It is considered more appropriate for the additional recreational facilities to be located on the outskirts of the Village, whilst facilitating further residential development land more conveniently situated for all facilities.	<p>The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.</p> <p>(allocation for development and removal recreation allocation have been addressed through other representations: 10660, 10662)</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10542 (Bassingbourn, Land North of Brook Road, West of North End)	Object	Our clients land (land to north of Brook Road, West of North End, Bassingbourn). It is considered that the land should be located within the village framework, which would represent a logical extension of the village boundary. The site is well related to the village centre and local facilities. The village has a good range of local facilities including a primary school and village college, and is located just 4km from Royston. The land at north Brook Road, if accessed from Poplar Farm Close, would ensure that the Important Countryside Frontage is not affected. The site is located in a very sustainable location.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It has also been designated an important countryside frontage, due to the role the openness of the frontage plays in bringing the countryside into the heart of the village.  (allocation for development and addressed through other representations: 10543)	
9805 (Caldecote, Land at 70 West Drive)	Object	Land at 70 West Drive, Caldecote. I request that land at 64a (formerly known as no 64) West Drive, Highfields Caldecote currently outside the village framework be included as development land for residential purposes. Or that the current approach outlined in CS3 should be modified to permit residential development outside the current village framework. Land marked on the attached plan.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It clearly relates more to the countryside. The same applies to the smaller change suggested in the representation.	
10496 - Mr. B. Baker, Mr. R Mallandine, The W Scrambler Trust (Swavesey, Land between Whitton Close/Rose & Crown Road)	Object	Land between Whitton Close / Rose & Crown Road, Swavesey. Objection is raised to the omission of this comprehensive area, as indicated on the attached plan, from inclusion in the Village Framework of Swavesey, which would facilitate a major mixed growth development at the benefit of the Village. Its position in relation to the existing built form of the Village would mean that the development would not project into open countryside owing to the development already to the north of the site.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10497)	
10547 (Fowlmere, Land between Cambridge Road & Thriplow Road)	Object	Land between Cambridge Road & Thriplow Road, Fowlmere. An objection is raised to the omission of my client's land from the designated Village Framework for Fowlmere. The land, which is adjoined on two sides by residential development and by existing roads on three sides, is considered to be well related to the existing village form. In addition, it is pertinent to note that the land is excluded from the Green Belt designation. Accordingly, it is recommended that it would be appropriate for residential development, which would facilitate the provision of both private and affordable housing within the village.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10548)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10530 - Yardline Limited (Pampisford, Land East of High Street)	Object	Land east of High Street, Pampisford. Objections are made to our client's land being excluded from the Village Framework, yet included within the Conservation Area and omitted from the Green Belt designation. There would appear to be no apparent reason for the Village Framework as indicated, which takes no account of access to the parking areas to the rear of properties fronting on to the High Street. The development of the land for residential purposes would enhance the visual amenity of this part of the Conservation Area by the removal of the overgrown scrub and debris. Vehicular access could be obtained from the High Street via that existing and any development on the land would be in keeping with that of surrounding and would not project development into the open countryside.	Disagree. Land to the rear of the property clearly relates more to the countryside than the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the framework. This is consistent with paragraph 3.27 of the Development Control Policies DPD.	
9982 - Laing Homes North Thames	Object	However, there is no allowance for non-conforming employment uses within villages which may cause adverse effects on residential amenity and would be better located elsewhere. We therefore consider that this policy should be amended to allow for redevelopment of such sites.	Disagree. The policy cross refers to policy ET7 (proposed to be modified), which considers when existing uses are generating environmental problems when considering the change of use of village employment sites.	
10855 (Caldecote, Land rear of 10 West Drive) 10841 (Caldecote, Land rear of 10 West Drive)	Object	Land at the rear of 10 West Drive, Caldecote. Representations are made in respect of the omission of land to the rear of 10 West Drive, Caldecote from within the Village Framework of Highfields Caldecote. Site formerly comprised part of Grafton Pig Farms. Site also adjoins residential development which has been recently implemented, and from which vehicular access into the land has been retained.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework.  (allocation for development addressed through other representations: 10851, 10856)	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10273 (Over, Chas Day Nurseries, Fen End)	Object	Land off Fen Road, Over, should be included within the village framework.	The site does not form part of the built up area of the village, and should remain outside the village framework. It has the characteristics of agricultural uses, and cannot be classified as previously developed land under the definition of PPG3. With regard to specific allocation for development, an additional allocation on this scale would not be appropriate for a group village, where community services and facilities, public transport, and access to employment, are less than available at other locations in the District. Allocation for development would be contrary to the search sequence in Policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003, and policy CSR1 of the Draft East of England Plan. Sufficient capacity has been demonstrated through the Urban Capacity Study and the Local Development Framework that additional housing allocations in the rural area are not required. On criteria one of the policy, what constitutes an essential part of village character can be determined at the planning application stage, and utilise other guidance including supplementary planning documents. Criteria 4 cross refers to other policies in the plan which make clear the circumstances where changes of use will be acceptable.	
8557	Support	Support the West Wrattling Village Framework as it currently stands.	Support noted.	
8031	Support	There are proposals for residential building outside the village envelope in Highfields Caldecote. These should be strongly opposed. Very extensive residential building has taken place in recent years. Further building would be detrimental and result in over-development. As a resident of West Drive, I am particularly worried about further building along this road which is narrow and has a ninety-degree bend near the only entrance, and this junction with Highfields road is a very difficult one. It is a very hazardous situation and I fear that an accident there is already likely to happen.	Support noted.	
9404 - Eltisley Parish Council	Support	Eltisley Parish Council support the village envelope as detailed on inset map ref 29.	Support noted.	
9413 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9162 - Papworth Saint Agnes Parish Meeting	Support	The village frameworks policy is strongly supported in general as is its application to the village of Papworth St Agnes in particular. The tightly drawn village framework for Papworth St Agnes is very appropriate for such a small village and ensures that the distinctive character of the village and its setting with the juxtaposition of buildings and pasture land is maintained.	Support noted.	
8577 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the proposed Inset No 24 for Croxton in terms of the extent of Village Framework shown.	Support noted.	
9581	Support	I support policy DP/8 regarding Village Frameworks for the reasons set out in paragraphs 3.25 - 3.27.	Support noted.	
10309 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Support	We maintain our support for Policy CS3 of the Council's Preferred Approach, which has been carried forward as Policy DP/8 of the DPD, in terms of safeguarding against development in the countryside.	Support noted.	
8451 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	Councillors strongly supported the existing identified boundary of the village framework, and would strongly oppose any amendment to this, apart from the requirement for amendment in relation to policy SP/6 (new cemetery to East of St Mary's Church)	Support noted.	
9750 - Caldecote Parish Council	Support	Caldecote Parish Council support the village envelope as detailed and would oppose any representation to change it.  Caldecote therefore asks to be informed of all representations received by SCDC which seek to change this.	Support noted.	
9539	Support	Strong support in recommending that no changes be made to the West Wrattling village framework, the infrastructure cannot support further development. Developing further housing in the district should not be at the expense of irreconcilably altering the character and nature of the existing communities, as well as environmental consequences of altering the village envelope.	Support noted.	
10808 - Comberton Parish Council	Support	Comberton Parish Council support the village envelope as detailed and the Parish Council would very probably vigorously oppose any further changes to Comberton in the LDF arising from the consultation.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10667 - Bourn Parish Council	Support	Bourn Parish Council Support the Village Framework as it currently stands and would oppose any proposals to change it.  The recent housing needs survey undertaken by SCDC shows that only 5 people require housing and given the number of affordable homes in the village and the turn over as identified, additional land is not required.	Support noted.	
9740 - Guilden Morden Parish Council	Support	Guilden Morden Parish Council support the Guilden Morden Framework as detailed on Inset Map no. 47 and would strongly oppose any representations to change this or develop outside the Village Framework.	Support noted.	
9686 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy DP/8.	Support noted.	
9981 - Laing Homes North Thames	Support	The Council's approach to development within village frameworks is that development will be permitted provided that it meets a number of criteria relating to village character, conservation and amenity and that there is no loss of employment service or facility where there is no other alternative available in the village. These criteria are generally supported.	General support for the criteria noted.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
7932 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	This policy is too restrictive in limiting development in the countryside to agriculture, forestry, horticulture and outdoor recreation. Other development can need to be accommodated in the countryside and the plan should provide for this. Limiting redevelopment to premises within village limits is also restrictive. The policy should reflect the wider recognition of the needs of the countryside set out in PPS7.	It can be argued that a variety of uses need to be located in the countryside if they are part of a farm diversification scheme, therefore its continued inclusion in policy DP/8 is sound.	
8427 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	The Parish Council strongly support this policy, as it will potentially control any windfall sites which may come forward over the plan period within the framework boundary. The Parish Council strongly supports the boundary as identified, with the exception of the requirement for an additional burial ground, proposed in policy SP/6.	Support noted, although policy DP/8 is proposed to be modified.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
4. 9642 - GO-East	Object	PPS12 indicates that DPDs should not take the form of a compendium of use related policies which can be repetitive. Criterion 4 references and defers policy detail to other policies within the DPD. As such, it duplicates other policies within the DPD and is unnecessary. We suggest therefore that criterion 4 is deleted as it is inconsistent with PPS12.	Disagree. Retention of point 4 in a modified form highlights policies of particular relevance.	
10046 - House Builders Federation	Object	The 4th criterion of the policy refers to the fact that development will be permitted provided that: "The development will not result in the loss of local employment, service or facility where there is no alternative available in the village". The HBF would just point out that this could make it difficult to utilise brownfield sites which are no longer commercially viable, in effect sterilising them. It would also seemingly be at odds with the government's proposed changes to PPG3 that sought to maximise the re-use of redundant employment sites.	Point 4 of the policy is intended to highlight that policies relating to protection of services and facilities exist. It is agreed that the wording is not consistent with those policies, and an amendment is required.	Action Amend DP/8 point 4: 'Development would not result in the loss of local employment, service, or facility [where there is no alternative available in the village,] PROTECTED BY Policies ET/7: Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses, SF/1: Protection of Village Services and Facilities and SF/11: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas.'
10065 - Bellway Homes	Object	The policy states that whatever form of development is to be lost then there must be an alternative elsewhere of that form of development in the village. If there is a non-conforming employment use within the village which has a history of environmental nuisance, there is no market for that particular use and that there are clear benefits to its redevelopment, then planning permission should be granted irrespective of whether or not there is an alternative available in the village.	Point 4 of the policy is intended to highlight that policies relating to protection of services and facilities exist. It is agreed that the wording is not consistent with those policies, and an amendment is required.	Amend DP/8 point 4: 'Development would not result in the loss of local employment, service, or facility [where there is no alternative available in the village,] protected by Policies ET/7: Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses, SF/1: Protection of Village Services and Facilities and SF/11: Protection of Existing Recreation Areas.'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>3.25</i>				
8114 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The exclusion of buildings from the village framework for the reason stated is illogical. Taking the examples of agricultural dwellings and rural exception housing, if these are in residential use and abutt the village framework then for all practicable purposes they are part of the framework in built and land use terms. It is contrived to exclude them. Taking the example of farm buildings on the village edge, these are part of the built framework. it is envidious to exclude them just because they happen to be (or have been) farm buildings. Their redevelopment may achieve well related development as well as environmental benefits. Furthermore, although they may not technically be previously developed sites, they are nevertheless developed.	No accepted. Agricultural buildings and rural exception sites are either countryside uses or uses which were only permitted because the site is in the countryside. Redevelopment of previously developed land which lies outside the Village Framework of Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres for employment use can be permitted under the provisions of policy ET/5 provided that they adjoin or are very close to the Village Framework as part of the overall policy to diversify the rural economy.	
10308 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Paragraph 3.25 states that 'the efficient re-use of previously developed land within Village Frameworks will generally be supported, subject to the satisfaction of relevant policies, in the interests of sustainability'. We support this approach, however, we consider that the same approach should apply to sites which immediately adjoins the Village Framework.	Policy ET/5 allows for the redevelopment of previously developed sites outside of Village Frameworks for employment uses. The Huntsman site at Duxford adjoins the village and forms part of a larger area of employment development. Redevelopment for employment would be compatible with this policy and with the adjoining uses. Redevelopment for housing would not be appropriate because of the relatively low level of services available in Duxford.	No change.
<i>Objectives</i>				
8596 - RAVE	Object	There is no reason not to adopt the objectives explained in Structure Plan Policy P9/2a verbatim. Coincidence of aims will then be assured.	Structure Plan Policy P9/2a sets out the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt, and these are captured at paragraph 4.2. Objective GB/b already refers to "to maintain the purpose" of the Green Belt. As the purpose is set out at paragraph 4.2 it would be unnecessary repetition to incorporate them in the Objectives. The Green Belt have a wider remit, and include objectives in PPG2.	
8446 - English Heritage	Object	GB/c should refer to preserving the unique character and setting of Cambridge, as set out in 4.2. The Green Belt Study 2002 identifies compactness as critical to the appreciation of Cambridge as a historic city, and specifically the length of the journey from the urban edge to the historic core. Since much of the urban edge lies in South Cambridgeshire, this plan should address the character of Cambridge as well as its setting.	Objective GB/b already refers to "maintaining the purpose" of the Green Belt. The purpose is set out at paragraph 4.2. Therefore, it would be unnecessary repetition to incorporate it in Objective GB/c.	
9942 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>GB/b</i>				
8228	Support	One of the purposes of the Green Belt is "To prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the city." This purpose will have failed if Cambridge East is allowed to get as close as 200 metres from Teversham. A separation of at least 500 metres is needed.	Support noted. The degree of separation between the urban extension at Cambridge East and the surrounding villages is an issue which is addressed in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.	
<i>Bullet 3</i>				
8243	Support	One of the purposes of the Green Belt is "To prevent communities in the environs of Cambridge from merging into one another and with the city." This purpose will have failed if Cambridge East is allowed to get as close as 200 metres from Teversham. A separation of at least 500 metres is needed.	200m is a distinct area of separation between two built-up areas. It is possible for the physical extent of the Green Belt to be reduced and still retain its openness and the separation of villages from Cambridge. There are already many areas around Cambridge where the amount of physical separation with surrounding settlements is less than currently exists between Teversham and Cambridge. It is considered that distance is not the only determining factor in achieving adequate separation: the treatment of that separation is crucial to its success. One of the purposes of the Green Belt designation is to maintain openness, which will assist in maintaining visual separation.	
<i>3rd Bullet</i>				
8338 - CPRE	Object	Qualities which contribute to the special character of Cambridge and its setting The special character of bullet point 'A distinctive urban edge' is incompatible with bullet point 'A soft green edge to the City'. Wish it to read 'A distinctive urban edge where needed for a gateway development.' Gateway development is identified in Cambridge Southern Fringe Area Action Plan (page 21) Trumpington West: Concept Diagram.	The two bullet points are mutually compatible and together they describe the varying edges of the city. Some parts of the edge of the city are characterised by a distinctive urban edge where the built-up area can provide a harsher visual boundary. At other parts of the urban edge green corridors or other landscaping can soften the edge of the city, but can still present a distinctive boundary.	
<i>4th Bullet</i>				
11066 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Reference to the protection of green corridors running from the countryside into the urban area has been incorporated, and is supported.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>GB/1 Green Belt Boundaries</i>				
10989 (Great Shelford, Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way) 10987 (Great Shelford, Land at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way)	Object	Land to north of Mingle Lane Great Shelford should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
10701 (Girton, Land North of Girton Farm, Oakington Road) 10697 (Girton, Land North of Girton Farm, Oakington Road)	Object	Land north of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton. Land at Girton should be removed from the Green Belt owning to its existing built form and part of site north of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton should be allocated for further employment development in this sustainable location. Objection is raised to the fact that the Green Belt has not been significantly amended to facilitate further growth in sustainable locations, as recommended in both the RPG and the Structure Plan. In the interests of sustainability, it is thought that amendments should be made to allow further needed growth in the villages around Cambridge. These amendments could be made without any compromise to the stated objectives of the Green Belt.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9770 - Anglia Polytechnic University (Girton, Land North of Huntingdon Road)	Object	Land north of Huntingdon Road, Girton. Green belt notation on this site should be removed. The land is on the north-west edge of Cambridge immediate adjacent to the Structure Plan strategic location identified for the expansion of education and research facilities between Madingley Road and Huntingdon Road (Policy P2/3); and within an area identified for housing and mixed-use development between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (Policy P9/2c). The land does not fulfil any of the 'purposes' of the Cambridge Green Belt; nor does it possess the 'qualities which contribute to the special character of Cambridge and its setting'. This representation is made in the context of APU considering their future space needs in the City and the possible use of this site for new educational facilities (built development). In the event that university buildings were proposed on the site, the existing playing fields would be relocated.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."	
8272 (Great Wilbraham, Land North of Toft Lane)	Object	Land north of Toft Lane, Great Wilbraham. Removal of 1st strip from Green Belt, Toft Lane Great Wilbraham Cambridge. The removal of this site from the from the green belt will not encroach significantly on the green belt. By removing the strip at Toft Lane great Wilbraham from the Green Belt, the originality of the hedgrow can be protected. Inconsistencies on site plan.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10766 - Deal Farms Ltd. (Barrington, Land North of Glebe Road)	Object	Land north of Glebe Road, Barrington. Objections are raised to the omission of Land to the north of Glebe Road, Barrington from within the Village Framework and being retained within the designated Cambridge Green Belt. It is considered that residential development on the land could be accommodated without detriment to the village form, as it would represent a rounding-off of the existing development in Barrington and would be adjoined on three sides by existing residential development. Owing to the relationship of the land to the existing built form, there would be no detriment to the openness of the Green Belt should the land be developed.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."	
10727 (Stow-cum-Quy, Land off Church Road)	Object	Land off Church Road, Stow-Cum-Quay, should be included within the village framework. The site does not project into the open countryside, nor would it be very visible owing to the fact that there is residential development on two sides of the site. The significant hedge between the Church and no. 15 Church Road, effectively restricts views across our client's land from the defined 'Important Countryside Frontage'. The site could be developed without material visual detriment to the area. There is a strong case for including the site based on the site's proximity to Cambridge (with good cycle links) and the park and ride. There is good justification in terms of visual amenity to also promote its exclusion from the Green Belt.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10623 (Dry Drayton, Land East of Cotton's Field)	Object	<p>Land east of Cotton's Field, Dry Drayton. It is required that:</p> <p>(i) The site as identified is deleted from its Green Belt designation, and instead is allocated within an amended village framework. The Proposals Map for Dry Drayton (Inset Map 26) should be modified in line with the enclosed plan.</p> <p>(ii) The site be allocated for residential development (up to 8 dwellings as per Policy ST/5) and the remainder of the site area to provide public open space, already identified as deficient in the village in the South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study (2002).</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p>	
10772 (Fen Ditton, Land off Horningsea Road)	Object	<p>Land off Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton. Objections raised to the omission of Land between no. 28 and 12 Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton from within the Village Framework, and its designation within the Cambridge Green Belt. Bearing in mind the sustainability of the settlement in relation to Cambridge, to which it is very accessible by foot, bicycle and the nearby park and ride, it is considered that it is an ideal settlement in which to incorporate further sustainable development. It is considered that the Green Belt boundary should be significantly amended so as to facilitate further growth in highly sustainable locations.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10769 - Babraham Farms (CERN) (Abington, Land East of A11)	Object	Land east of A11, Abington. A minor amendment to the Green Belt is sought between Babraham and Little Abington. The strip of land shown is designated as Green Belt which does not serve any of the purposes of Green Belt as set out in the Structure Plan and PPG2. It is therefore proposed that the Green Belt boundary run along the A11 which is a hard defensible boundary and easily understood on the ground.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."	
10563 (Fulbourn, Land at Home End)	Object	Land at Home End, Fulbourn. Objections are raised to the omission of Lane at Home End, Fulbourn from within the Village Framework and also for the proposed designation of Important Countryside Frontage and the designation within the Cambridge Green Belt. The site is suitable for small scale residential development, as it is within the core of the Village and adjoins a residential development both to the north and south and existing development on the opposite side of Home End. Objections are raised to the fact that the Green Belt has not been amended so as to facilitate further growth in sustainable locations, as recommended in both the RPG and Cambridgeshire Structure Plan.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10702 (Girton, Land South of Girton Farm, Oakington Road) 10698 (Girton, Land South of Girton Farm, Oakington Road)	Object	Land south of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton. Land at Girton should be removed from the Green Belt owing to its existing built form and part of site north of Girton Farm, Oakington Road, Girton should be allocated for further employment development in this sustainable location. Objection is raised to the fact that the Green Belt has not been significantly amended to facilitate further growth in sustainable locations, as recommended in both the RPG and the Structure Plan. In the interests of sustainability, it is thought that amendments should be made to allow further needed growth in the villages around Cambridge. These amendments could be made without any compromise to the stated objectives of the Green Belt.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
10867 (Great Shelford, Land at 12 Cabbage Moor)	Object	Land to south of Great Shelford Caravan and Camping Club, Cambridge Road, Great Shelford should be removed from the green belt. Bearing in mind the existing residential property on the site, together with the adjoining residential development to the South East, the camping and caravan site to the north and the proposed development on the northern side of Cabbage Moor, it is considered that the land is very appropriate for further residential development.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10527 (Stapleford, Land at Gog Magog Way)	Object	Land at Gog Magog Way, Stapleford. Objection is raised to the fact that the Green Belt has not been significantly amended so as to facilitate further growth in sustainable locations, as recommended in both the RPG and Structure Plan. In the interests of sustainability, it is considered that amendments should have been made to allow further needed growth in villages around Cambridge. Amendments could have been made without any compromise to the stated objectives of the Green Belt. In particular, Land off Gog Magog Way, Stapleford should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
10536 - The W Scambler Trust (Dry Drayton, Land North of Pettitt's Close)	Object	Land north of Pettitt's Close, Dry Drayton. Objection is raised to the inclusion of our client's land within the Green Belt and outside the defined Village Framework of Dry Drayton. The site represents a logical one for residential development, as it adjoins recent residential development both to the south east and south west, and is defined by a footpath connecting to the rest of the Village along the north eastern boundary. The inclusion of this land in the Village Framework would represent a logical rounding off of a development in this vicinity, without detriment to the village form or significant incursion into the Green Belt. It is considered that further limited growth within Dry Drayton would support the local facilities whilst at the same time providing needed affordable housing in the locality.	Inset map 26 shows that this land has not been designated as green belt.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10828 (Waterbeach, Land adjacent to Pieces Lane)	Object	Land adjacent to Pieces Lane Waterbeach represents a logical rounding off of the village framework of Waterbeach by the inclusion of land which is contiguous with existing residential development on three sides. should also be removed from the Green Belt. Failure to re-access this boundary will lend to less sustainable development being promoted. The removal of the land from the Green Belt will not compromise the purpose of the designation as it is considered that the open countryside effectively starts to the east of the nearby railway line. The designation as a green belt is not required to protect the character and setting of the village.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."	
10868	Object	Objection is raised to the resistance to amend the Green Belt boundaries around the southern perimeter of the City so as to facilitate further development in the emerging LDF. This action is recommending both the RPG and the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan. By refusing to make any significant alterations to the Green Belt boundary close to Cambridge City, the plan fails to meet Objective GB/a, which is to secure a Green Belt around Cambridge with boundaries which will endure for the plan period and beyond. It is now over 15 years since the Green Belt boundaries were first drawn up around Cambridge, and it is considered an appropriate time to reassess these boundaries especially in the light of the current emphasis on the sustainability of new development.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10523 (Great Shelford, Land behind 34-60 Hinton Way) 10954 (Great Shelford, Land East of Hinton Way)	Object	Objection is raised to the fact that the Green Belt has not been significantly amended so as to facilitate further growth in sustainable locations, as recommended in both the RPG and Structure Plan. In the interests of sustainability, it is considered that amendments should have been made to allow further needed growth in villages around Cambridge. Amendments could have been made without any compromise to the stated objectives of the Green Belt. Land to east of Hinton Way, Great Shelford should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development as detailed in previous representations.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
11016 - Trustees of the Estate of the Late D L January (Great Shelford, Land NW of 11 Cambridge Road)	Object	Land NW of 11 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford. An objection is raised to the continued inclusion of land to the northwest of 11 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford within the Cambridge Green Belt and the designation of Important Countryside Frontage to the Cambridge Road. As the site is heavily treed on all sides, it is not seen in relation with the adjoining open countryside from which it is totally different in character. As a consequence, there would appear to be no conflict with the stated aims of the Green Belt if this land was removed and developed for residential purposes. Any development scheme could retain the existing trees in the road frontage as the existing vehicular access could serve the development.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10565	Object	It is submitted that there is no exceptional justification for the proposed allocation around Longstanton / Northstowe. Future development can be adequately controlled by countryside and settlement envelope policies.	Structure Plan Policy P9/2b requires "the review of the outer boundary of the Green Belt to determine if additional areas can be identified which serve the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt and should be included within it, having regard to new settlement proposals". Policy NS/4 in the Northstowe Area Action Plan proposes the extension of the Green Belt in the vicinity of the new town. In this location the Green Belt is at its narrowest, and when developed, Northstowe will be the largest urban area close to Cambridge and it will be in close proximity to four villages. The Structure Plan requires their separation be maintained and protecting against coalescence is a key function of the Green Belt and therefore Green Separation is also defined as Green Belt, as it is at Cambridge East.	
8524 - The Felix Hotel (Girton, The Felix Hotel, Huntingdon Road)	Object	The Felix Hotel, Huntingdon Road, Girton. On behalf of the Felix Hotel, it is considered that the hotel north of Huntingdon Road should be removed from the Green Belt. The removal of this site from the Green Belt would in no discernible way prejudice the openness of the Green Belt, and would enable the Felix Hotel to extend in a modest and sympathetic way, thereby allowing it to compete on a 'level playing field' with other 4/5 bedroom hotels in the Cambridge area.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10558 (Fulbourn, Land either side of Hinds Loder (Track))	Object	Land either side of Hinds Loder (track), Fulbourn. Lane off Balsham Road, Fulbourn. An objection is raised to the fact that the Green Belt boundary has not been significantly altered so as to facilitate further significant growth in sustainable locations as recommended in both the RPG and the Structure Plan. This is particularly so as it is stated that the Green Belt boundaries should 'endure for the plan period and beyond'. Bearing in mind the urgent need to accommodate 20,000 houses in sustainable locations in the period up to 2016, it seems entirely inappropriate to retain the Green Belt boundaries which were initially proposed in the early 1990's.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
11002 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge (Cambridge, Animal Research Station A1307)	Object	The site of 307 Huntingdon Road should be removed from the Green Belt as part of the review of the boundary of the Green Belt required by the Structure Plan Policy P9/2b. The University considers that this review of the Green Belt boundary should have been undertaken as part of the preparation of the LDF. Alternatively, the land is not to be immediately released from the Green Belt, then the University would wish to see the site of 307 Huntingdon Road included within the list of Major Developed Sites within the Green Belt (Policy GB/5 refers).	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Annex C of PPG2 identifies major developed sites in the Green Belt as "factories, collieries, power stations, water and sewage treatment works, military establishments, civil airfields, hospitals, and research and education establishments." It goes on to state that they are "substantial sites". The site therefore does not warrant designation as a major development site in the Green Belt.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10221 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge (Cambridge, Land between M11 and A1307)	Object	The University objects to the inclusion of that land between Huntingdon Rd. and Madingley Rd. within the Green Belt designation on the Proposals Map. The Structure Plan (Policy 9/2 (c) proposes that this land is removed from the Green Belt for predominately University related development and a revised Green Belt boundary, which will ensure the expanded City will not coalesce with Girton village, will be defined as part of the proposed Area Action Plan. The University believes that all this land should be omitted from the Green Belt designation on the Proposals Map at this stage and that the Area Action Plan should redefine the Green Belt boundary in due course.	Paragraph 4.5 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in accordance with the Structure Plan locations for development. The detailed review of the Green Belt boundaries is being undertaken through the relevant Area Action Plan for each of these locations, as part of a comprehensive approach to identifying the extent of the site. For consistency, the same approach will be applied in the Cambridge North West Area Action Plan.	
10552 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Girton, Land South of A14) 10557 - Persimmon Homes (Girton, Land South of A14)	Object	Land south of A14, Girton. Land as shown on the attached plan should not be shown as Green Belt on the Proposals Map. Some of this land may be required for development related purposes prior to 2016.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
10963 - Mrs A J Johnson and Mr B Moore (Great Shelford, Large site at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way)	Object	Land at Mingle Lane and Hinton Way, Great Shelford. Land at Great Shelford/Stapleford should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11000 (Sawston, Land near Sawston Church)	Object	I would like to see a small change in the Green Belt boundary around Sawston. The area that I would like to see taken out of the Green Belt is the small triangle of land behind 2 and 4 St Mary's Road, Sawston, land which abuts onto Church Lane. I believe that this land serves no useful Green Belt function and that removing it from the Green Belt would tidy up a small anomaly.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."	
10939 (Sawston, Deal Grove)	Object	Land at Deal Farm, including nos. 64 and 62 Cambridge Road, Sawston. The land comprises two farm dwellings together with the extensive outbuildings associated with Deal Farm. The boundary of the Green Belt would be better located to include the buildings and houses currently on site. This would be a clearly defined boundary which would endure for the plan period and beyond as required in objective GB/a. There is no advantage to be gained from including this built land within the Green Belt as it does not satisfy objective GB/b which is to maintain the openness of the area. Bearing in mind the extensive Green Belt designated beyond, the exclusion of this land would not effect the unique setting of Sawston.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11372 (Waterbeach, Land between Cambridge Road and Car Dyke Road)	Object	<p>Objections are raised to the omission of our client's land, edged red on the attached plan, from within the Village Framework of Waterbeach and its designation within the Cambridge Green Belt.</p> <p>It is considered that Waterbeach is a highly sustainable settlement with a good range of facilities which could accommodate further growth without detriment to the form of the settlement, impact on the countryside or the general attractiveness of the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."</p>	
10818 - Messrs J and P Dossett (Barton, Land North of Kings Close)	Object	<p>Land off King's Grove, Barton should be excluded from the Cambridge Green Belt and allocated for residential development. Owing to the proximity to Cambridge, the land is considered to be highly sustainable, well related to the existing village and with an adequate vehicular access. Provided the development was supported by structural landscaping around the edge of the site, this would considerably enhance the visual appearance of the Green Belt in this vicinity.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10961 - Mrs A J Johnson and Mr B Moore 10935 - Deal Farms Ltd. 10953 10986	Object	Objection is raised to the fact that the Green Belt has not been significantly amended so as to facilitate further growth in sustainable locations, as recommended in both the RPG and Structure Plan. In the interests of sustainability, it is considered that amendments should have been made to allow further needed growth in villages around Cambridge. Amendments could have been made without any compromise to the stated objectives of the Green Belt.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
9933 - Old Road Securities Plc (Oakington, Land at Oakington Tomato Farm Dry Drayton Road)	Object	Land at Oakington Tomato Farm, Dry Drayton Road, Oakington. Objection is made to Oakington Tomato Farm, located to the north of Dry Drayton Road, Oakington, being in the Green Belt. The land is in active agricultural use and the proposed new Green Belt extension policy should not impinge on the agricultural practices of the farm (tomatoes and raspberries).	Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states "The Local Planning Authority will review the outer boundary of the Green Belt to determine if additional areas can be identified which serve the purpose of the Cambridge Green Belt and should be included within it, having regard to the new settlement proposals. The area has a distinct rural character and it is appropriate for the extension of the Green Belt to include this land, as it fulfils the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. It is unlikely that the inclusion within the Green Belt will impinge upon agricultural practices, given that permissible development in the Green Belt includes buildings for agriculture.	
10219 - Scotsdales Garden Centre (Great Shelford, Scotsdales Garden Centre)	Object	Scotsdales Garden Centre, Great Shelford. Scotsdales Garden Centre should be removed from the Green Belt and included within the village framework to enable the company to operate its successful retail business more efficiently and so contribute further to the local economy.	Garden centres are unlike nurseries, which sell stock grown on site, in that they have a wider retail function. Policy SF/3 states that "in the case of proposals to develop sites in edge-of-centre or out-of-centre locations (or extend existing stores in such locations) developers will be required to demonstrate a positive need for the additional floor area". This would be applied irrespective of whether the site is in the countryside or within the village framework. In addition, Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly states that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004, therefore a further review at this location would be contrary to PPG2.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10843 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd (Waterbeach, Land between Waterbeach and railway)	Object	Land between Waterbeach and railway, Waterbeach. Waterbeach should be a Rural Centre. Land south of Bannold Road, Waterbeach to the east of the village should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for housing development. The Inset Boundary for the village should follow the line of the railway line. The floodplain map should be re-evaluated.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
10643 - Munro Group Ltd (Waterbeach, Land between Bannold Road/Burgess Road)	Object	Land between Bannold Road and Burgess Road, Waterbeach should also be removed from the Green Belt. Failure to re-access this boundary will lend to less sustainable development being promoted. The removal of the land from the Green Belt will not compromise the purpose of the designation as it is considered that the open countryside effectively starts to the east of the nearby railway line. The Green Belt should be redrawn to facilitate a more even distribution of growth.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10281 - Stannifer	Object	The Green Belt Review is too restrictive and does not accord with the requirements of PPG2 that: green belt review should have regard to a longer time frame than local planning policies; safeguard land for longer term expansion should be provided; new boundaries should be defensible and drawn along clear physical features.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
10656 - David Wilson Estates	Object	In assessing the availability of sites for housing-led development, the accepted hierarchy of: 1. Cambridge 2. Cambridge edge through Green Belt releases 3. New town of Northstowe 4. South Cambridgeshire and rural areas, needs to be followed for clear sustainability reasons and compatibility with the Structure Plan. As a necessary consequence, the assessment of the edge of Cambridge sites requires a comprehensive view of the Green Belt boundary, which is not evidence in the commentary at paragraphs 4.4 - 4.7. To discount the land between A14, M11 and the boundary with Cambridge City Council as inappropriate for development because of its location in the Green Belt is accordingly fundamentally flawed.	Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P9/2b, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Further releases of Green Belt land are unnecessary and would be contrary to PPG2. The Green Belt serves five purposes, including; checking unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, preserving the setting and special character of historic towns, and preventing coalescence, and PPG2 states at paragraph 1.4 "the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness." Despite being bisected by major trunk roads, the Green Belt continues to serve these purposes and therefore, further development in the Green Belt is contrary to national policy in PPG2.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8047 (Oakington, Land at the The Drift)	Object	Land at The Drift, Oakington. The extension of the Greenbelt around villages (POLICY GB/1) does not take into account small areas of land around those villages, which currently lie outside the village framework (but on the edge of it), which could be used for small scale development. Clearly this does not fit with the general aims & requirements of the LDF (POLICY ST/1) which is to provide substantial additional housing. The boundaries of such villages should be examined to see where there is the possibility of sensibly extending it and in turn the greenbelt to allow for this.	Policy P9/1 of the Structure Plan provides a clear indication of the distribution of housing within each of the districts and Policy ST/1 accords with this, and greater detail of the breakdown is provided in Figures 1 to 3. Policy ST/7 sets out the phasing of housing land to ensure a continuous supply over the plan period. The detail for each of the major development locations is contained in the Area Action Plans. Policy ST/8, the housing trajectory and the Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant and ensure an adequate and continuous supply of housing land is available throughout the plan period. The Council has undertaken further work on the rural housing numbers, including the production of a housing trajectory. As part of this work the Council revisited the housing allocations rolled forward from Local Plan 2004 and deleted the sites with planning permission at March 2005 (as these are now counted as commitments), deleted those allocations in the less sustainable settlements that cannot be relied upon to come forward for development in the plan period, and updated the housing land supply information with data to the end of March 2005. The Council is able to demonstrate sufficient housing land supply to meet the remainder of the requirement in the rural area without the need to allocate any further sites on the edge of villages, therefore, there is no need to exclude land from the Green Belt. The detailed housing land supply information is included in the report to Council on 15th November 2005.	
8103 (Great Wilbraham, Rolph Land at Toft Lane) 8101 (Great Wilbraham, Rolph Land at Toft Lane)	Object	Land at Toft Lane, Great Wilbraham. Amend Green Belt boundary at Toft Lane Great Wilbraham. With pressure for development in the area, now would be an opportune time to remove this land from the green belt, allowing much needed and sustainable housing. This would not be detrimental to the village, or compromise the integrity of the green belt. With development to the north it would complete a process that has already started. It is important to retain the green belt around Great Wilbraham, the position of this small piece of land is not essential to the green belt and appears something of an aberration.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8638 - Grantchester Townlands Charity (Cambridge, Land at Fulbrooke Road)	Object	Land at Fulbrooke Road, Cambridge. The Green Belt boundary should be varied at Fulbrooke Road, Cambridge, to facilitate a small housing development in a sustainable location.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
7874 (Histon, Land adjoining 59 & 61 Cottenham Road)	Object	Land adjoining 59 & 61 Cottenham Road, Histon. The policy should provide for a review of the boundary of the green belt to make land available for development where this relates well to the existing built-up framework and does not have a strategic role in delivering the aims of the green belt. Limited areas on the northern edge of Histon should be released on such a review and these would perform well in terms of sustainability.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7962	Object	The boundary of the Green Belt around Histon and Impington should be reviewed so as to make land available for development where that land relates well to the existing built-up framework and plays no strategic role in delivering the aims of the green Belt designation.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
8117 (Impington, Land South of Clay Close Lane)	Object	Land south of Clay Close Lane, Impington. The site is largely surrounded by existing residential development and bounded by Clay Cross Lane. It is within 150m of a secondary school and associated sports centre and within walking distance of the village centre. The site is located within a settlement with good public transport links, shopping, other local services and employment opportunities which is designated as a Rural Centre. The site is within the physical structure of the settlement and fulfils none of the purposes of Green Belts as set out in PPG2. The site should be excluded from the Green Belt as defined in GB/1, included in the village framework and allocated for housing.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10559 - Vogan & Company (Fulbourn, Land East of disused Railway Station)	Object	Land east of disused railway station, Fulbourn. The Green Belt boundary on the north eastern edge of Fulbourn is illogical and follows no physical or visual boundary in relation to the eastern end of the site curtilage at the Fulbourn silo site. The boundary should be amended to follow the tree / landscaped site boundary.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. The boundary is currently tightly drawn around the rear of buildings. This is a clear boundary, and given that landscape features will continue to change over time, it is a more permanent feature. This accords with guidance in PPG2 for drawing the Green Belt boundary.	
9879 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	Green Belt - we note that there is nowhere (not even in the C & P Structure Plan 2003) is a single map highlighting the entire boundaries of the Green Belt and strongly recommend such being included.	The full extent of the Cambridge Green Belt is shown on the Proposals Map.	
10829	Object	The Green Belt should be redrawn to facilitate a more even distribution of growth.	Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P9/2b, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8642 - RAVE	Object	RAVE objects strongly to the Fait Accompli which this policy presents. Structure Plan Policy requires the LPA's to undertake a specific review which has not been done in a principled way based on the GREEN BELT function of the Land.	Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan Policy P9/2b, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe.	
10047 - House Builders Federation	Object	The HBF queries whether the long-term adequacy of the green belt boundaries given the development pressures around Cambridge. The Regional Spatial Strategy might well have a strong bearing on this matter. It is essential that adequate long-term housing provision is provided for in a Green Belt review.	As explained in paragraph 4.5, the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge. It takes into account the development requirements of Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia (now RSS6) and the adopted Structure Plan. These Plans cover the period to 2016 and any development proposals beyond this period are beyond the scope of the LDF.	
9882 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Object	What is the definition of the Green Belt boundary. We note that there is nowhere (not even in the C & P Structure Plan 2003) is a single map highlighting the entire boundaries of the Green Belt and strongly recommend such being included. With the recent loss of Green Belt to accommodate the various urban expansions, additions/ extensions to the Green Belt need to be planned as compensation at this stage.	The full extent of the Cambridge Green Belt is identified on the Proposals Map.	
8229	Object	The map shows that the land between Cambridge East and Teversham (CE/6 is it?) is "Green Separation". This is not acceptable. There is no justification for this. It should remain in the Green Belt.	Whilst Policy CE/6 in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan identifies an area of Green Separation between the urban extension and Teversham, Policy CE/4 revises the Green Belt to exclude land for the built-up area but includes the Green Separation within the Green Belt.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9945 - Bayer CropScience Ltd (Hauxton, The Bayer CropScience Ltd Site, Water treatment Plant)	Object	<p>The Bayer CropScience Ltd Site, Water treatment plant, Hauxton.</p> <p>Object to the inclusion of the Water Treatment Plant site on the west side of the A10 which includes prominent plant and building structures. Following much technical work and public consultation there is a strong body of support for a hotel and/or leisure development to meet a need in this part of the sub-region and as a more compatible form of development in the Green Belt instead of the industrial structures.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9688 - GO-East	Object	Policy GB/2 either largely repeats PPG2 or cross-references those matters to other policies, thereby deferring the detail of the matters to other policies within the DPD. PPS12 indicates that generic development control policies should not take the form of a compendium of use related policies that introduces repetition and that they should not repeat national policy. We consider that the criteria in Policy GB/2 should be reviewed and the policy amended to only include criteria only retained where they do not repeat other policies in the DPD or national policy. Additionally, following a review of the criteria in Policy GB/2, consideration should be given to including any remaining criteria with Policy GB/1, and GB/2 being deleted.	Agree, PPS12 makes it clear that policies in the LDF should not repeat national planning guidance.	<p>Amend heading before Policy GB/1 to read as follows: "DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT"</p> <p>Amend Policy GB/1 to read as follows: "There is a presumption against inappropriate development<sup>1</sup> in the Cambridge Green Belt as defined on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>NOTE: 1 Inappropriate development is defined in section 3 of PPG2 Green Belt."</p> <p>Move paragraphs 4.8 and 4.9 to follow paragraph 4.7.</p> <p>Amend first sentence of paragraph 4.8 to read: "The main purpose of the Green Belt is to keep land open by placing a permanent and severe restriction on inappropriate development; therefore most types of development can only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, in accordance with PPG2."</p> <p>Delete Policy GB/2 and remainder of the supporting text - paragraphs 4.10 to 4.15.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10376 (Oakington, Land at Water Lane/Kettles Close)	Object	Land at Water Lane / Kettles Close, Oakington. We also recommend the inclusion of an additional housing allocation on our client's land south of water Lane. The site is no different than the allocation of the Council's depot site in terms of size or orientation, and the proposals are attached accordingly for the allocation of this site, as an amendment to Proposals Map Inset 80. At the last Local Plan review, the Inspector clearly indicated that given the lawful use of the site for commercial purposes, consideration should be given to its exclusion from the Green Belt. We note no such consideration has been given, despite the fact that arguments for its exclusion were generally supported by the Inspector and we had anticipated that the consequential amendment would be included in this Local Plan.	At the time of the Inquiry into the now adopted Local Plan 2004 the site had not obtained Lawful Use Certificate (Inspector's Report, paragraph 74.11). The Local Plan Inspector considered the issue of the site being included in the Green Belt and concluded that he did "not consider its inclusion so anomalous as to require exclusion at this stage." (Inspector's Report, paragraph 74.14) Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly states that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
11351	Object	The outer boundary of the extended Green Belt at Willingham does not follow clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground.	Agree the boundary should be revisited to ensure it follows clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground.	Revisit the Green Belt boundary around Willingham.
9444 (Longstanton, Land South of Woodside)	Object	Land south of Woodside, Longstanton. The Green Belt should not extend into the area identified.	Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states "The Local Planning Authority will review the outer boundary of the Green Belt to determine if additional areas can be identified which serve the purpose of the Cambridge Green Belt and should be included within it, having regard to the new settlement proposals. The area has a distinct rural character and the site forms an important part of the separation between Longstanton St.Michaels and the main part of the village, reflected in its designation as important countryside frontage. It is also appropriate for the extension of the Green Belt to include this land, as it fulfils the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10812 - C & A Locke	Object	Land at Granta Cottage, Mill Lane, Whittlesford. Objection is raised to the fact that the Green Belt has not been significantly amended so as to facilitate further growth in sustainable locations, as recommended in both the RPG and Structure Plan. It is suggested that amendments could have been made without any compromise to the stated objectives of the Green Belt, while also facilitating the identification of much needed housing sites.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
10810 - C & A Locke (Whittlesford, Land at Granta Cottage, Mill Lane)	Object	Land at Granta Cottage, Mill Lane, Whittlesford. Land adjacent to Swan's Corner, in Whittlesford is considered appropriate for exclusion from the Green Belt on account of its more direct association with the built form of the existing settlement than to the adjacent countryside.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8747 - Capital & Counties (Fulbourn, Land West of Ida Darwin Hospital)	Object	Land west of Ida Darwin Hospital, Fulbourn. The site at Fulbourn Old Drift being identified to the Council should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for beneficial employment development.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
9947 (Fulbourn, Land West of Station Road including proposed Railway Station)	Object	<p>An additional / alternative site is put forward to complement the re-designation of Fulbourn as a Rural Centre. This site would provide for a mixed-use development that would deliver a new railway station, a community centre and affordable homes as well as general open market housing. The development can be brought forward immediately. The site is identified on the accompanying plan.</p> <p>The allocation of this land should be accompanied by its removal from the Cambridge Green Belt, as previously recommended by the appointed Inspector at the Green Belt Inquiry, and subsequently endorsed by the local authority commissioned study undertaken by Colin Buchanan and Partners. As confirmed by these recommendations and study the land does not fulfil any of the identified criteria to justify the continuing retention of the land within the Cambridge Green Belt.</p> <p>This site is no longer, and hasn't been suitable for some time, for farming.</p>	<p>Whilst the Inspector at the Green Belt recommended the removal of this land from the Green Belt, it was rejected by the Local Planning Authority, as this land forms an important part of the setting of Cambridge and Fulbourn. Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5. Paragraph 1.7 in PPG2 also states that "the extent to which the use of land fulfils these objectives is however not itself a material factor in the inclusion of land within a Green Belt, or in its continued protection. The purposes of including land in Green Belts are of paramount importance to their continued protection, and should take precedence over the land use objectives."</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8082 (Longstanton, Land between Longstanton and proposed Longstanton Bypass)	Object	The principle of designating new Green Belt around the new settlement of Northstowe is supported. We object, however, to the inclusion of land between Longstanton village and the line of the proposed Longstanton Western Bypass within the proposed Green Belt.	Paragraph 2.10 of PPG2 states "When drawing Green Belt boundaries in development plans local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development." The Longstanton bypass has been planned to run through the countryside to the west of the new development. Drawing the Green Belt boundary close to the village of Longstanton in this location will restrict further development on the edge of the village. Longstanton is a less sustainable location for further development than other settlements higher up the development strategy hierarchy, as detailed in Policy ST/1 and Structure Plan Policy P9/1. In addition, land between the village framework and the proposed Longstanton bypass has the ability to perform a positive role in fulfilling the objectives of the Green Belt, as identified at paragraph 1.6 of PPG2. In particular, it can provide opportunities for access to open countryside for the urban population, particularly for residents of the new Home Farm development, who could otherwise be constrained by development and the proposed bypass.	
8100 (Teversham, Land North of Teversham Hall)	Object	Land north of Teversham Hall, Teversham. Rather than leave all green belt boundaries as they are, the opportunity should be taken to modify the boundary where obvious changes, including where development has been built as a result of planning approval, reinforcing what is an obvious anomaly. Such is the position at Teversham, in the vicinity of Teversham Engineering and the factory of Borley Brothers. Both premises should be excluded from the green belt along with a small area of garden. That can be achieved by using a clearly established fence line as a boundary, as shown on the attached plan (Inset 99).	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	
9700 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy GB/1.	Support noted.	
9632 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Support	The Councils recognise that, in previous LDF submissions, multiple areas were proposed for development in the Green Belt in and around Histon and Impington. The Councils object in the strongest possible terms to these proposals, and any further proposals that may be forthcoming in this round of submissions. The Councils recognise and applaud the rejection of these submissions by SCDC.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9944 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Bayer CropScience Ltd welcomes the continuing exclusion of the main works site from the Green Belt as proposed on the Proposals Map, Inset 53.	Support noted.	
8107 - Comberton Parish Council	Support	Comberton Parish Council wish to give strong support and endorsement of the many policies which guarantee Green Belt protection.	Support noted.	
10793 - Jesus College (Cambridge)	Support	The delineation of the Green Belt to exclude Beech Farm, Harston is supported.	Support noted.	
<i>4.4</i>				
9093 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Object	The PCT endorses the objection of the Cambridge and Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS trust to the inclusion of the Fulbourn Hospital site, as indicated in policy GB/5 within the designated Cambridge Green Belt.	Paragraph C3 states that "development plans should identify the site, define the boundary of the present extent of development, and set out a policy for limited infilling for the continuing use within this boundary." It goes on to explain acceptable infilling. Paragraph C4 explains where redevelopment would be acceptable. Therefore, whilst some further infilling and/or redevelopment is permitted on Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt, it is appropriate that it should be restricted to that which can be accommodated without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt, and Policy GB/5 fully accords with Annex C of PPG2.	
<i>4.5</i>				
8394 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The Green Belt boundaries should be further reviewed to ensure that sufficient provision can be made for necessary development to take place in sustainable locations.	Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 clearly state that "detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted local plans should be altered only exceptionally." Paragraph 2.7 goes on to state that where existing local plans are being revised and updated, existing Green Belt should not be changed unless alterations to the structure plan have been approved". Structure Plan Policy P9/2b states that the Green Belt should be reviewed "to identify the boundaries of land to be released from the Green Belt to serve the long-term development needs of Cambridge, in locations indicated on the Key Diagram and set out in Policy P9/2c". These locations comprise the urban extensions to Cambridge. Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in the 1980s and in Local Plan 2004. Therefore, in accordance with Structure Plan and PPG2, the only further review in the LDF is at the locations identified in Structure Plan Policy P9/2c and around the new town of Northstowe, as explained in paragraph 4.5.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
4.7 8395 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Given the acknowledgement of the 'complexity of the administrative boundaries between Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire' the two authorities should not just undertake work on the Green Belt boundary jointly, but joint working should be extended to the production of a joint Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire LDF, which the Authorities are empowered to do under Section 28 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.	The two Councils are working closely on cross-boundary issues, such as the review of the Green Belt boundary and the Cambridge East urban extension. The joint working referred to in Paragraph 4.7 includes the review of the Green Belt boundary at Cambridge East through the Cambridge East Area Action Plan, a joint Plan being produced by the two local authorities.	
<i>GB/2 Development in the Green Belt</i>				
9687 - GO-East	Object	Policy GB/2 either largely repeats PPG2 or cross-references those matters to other policies, thereby deferring the detail of the matters to other policies within the DPD. PPS12 indicates that generic development control policies should not take the form of a compendium of use related policies that introduces repetition and that they should not repeat national policy. We consider that the criteria in Policy GB/2 should be reviewed and the policy amended to only include criteria only retained where they do not repeat other policies in the DPD or national policy. Additionally, following a review of the criteria in Policy GB/2, consideration should be given to including any remaining criteria with Policy GB/1, and GB/2 being deleted.	Agree, PPS12 makes it clear that policies in the LDF should not repeat national planning guidance.	<p>Amend heading before Policy GB/1 to read as follows: "DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT"</p> <p>Amend Policy GB/1 to read as follows: "There is a presumption against inappropriate development<sup>1</sup> in the Cambridge Green Belt as defined on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>NOTE: 1 Inappropriate development is defined in section 3 of PPG2 Green Belt."</p> <p>Move paragraphs 4.8 and 4.9 to follow paragraph 4.7.</p> <p>Amend first sentence of paragraph 4.8 to read: "The main purpose of the Green Belt is to keep land open by placing a permanent and severe restriction on inappropriate development; therefore most types of development can only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, in accordance with PPG2."</p> <p>Delete Policy GB/2 and remainder of the supporting text - paragraphs 4.10 to 4.15.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10790 - Middlereach Ltd (Longstanton, Land West of Station Road)	Object	Policy GB/2 should provide for flexibility with particular regard to land to the west of Station Road, Longstanton. If land is to be included within the Green Belt then the existing employment uses on the land should not be unduly constrained. In this particular instance Policy GB/2 should allow for the operational requirements of businesses on the land to the west of Station Road to be met. A similar policy approach taken to major developed sites in the Green Belt should be adopted.	The employment site is outside the village framework and therefore further expansion would be considered in light of Policy ET/6. This permits expansion within village frameworks, Northstowe, Cambridge East, on previously developed sites next to village frameworks, and in established Employment Areas in the Countryside (as defined in Policy ET/4). The site does not fall into any of these categories and further expansion on this site would be constrained regardless of whether the site was situated within the Green Belt. Therefore, there is no reason to exclude such land from the Green Belt.	
9955 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support subject to comments made in respect of other policies.	Support noted.	
<i>3.</i>				
8525 - The Felix Hotel	Object	On behalf of the Felix Hotel, we object to this Policy on account of the fact that the third criterion should equally refer to "appropriate commercial uses". There will be instances, such as in the case of the Felix Hotel, where extensions can be promoted without having any material impact on the Green Belt. The Green Belt is a planning tool most appropriately deployed to keep genuinely open land as just that. It need not be used to prevent reasonable and low impact extensions to existing buildings to be carried out.	In response to another representation, the requirements of Policy GB/2 have been merged with Policy GB/1 and Policy GB/2 deleted. Policy GB/1 now reads as follows: "There is a presumption against inappropriate development <sup>1</sup> in the Cambridge Green Belt as defined on the Proposals Map. NOTE: <sup>1</sup> Inappropriate development is defined in section 3 of PPG2 Green Belt."	
<i>6.</i>				
9703 - Foxton Parish Council	Object	Cambridge Green Belt is relatively small and it is therefore essential to ensure that it cannot be compromised in this way.	This approach accords with PPG2 Green Belt and PPG3 Housing.	
7875	Support	The proposal to allow the development of affordable housing on exception sites is supported.	Support noted.	
<i>8.</i>				
9930 - Babraham Institute	Object	There appears to be a typo under Section 8. Should read '.. in accordance with Policy GB/5', NOT GB/6.	In response to another representation, the requirements of Policy GB/2 have been merged with Policy GB/1 and Policy GB/2 deleted.	
<i>4.8</i>				
10225 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	Paragraph 4.8, as currently drafted, does not accurately reflect the fundamental aim or the purpose of including land within a Green Belt as set out in paragraphs 1.4 and 1.5 in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2. The University feels that paragraph 4.8 ought to be revised to reflect PPG guidance.	Paragraph 4.2 sets out the purposes of the Green Belt, which reflects paragraph 1.4 of PPG2, whilst the policies in the Green Belt chapter each reflect the aims detailed in paragraph 1.5 of PPG2. Paragraph 3.5 of PPG2 sets out the types of development which may be appropriate in the Green Belt, uses "which preserve the openness of the Green Belt". Therefore, Policy GB/2 and text at paragraph 4.8 fully reflects PPG2.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8231	Support	Precisely. See my comments on 4.8. The proposed Cambridge East development is exactly the sort of urban sprawl that the Green Belt is there to prevent.	Support noted.	
8230	Support	If the Green Belt places a "permanent" restriction on inappropriate development then it is not acceptable to move the Green Belt in order to allow the proposed development of Cambridge East. It's no good saying "We're not destroying the Green belt, we're just moving it." If you just move it whenever you want to then we may as well not have it in the first place.	Support noted. The amendments to the Cambridge Green Belt at Cambridge East are being carried out in accordance with the adopted Structure Plan, emerging RSS14, and in accordance with paragraph 2.7 of PPG2.	
<i>4.11</i>				
8396 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Buildings for indoor sports may be appropriate in the Green Belt where they are considered as part of a larger sporting complex, where the indoor use would complement the use of Green Belt land for outdoor sports and where the provision of a building for indoor sports would deliver a sustainable form of development.	Paragraphs 3.4 - 3.6 of PPG2 set out the types of development which may be appropriate in the Green Belt, uses "which preserve the openness of the Green Belt". This includes "essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation..." as reflected in criteria 2 of Policy GB/2. Paragraph 3.5 provides further clarification "possible examples of such facilities include small changing rooms or unobtrusive spectator accommodation for outdoor sport, or small stables for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation." The provision of indoor sports facilities, other than the sorts of uses referred to in paragraph 3.5 of PPG2, would likely compromise the openness of the Green Belt and be contrary to PPG2.	
<i>4.14</i>				
10226 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	The wording in line 1 of paragraph 4.14 ought to be more specific about the nature of the change of use involved.	In response to another representation, Policy GB/2 and supporting text at paragraphs 4.10 to 4.15 has been deleted. These issues are covered by national planning guidance in PPG2 and PPS12 makes it clear that policies in the LDF should not repeat national planning guidance.	
<i>4.15</i>				
8244	Support	Precisely. See my comments on 4.8. The proposed Cambridge East development is exactly the sort of urban sprawl that the Green Belt is there to prevent.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>GB/3 Location and Design of Development</i>				
9691 - GO-East	Object	Policy GB/3 largely repeats PPG2 whilst Policy GB/4 is an effectively a related (landscaping and design criteria) policy. Consideration should be given to amalgamating these policies as both relate to implementation of development in the Green Belt. Consideration might also be given to expanding the policy if necessary, to provide more detail of design considerations that would need specific address relative to the landscape character of the Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire.	Agree, there is some similarity between policies in the remainder of the Green Belt Chapter. Policies GB/3 and GB/7 cover similar issues and should be amalgamated into a new Policy GB/2 - Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt. However, Policy GB/4 refers to development on the edge of the Green Belt and should be amended into a new Policy GB/3 - Mitigating the Impact of Development adjoining the Green Belt.	<p>Create new Policy GB/2 to read: POLICY GB/2 Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt</p> <p>Any development considered appropriate within the Green Belt must be located and designed so that it does not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Where development is permitted, landscaping conditions, together with a requirement that any planting is adequately maintained, will be attached to any planning permission in order to ensure that the impact on the Green Belt is mitigated.</p> <p>Move Paragraphs 4.26 and 4.27 to follow paragraph 4.16.</p> <p>Create new Policy GB/3 to read: POLICY GB/3 Mitigating the Impact of Development adjoining the Green Belt</p> <p>Where development proposals are in the vicinity of the Green Belt, account will be taken of any adverse impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Development on the edges of settlements which are surrounded by the Green Belt must include careful landscaping and design measures of a high quality in order to protect the purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Delete Policies GB/3, GB/4 and GB/7.</p> <p>Move paragraph 4.28 to follow paragraph 4.24.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8902 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	PPG2 makes it clear that the essential character of the Green Belt is its openness and not its rural character. There are parts of the Green Belt which are open, but not rural, in character. Policy GB/3 should be amended by the deletion of 'the rural character and'. This will help ensure consistency with national planning policy and help meet the following test of soundness as set out in paragraph 4.24 of PPS12: iv and ix.	PPG2 is national planning guidance and the wording within it cannot be site specific, therefore it refers to the broad character of Green Belts, as a collective group, as their openness. However, the majority of the Cambridge Green Belt has a distinct character as being rural as well as open. PPS12 advises against repeating national guidance in LDF policies, so it is justified to refer to the local character of the Cambridge Green Belt in Policy GB/3 as this is a factor which should be taken into consideration in determining any planning application for appropriate development in the Cambridge Green Belt.	
9956 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support subject to comments made in respect of other policies.	Support noted.	
<i>GB/4 Landscaping and Design Measures</i>				
10487 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Current Government policy precludes the use of the Green Belt for waste management. However there are difficulties in the Cambridge area due to pressures on development land particularly in the Southern Fringe and Milton areas.	Noted. This is an issue for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Waste Local Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9692 - GO-East	Object	Policy GB/3 largely repeats PPG2 whilst Policy GB/4 is an effectively a related (landscaping and design criteria) policy. Consideration should be given to amalgamating these policies as both relate to implementation of development in the Green Belt. Consideration might also be given to expanding the policy if necessary, to provide more detail of design considerations that would need specific address relative to the landscape character of the Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire.	Agree, there is some similarity between policies in the remainder of the Green Belt Chapter. Policies GB/3 and GB/7 cover similar issues and should be amalgamated into a new Policy GB/2 - Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt. However, Policy GB/4 refers to development on the edge of the Green Belt and should be amended into a new Policy GB/3 - Mitigating the Impact of Development adjoining the Green Belt.	<p>Create new Policy GB/2 to read: POLICY GB/2 Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt</p> <p>Any development considered appropriate within the Green Belt must be located and designed so that it does not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Where development is permitted, landscaping conditions, together with a requirement that any planting is adequately maintained, will be attached to any planning permission in order to ensure that the impact on the Green Belt is mitigated.</p> <p>Move Paragraphs 4.26 and 4.27 to follow paragraph 4.16.</p> <p>Create new Policy GB/3 to read: POLICY GB/3 Mitigating the Impact of Development adjoining the Green Belt</p> <p>Where development proposals are in the vicinity of the Green Belt, account will be taken of any adverse impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Development on the edges of settlements which are surrounded by the Green Belt must include careful landscaping and design measures of a high quality in order to protect the purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Delete Policies GB/3, GB/4 and GB/7.</p> <p>Move paragraph 4.28 to follow paragraph 4.24.</p>
9957 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support subject to comments made in respect of other policies.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>GB/5 Major Developed Sites</i>				
9098 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust 10463 - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust	Object	The Policy relating to Major Development Sites is too restrictive to facilitate the best use of the Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospital Sites, and to permit the necessary changes to enable the buildings to fulfil their required function, especially for the NHS Trust. It is logical for policies to allow further rationalisation and alterations within the site. The land is not currently over developed and provides scope of further new build to accommodate changing requirements. The proposed limitation on new build is not in the interests of providing the best National Health Services, and contrary to the policy of utilising brownfield sites to their maximum ability. Any limitation on new build might necessitate the split of functions between various sites, which would obviously be not only unsustainable, but undesirable.	Paragraph C3 states that "development plans should identify the site, define the boundary of the present extent of development, and set out a policy for limited infilling for the continuing use within this boundary." It goes on to explain acceptable infilling. Paragraph C4 explains where redevelopment would be acceptable. Therefore, whilst some further infilling and/or redevelopment is permitted on Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt, it is appropriate that it should be restricted to that which can be accommodated without undermining the purpose of the Green Belt, and Policy GB/5 fully accords with Annex C of PPG2.	
9582	Object	I support the general thrust of policy GB/5. However plans and frameworks can sometimes become out of date as new situations develop. I believe that policy GB/5 should be amended to include some reference to the Bayer Copsience site at Hauxton.	Paragraph 4.4 explains that the Green Belt review was undertaken in the 1980s and again in Local Plan 2004. As part of this review process, the boundaries of the Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt were also considered. It is not appropriate for GB/5 or the associated reasoned justification to include reference to the Bayer Cropsience site at Hauxton as it does not fall under the remit of the policy as the site has been removed from the Green Belt. To include reference would be contrary to PPS12.	
9958 - Bayer CropScience Ltd (Hauxton, The Bayer CropScience Ltd Site, Water treatment Plant)	Object	Bayer CropScience Ltd welcomes the removal of the MDS notation from this version of the Local Development Framework in respect of the main works site at Hauxton. However the draft plan does not address the redevelopment potential of the waste water treatment part of the site so until such discussions are concluded the company wishes to maintain an objection to this element of Green Belt policy as the MDS approach would be one way in which this could be tackled (An objection is maintained).	Annex C of PPG2 defines Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt, as "substantial sites" and includes sewage treatment works. However, this site is a waste water treatment works and although it is a large site, the works only constitute a very small proportion of the site. There are a number of other unrelated uses, such as a squash hall, cricket pitch, tennis court and an area of lawn. Therefore, it is neither an appropriate use nor of a scale to accord with the definition of Major Developed Site in the Green Belt in PPG2.	
11003 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge (Cambridge, Animal Research Station A1307)	Object	The site of 307 Huntingdon Road should be removed from the Green Belt as part of the review of the boundary of the Green Belt required by the Structure Plan Policy P9/2b. The University considers that this review of the Green Belt boundary should have been undertaken as part of the preparation of the LDF. Alternatively, the land is not to be immediately released from the Green Belt, then the University would wish to see the site of 307 Huntingdon Road included within the list of Major Developed Sites within the Green Belt (Policy GB/5 refers).	Paragraph 4.5 explains that the Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed in accordance with the Structure Plan locations for development. The detailed review of the Green Belt boundaries is being undertaken through the relevant Area Action Plan for each of these locations, as part of a comprehensive approach to identifying the extent of the site. For consistency, the same approach will be applied in the Cambridge North West Area Action Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>1st Bullet</i>				
9928 - Babraham Institute	Object	Although the proposed policy broadly reflects the advice in PPG2 (Green Belts), in some cases (e.g. Babraham Hall) redevelopment proposals have been approved that do not necessarily adhere to the policy specifics but which have nevertheless demonstrated their acceptability/appropriateness within the context of exceptional development in the green belt (e.g. the clustering of bio-technology development, in the national interest). In this instance, planning permission has been granted together with an approved masterplan. It would be helpful if the existence of such an exception to policy was acknowledged, perhaps most appropriately in the supporting paragraphs.	Policy GB/5 accords with national planning policy guidance in PPG2 and should not be amended. Each planning application is judged on its individual merit and any development permitted where it does not conform to policy (such as the case outlined as being in the national interest) is treated as an exception to policy. These cases are by their very nature permitted on a very exceptional basis, and not as a general rule.	
<i>2nd Bullet</i>				
10462 - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust (Fulbourn, Fulbourn MDS Area's 1, 2, 3 & 4)	Object	Objection is raised to the inclusion of the Fulbourn Hospital site, within the designated Cambridge Green Belt. It is considered that the built form of the site, which predated the initial designation, means that the site fulfils none of the objectives for inclusion within the Green Belt. In addition, the built-up nature of the site means that it does not comply with any of the criteria for inclusion listed in paragraph 4.3. It is strongly recommended that this area be excluded from the Green Belt.	Annex C of PPG2 outlines what constitutes a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and their future use. The list of Major Developed Sites in paragraph C1 includes hospitals. The Fulbourn Hospital site is developed at a low density and has an important role in protecting the openness in this part of the Green Belt. There is little physical separation between Fulbourn and Cambridge, in an area with key views of Cambridge from the surrounding countryside, which makes it even more important that any infill development or redevelopment is strictly controlled. Major Developed Sites are restricted to infilling and redevelopment which will continue to protect the openness of the Green Belt. Redevelopment of the site could result in urban sprawl and the loss of a distinctive urban edge to the city. Therefore it is appropriate to designate it a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt in accordance with PPG2.	
<i>4th Bullet</i>				
10637 - Spicers Ltd	Object	We note that the documents identify the existing employment sites as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt where Policy GB/5 applies. The site is a long established employment site with a number of large buildings, which does not contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt as outlined in PPS2. As such the site should not be identified as within the Green Belt and should instead be treated as it was in the previous Local Plan, as a site lying outside the Green Belt boundaries.	Annex C of PPG2 outlines what constitutes a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt and their future use. The list of Major Developed Sites in paragraph C1 includes factories. Whilst the Spicers site at Sawston is a large factory surrounded by the Cambridge Green Belt it does not affect the purposes of the Green Belt, as outlined in paragraph 4.2, given that the site is remote from Cambridge. Any further development on the Spicers site would still need to have regard to its setting surrounded by Green Belt. Therefore it is proposed to revert the site back to an island within the Green Belt, as it is in the adopted Local Plan 2004.	Delete Spicers from Policy GB/5 and remove the Green Belt designation from the Spicers site at Sawston and show it as white land on the Proposals Map.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>d.</i>				
9932 - Babraham Institute	Object	To reflect more accurately the advice in PARA C4 (a) of PPG2 (Green Belts), it is suggested that Paragraph 2d reads as follows: 'There being a greater impact than the existing development on the openness of The Green Belt'.	Agree.	Amend criteria 2 d to read: "There being a greater impact than the existing development on the openness of the Green Belt."
<i>GB/6 Recreation in the Green Belt</i>				
8331 - The Marshall Group 9062 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object		Paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it is for the follow purpose - "essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, for cemeteries, and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it (see paragraph 3.5)". Paragraph 3.5 states that "essential facilities should be genuinely required for uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it. Possible examples of such facilities include small changing rooms or unobtrusive spectator accommodation for outdoor sport, or small stables for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation." To widen the scope of Policy GB/6 beyond 'countryside recreation' and to allow built development would be contrary to PPG2.	
9140 - English Partnerships	Object	National planning guidance in PPG2 states that use of land in Green Belts has a positive role to play in fulfilling key land use objectives. One objective is to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas as well as to provide opportunities for access to open countryside. Additional reference should therefore be added to the objectives of this policy that make specific reference to the provision of outdoor sports facilities within the Green Belt. Policy should be reworded as follows: 'Proposals for the use of the Green Belt which secure increased opportunities for access to the open countryside and which provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation will be encouraged'	Policy GB/6 states "enhanced opportunities for countryside recreation, appropriate to the Green Belt, will be encouraged where it will not harm the objectives of the Green Belt." Thus, the policy already encourages provision for outdoor sport and recreation. Agree, that the first sentence should be broadened to include access to the countryside and outdoor recreation as these accord with paragraph 3.4 of PPG2. However, to remove the caveats "appropriate to the Green Belt" and "where it will not harm the objectives of the Green Belt" could result in development contrary to PPG2.	Amend first sentence of Policy GB/6 to read: "Proposals for the use of the Green Belt for enhanced opportunities for access to the open countryside and which provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation, appropriate to the Green Belt, will be encouraged where it will not harm the objectives of the Green Belt."
8903 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	PPG2 stipulates the positive role that use of land in Green Belts has on fulfilling key land use objectives such as providing opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation. This positive approach should be reflected in the policy. The following wording is suggested: 'Proposals for the use of the Green Belt which secure increased opportunities for access to the open countryside and which provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation will be encouraged'.	Policy GB/6 states "enhanced opportunities for countryside recreation, appropriate to the Green Belt, will be encouraged where it will not harm the objectives of the Green Belt." Thus, the policy already encourages provision for outdoor sport and recreation. Agree, that the first sentence should be broadened to include access to the countryside and outdoor recreation as these accord with paragraph 3.4 of PPG2. However, to remove the caveats "appropriate to the Green Belt" and "where it will not harm the objectives of the Green Belt" could result in development contrary to PPG2.	Amend first sentence of Policy GB/6 to read: "Proposals for the use of the Green Belt for enhanced opportunities for access to the open countryside and which provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation, appropriate to the Green Belt, will be encouraged where it will not harm the objectives of the Green Belt."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9449 - English Partnerships 9438 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	The last sentence of policy GB/6 should be deleted. Matters relating to country parks are addressed in individual AAPs.	Agree, the last sentence of Policy GB/6 should be deleted. These issues are addressed in the Area Action Plans for the major development locations.	Delete the last sentence of Policy GB/6.
9960 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support	Support noted.	
9143 - Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum	Support	Welcome the inclusion of creation of new country parks and improvements to public rights of way.	Support noted.	
8951 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	Support increased provision within the green belt by the creation of more public rights of way. The current network is very fragmented and new links will enable local communities and visitors to the area to enjoy informal recreation at any time, whether on horseback, cycle or foot.	Support noted.	
9725 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds	Support	The RSPB support the policy to seek opportunities for quiet countryside recreation within the greenbelt. Further, the RSPB strongly support the policy including provision to create new opportunities for countryside recreation in the greenbelt associated with urban development. The RSPB believe that there are significant opportunities for habitat creation within the district contributing to a high quality of life for the current and future population of the district.	Support noted.	
11074 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	It is noted that these two policies cover aspects of active management of the Green Belt as suggested in the last paragraph of Structure Plan Policy P9/2a. Although farm diversification is not covered here, it is covered in Policy ET/10.	Support noted.	
9883 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Support	Support the policy but consider it essential that the following is included: a balance is to be achieved between public access and related access infrastructure the need to retain wildlife sanctuary areas. This in particular to apply to narrow green and river/stream corridors.	Support noted. The protection of wildlife areas is covered by other policies in the Plan. Therefore, specific reference in Policy GB/6 would be unnecessary duplication.	
11089 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Strongly support - welcome explicit reference to improvements of Rights of Way in Green Belt areas.	Support noted.	
<b>4.22</b>				
9452 - swavesey & district bridleways association 8964 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire) 9454 11046 10470	Object	Amend paragraph 4.22 to say: "Given the significant development which is proposed for the edge of Cambridge and in the new town of Northstowe, which will take place at higher densities than in the past, it is essential that the residents of these new developments have direct and easy access by foot or cycle AND HORSEBACK to open countryside for recreation"	Agree, Policy GB/6 makes provision for improvements to public rights of way, and some of these will also serve horse riders.	Include a reference in the supporting text to Policy GB/6 to horse riders using public rights of way.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10471 - Swavesey and District Bridleways Association (Over representative) 10472 10540 10493	Object	I am concerned that horseriders have been omitted as a group from paragraph 4.22. Like cyclists and walkers they are very vulnerable road users. The area which will encompass Northstowe is surrounded by stables and fields containing horses. Many of these are ridden by young children as well as adults. It is therefore imperative that the paragraph mentions their needs too.	Agree, Policy GB/6 makes provision for improvements to public rights of way, and some of these will also serve horse riders.	Include a reference in the supporting text to Policy GB/6 to horse riders using public rights of way.
<i>4.23</i>				
11077 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Would like to see added "bridleways, including cycle use, so that wider community (equestrians) are not disadvantaged."	Paragraph 4.23 makes provision for countryside access, including "the provision of new routes for footpaths, bridleways and cycleways." It is not clear why equestrians should be disadvantaged by such provision for all types of countryside access, as cyclists will be able to use bridleways or cycle paths, potentially freeing up space for equestrians.	
8976 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	Support the inclusion of bridleways but this paragraph can be improved by including reference to "community circuits" which are the local routes that form part of the National Bridleroute Network.	Support noted. Paragraph 4.23 does not preclude the development of "community circuits" and Policy TR/4 already makes provision for improvements to the public rights of way network, including the provision of circular routes.	
7879 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	We welcome these sentiments: increased development within the Green Belt will also increase pressure on the recreational use of the Green Belt, and indeed increase the opportunities for that use. It is important to recognise that different users have different requirements and concerns: neither horses nor cyclists mix easily with walkers, and adequate separation of provision is required.	Support noted.	
<i>4.24</i>				
7880 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	We welcome these comments. We would be concerned that high profile, capital intensive projects, such as 'country parks' might gain a disproportionate share of the budget. Good RoW signing; path maintenance; sturdy stiles and adequate fencing are not capital intensive, but require instead labour intensive care and concern, with problems sorted quickly.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>GB/7 Improvements to Landscape and Biodiversity</i>				
8447 - English Heritage	Object	We recommend that new planting schemes should take account of historic landscape features as represented in the Historic Landscape Character [HLC] database, and any archaeological interest. The policy should be amended to read: '..through additional planting and habitat creation, to reverse the decline in quality, and as appropriate to historic landscape character'. The text should include a reference to the HLC database, and the need to ensure historic features and archaeological remains are taken into account.	Paragraph 9.2, in the Cultural Heritage Chapter refers to historic landscapes and the need to have regard to the Historic Landscape Database in determining whether proposals would have an adverse impact on historic landscapes. In addition, policies in the Development Principles and Natural Environment chapters ensure good design and the need to conserve and enhance biodiversity. It would be unnecessary duplication to repeat such requirements.	
9071 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Improvements to the landscape and biodiversity need to be considered together with access and use of the Green Belt for formal and informal recreation purposes.	Paragraph 4.28 already states that "the need for improvements to the landscape and biodiversity will need to be taken into account when considering improvements for recreation and public access."	
9698 - GO-East	Object	Consideration should be given to expanding the application of the policy to all rural areas rather than just the Green Belt.	Policies in the Development Principles and Natural Environment chapters ensure suitable landscaping and the need to conserve and enhance biodiversity. It would be unnecessary duplication to broaden the requirement in Policy GB/7, which is specific to the Green Belt, to include such requirements across the district as a whole.	
9699 - GO-East	Object	The policy and supporting text should be amended to clearly indicate how the policy will be implemented and by who.	Agree Policy GB/7 currently reads as a statement of intention. It is proposed to delete Policy GB/7 and expand Policy GB/3 into a new policy on "Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt".	<p>Delete Policy GB/7.</p> <p>Amend title of Policy GB/3 to read: "Policy GB/3 Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt"</p> <p>Add a new second paragraph to Policy GB/3: "Where development is permitted, landscaping conditions, together with a requirement that any planting is adequately maintained, will be attached to any planning permission in order to ensure that the impact on the Green Belt is mitigated."</p> <p>Move paragraphs 4.26 and 4.27 to follow paragraph 4.16.</p> <p>Move paragraph 4.28 to follow paragraph 4.24.</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9697 - GO-East	Object	May need to be included in a different chapter such as Natural Environment and consideration should be given as to whether it could be included within another Policy, for example NE/8 which relates to Natural Areas throughout the district that have been defined by, amongst other attributes, landscape and biodiversity.	This is an important issue for the Green Belt chapter. Other policies, such as DP/2 apply district-wide. It is proposed to delete Policy GB/7 and expand Policy GB/3 into a new policy on "Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt".	<p>Delete Policy GB/7.</p> <p>Amend title of Policy GB/3 to read: "Policy GB/3 Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt"</p> <p>Add a new second paragraph to Policy GB/3: "Where development is permitted, landscaping conditions, together with a requirement that any planting is adequately maintained, will be attached to any planning permission in order to ensure that the impact on the Green Belt is mitigated."</p> <p>Move paragraphs 4.26 and 4.27 to follow paragraph 4.16.</p> <p>Move paragraph 4.28 to follow paragraph 4.24.</p>
11075 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	It is noted that these two policies cover aspects of active management of the Green Belt as suggested in the last paragraph of Structure Plan Policy P9/2a. Although farm diversification is not covered here, it is covered in Policy ET/10.	Support noted.	
11058 - Environment Agency	Support	We support the proposed policy to seek improvements to landscape and biodiversity in the district.	Support noted.	
9961 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support	Support noted.	
<i>4.26</i>				
11092 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Would like to see more emphasis in the supporting text on woodland planting especially around existing ancient woodland sites. Ancient woodland is especially highlighted in the new Government Planning Policy Statement 9.	Policy GB/7 and supporting text do not detail the type of planting, as this will vary according to the location. Paragraph 4.26 recognises that much of the landscape is over mature and refers to the need for "new hedge and tree planting". However, policies in the Development Principles chapter, Policy NE/4 and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document will ensure appropriate landscaping, which may include woodland planting, as appropriate.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>4.27</i>				
11093 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Would like to see more emphasis in the supporting text on woodland planting especially around existing ancient woodland sites. Ancient woodland is especially highlighted in the new Government Planning Policy Statement 9.	Policy GB/7 and supporting text do not detail the type of planting, as this will vary according to the location. Paragraph 4.26 recognises that much of the landscape is over mature and refers to the need for "new hedge and tree planting". However, policies in the Development Principles chapter, Policy NE/4 and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document will ensure appropriate landscaping, which may include woodland planting, as appropriate.	
<i>4.28</i>				
11095 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Would like to see more emphasis in the supporting text on woodland planting especially around existing ancient woodland sites. Ancient woodland is especially highlighted in the new Government Planning Policy Statement 9.	Policy GB/7 and supporting text do not detail the type of planting, as this will vary according to the location. Paragraph 4.26 recognises that much of the landscape is over mature and refers to the need for "new hedge and tree planting". However, policies in the Development Principles chapter, Policy NE/4 and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document will ensure appropriate landscaping, which may include woodland planting, as appropriate.	
<i>Objectives</i>				
9964 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support.	Support noted.	
<i>HG/a</i>				
11107 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	It would be useful to show the origins of people moving in - (the County Council is still awaiting the data from the Office for National Statistics). A "context" section could usefully review current tenures, showing the small % of social rented housing in the district, and the % of this, which is specifically for elderly people. This underpins the requirement for affordable housing - i.e. very few re-lets per annum which are not for elderly people.	This level of detail is not directly relevant to the LDF process and should be included in the Supplementary Planning Document.	
10227 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 10392 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Objective HG/a that seeks the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community, including key workers is welcomed.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>HG/1 Housing Density</i>				
8332 - The Marshall Group	Object	Higher densities than those stated in Policy HG/1 will be appropriate at Cambridge East, to help in part address the historic imbalance between jobs and homes. The Cambridge East Area Action Plan refers to at least 50 dwellings per hectare, with development aiming to achieve an average net housing density in the order of 75 dwellings per hectare.	Agree Cambridge East can and should accommodate higher densities than the minimum densities stated in HG/1, as reflected in the text at paragraph 5.2. However HG/1 applies district-wide and it is for the Cambridge East AAP to set out the policies that apply specifically to the development of the urban extension.	
9142 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships supports the principles of higher density development i.e. over 40 dwellings per ha. In designing new development opportunities sustainability will be a key consideration and therefore an integral part of the masterplan process and the policy should be reworded to recognise the potential contribution of higher density development to enhance the sustainability of certain locations, (i.e. town and local centres and areas around public transport nodes) where 40 dwellings per ha should be a minimum requirement subject to environmental and detailed design assessment.	Agree higher densities help achieve sustainable development. HG/1 already recognises the role of density in achieving more sustainable development and requires densities of at least 40dph in more sustainable locations. Many of the rural villages have average densities below 30dph and it would not be appropriate to require higher densities in these locations as this would be out of character, although HG/1 does not preclude development at higher densities. However, higher densities will be sought at the new town of Northstowe and the urban extensions to Cambridge, as reflected in the text at paragraph 5.2, and this will be a matter of detail for the individual AAPs for these areas to determine. It would be an unnecessary duplication incorporating this level of detail into HG/1.	
10228 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	Policy HG/1 should be clarified in respect of the net residential density that will be required in the new urban extensions and specifically the land to be released from the Green Belt between Huntingdon Rd. and Madingley Rd: paragraph 5.2 refers to higher densities being sought in the new urban extensions but is not specific as to the net density that will be sought. The Plan should be specific on net residential densities in relation to the new urban extensions.	HG/1 requires densities of at least 40dph in more sustainable locations. Para 5.2 explains that higher densities will be sought in the urban extensions to Cambridge and that this detail will be set out in the AAPs. It would be an unnecessary duplication incorporating this level of detail into HG/1, which sets out district-wide density standards.	
11100 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	To be consistent the term "good quality public transport" should be changed to "high quality public transport" throughout and in accordance with Policy 8/6 of the Structure Plan. Also a definition is needed here to clarify what is meant by "high quality".	Agree the reference to Good Quality Public Transport is no longer valid and should be deleted, as this is no longer referred to in the Provisional Local Transport Plan. However, it is not appropriate refer to High Quality Public Transport (HQPT), as Policy P8/6 of the Structure Plan refers to the development of HQPT within Cambridge and Peterborough, and concentrated on the corridors between cities and market towns. Policy 8/6 also refers to "good local services for market towns and feeder services linking rural areas to urban centres", and it is this approach that should be incorporated into Policy HG/1. It is not feasible to require HQPT, given that the majority of villages will never meet this standard of service and such a requirement could preclude development at higher densities. A definition of HQPT is already included in the Glossary.	Delete GQPT from Glossary. Amend reference to GQPT to refer to "good local services", and add a definition in Glossary (using the definition in the Local Transport Plan).

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7956 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Object	Densities should respect the surrounding area. Heavily increased density levels could detract from the progression of the Cambridge Phenomenon.	HG/1 applies district-wide and is worded to reflect and respect the lower densities in villages, but at the same time bring new development in villages up to a minimum density of 30dph. In more accessible locations, a higher density of at least 40dph will be sought. This approach accords with Structure Plan Policy P5/3 and paragraphs 57 & 58 of PPG3. Higher densities can be accommodated through good design without detriment to the locality and other policies, such as DP/2, control the design of development.	
9965 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support.	Support noted.	
<i>5.1</i>				
9702 - GO-East	Object	It would be helpful to indicate, perhaps in paragraph 5.1, that the policy will not be applied in an inflexible manner, and to emphasise that the density of the development of individual sites will be design-led to ensure that the most efficient use of the land is made, relative to the site's location and context.	Flexibility is inherent in HG/1, requiring densities of "at least" 30 or 40 dph and exceptionally allowing lower densities where there are local circumstances that require different treatment. Paragraph 5.1 already stresses the need for good design, which is also addressed in Policy DP/2. Further reasoned justification is unnecessary, and would be contrary to PPS12 paragraph 2.6.1 which states that "reasoned justification in support of the policies...should be kept to a minimum necessary to provide context to the policy".	
<i>5.2</i>				
10745 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Ltd is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. As a consequence, paragraph 5.2 should be amended to read (1st line) "In the urban extensions and the new towns of Northstowe and Hanley Grange, higher densities .....".	The development strategy in the LDF plans for development to 2016 in accordance with the adopted and saved Structure Plan 2003. The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS14), which incorporates growth in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough corridor, covers a longer period to 2021, and is beyond the scope of this LDF.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>HG/2 Housing Mix</i>				
10569	Object	The proposal takes no account whatsoever of housing demand and construes need in over simplistic terms. The policy should be modified to allow for demand to influence housing mix.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach is entirely consistent with Government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey. Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, identified a need for 89% 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings. However, this requirement was adjusted to take into account market forces and to better achieve balanced communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with paragraph 2 of PPG3.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8904 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	<p>Inconsistent with national policy, over prescriptive, inflexible and not grounded on a robust evidence base.</p> <p>Lacks flexibility to deal with changing circumstances in the District over the life of the LDF.</p> <p>Once affordable housing is taken into account, the resultant proportion of 1 and 2 bed dwellings might be higher.</p> <p>The requirement for significantly large proportions of 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings will place unacceptable constraints on development and could have an inverse effect in terms of creating balanced and mixed communities</p> <p>The provision of dwellings with more bedrooms is consistent with the concept of encouraging a greater degree of home-based working.</p>	<p>PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach in Policy HG/2 is entirely consistent with Government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance. The HNS identified a need for 89% of all new properties to be 1 and 2 bedroom, and also identified an affordable housing need equating to a target of 80.1%. Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. Policies HG/2 and HG/3 provide flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different market housing mix or affordable housing provision. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the HNS will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed. Provision for home working should be addressed through good design and the appropriate provision of a study or similar, rather than the provision of additional bedrooms.</p>	
9459 - English Partnerships	Object	<p>Reference should be made to the full range of affordable housing types including Homebuy, shared ownership and key worker housing in line with current and emerging government guidance.</p>	<p>Affordable housing is an umbrella term for a range of subsidised housing, and is defined in Paragraph 5.8. This already includes these types of affordable housing.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9968 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The mix is too prescriptive. The mix should be determined by regular assessment of market factors and housing needs for the affordable housing element and to enable housing development to be responsive as advocated in 'Planning for Housing Provision' (ODPM, 2005).	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with PPG3 and PPS12 requiring such targets be included within the DPD and not SPD in order that it can be fully consulted on and tested through the Inquiry process. Policy HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	
8981 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	It is inappropriate to include a policy in the DPD which restricts market housing, given the fact that the Policy will be out of date within less than a year of adoption and the market experiences 'cycles' and that after 2007, conditions in the private housing market may have changed. The Policy does not provide for a balanced community and this is particularly important when considering provisions for the settlement at Northstowe, which is in a rural area. Restricting 50% of all market housing to 1-2 bedroom homes in Northstowe will result in an unnatural bias towards smaller households.	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. The issue of housing mix at Northstowe is dealt with under separate representations on the Northstowe Area Action Plan. This approach is in accordance with paragraph 2 of PPG3. HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10283 - Stannifer	Object	The market housing mix is too prescriptive and does not have regard to the conclusions of the Barker Review and the Consultation Paper on 'Planning for Housing Provision' (2005). It also assumes that South Cambridgeshire District is a uniform housing market and the market demand for housing sites at the edge of Cambridge is the same as within the smaller villages.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach is entirely consistent with Government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey (HNS). Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The HNS identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. Policy HG/2 provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. This approach is in accordance with paragraph 2 of PPG3. The city edge sites do not have a specific target because evidence shows that Cambridge City is responding better to the need for 1 and 2 bedroom properties. For example, the Cambridge East Area Action Plan does not prescribe a market housing mix, but requires a mix to address the high level of need local need for smaller homes.	
10665 - David Wilson Estates	Object	To detail in a prescriptive manner the housing mix which will be required on residential developments does not take into account the location of such developments, or indeed the needs which pertain at a particular point in time. Whilst quite clearly the need for housing mix is acknowledged and accepted, the particular mix for any specific site should be a matter for detailed discussion, and not a requirement of a detailed policy. It is therefore suggested that, with the exception of Paragraphs 1 and 2, the remainder of the wording contained within the policy should be deleted.	The housing mix is indicative of the housing need at the present time, as identified by the Housing Needs Survey (HNS). Policy HG/2 provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Even with the deletion of the approximate housing mix, there is still a requirement for the provision of a suitable housing mix to meet local needs (i.e. that identified by the HNS and currently set out in paragraph 3). Therefore, the retention of the approximate mix provides clarity to applicants as to the appropriate housing mix that will be required at any given time. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10672 - Atkins Property Development Ltd	Object	It is for the market to determine the appropriate mix based upon local demand. New development proposals in certain areas may provide the opportunity for a variety of house types currently not available to create a balanced and sustainable community. Delete all policy wording following the first paragraph.	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many villages which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with paragraph 2 of PPG3.	
10224 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 10391 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The desirability of providing a range of type, size and affordability of dwellings across the District is accepted. In setting the parameters for the future market housing mix, however, the Council should be careful to balance long term market demand based on real aspirations against snap shot assessments of minimum needs based on shorter time horizons and abstract analysis. Whilst it is true that the 2002 Housing Needs Survey (HNS) attempted to assess the mix of market housing required, no weight should be attached to its conclusions in this regard.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach is entirely consistent with Government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance. The housing mix in paragraph 3 is indicative of the current housing needs as identified in the HNS. Policy HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	
10127 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to the requirement that residential developments will contain a mix of units providing accommodation in a range of types, sizes and affordability and also object specified mix. Although Fairview agree with the need to encourage the provision of smaller dwellings in line with national housing trends, the document should not set specific housing mixes for developments, but allow sufficient flexibility for the composition of residential development to be determined by developers. Such requirements increase the complexity of development which may make it unviable, especially on smaller sites. The policy should recognise the variety in housing types that come forward on different development sites and the potential for the combination of these sites to meet the housing needs of the local area.	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with PPG3. Policy HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9252 - Defence Lands Ops North	Object	The viability of a development can often depend on the correct type of housing being built, for example executive style developments would not sell so well interspersed with one bedroom flats or affordable accommodation. At present, such specific requirements for all new developments are considered onerous and impracticable. It is therefore recommended that the Policy be altered to state; 'Residential developments will contain a mix of units providing accommodation in a range of types, sizes and affordability, to meet local needs, identified at that time through an up to date housing needs assessment.'	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey (HNS) identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many villages which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with paragraph 2 of PPG3, which promotes good design in new housing developments. The housing mix is indicative of the housing need at the present time, as identified by the HNS. Policy HG/2 provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Even with the deletion of the approximate housing mix, there is still a requirement for the provision of a suitable housing mix to meet local needs (i.e. that identified by the HNS and currently set out in paragraph 3). Therefore, the retention of the approximate mix provides clarity to applicants as to the appropriate housing mix that will be required at any given time. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	
8333 - The Marshall Group	Object	Policy too prescriptive. Smaller household sizes do not necessarily dictate the need for smaller homes. Need to recognise changing circumstances over time by including the appropriate mix in terms of housing tenures and house sizes of affordable housing within a development will be determined in response to identified needs and funding priorities at the time of the development. To seek to determine house size is unjustified. The house building industry is sensitive to its market, both in general terms and particularly to house size.	It is acknowledged that some smaller households would prefer to have a home larger than the minimum that they require. However, in an area of high house prices, affordability is also a relevant factor. The Housing Needs Survey took account of both what people would like and what they expect in identifying a need for 89% of all new properties to be 1 and 2 bedroom. Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. Policy HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10086 - Bellway Homes	Object	We object to this policy on the basis that it is prescriptive across the entire district and that it places further conditions on the market, which must remain flexible in order to deal with changing demands.	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with PPG3. Policy HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	
10049 - House Builders Federation	Object	HBF is supportive of policies that seek the provision of an appropriate housing mix. However, it is firmly of the view that this needs to be achieved via negotiation on a site by site basis taking account of local needs and market circumstances. One-size-fits-all policies on housing have been tried in the past and have failed. The suggestion that the 2002 Housing Needs Survey is capable of determining the precise bedroom composition of market sector housing is rejected. That is neither its role nor its purpose. A Local housing Market Assessment will be the more appropriate vehicle for doing this.	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, identified a need for 89% 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings. However, this requirement was adjusted to take into account market forces and to better achieve balanced communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with PPG3. Policy HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	
9992 - Laing Homes North Thames	Object	Introducing such a prescriptive approach to the housing mix does not take into account local circumstances and other external factors which can affect the housing market. We would suggest that a more flexible approach would be more appropriate and whilst there is some merit in trying to set out a specific housing mix we believe that this policy should be seen as a guideline rather than an inflexible standard.	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with PPG3. Policy HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9147 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships requests that the policy states that in ensuring an appropriate mix is achieved, that each proposal is considered on its own merits taking into account the socio-economic profile of existing and new communities, housing need assessments, development funding and phasing and market constraints. In considering new settlement proposals the local authority should also balance housing need with the need for a socio economic mix capable of supporting new employment, commercial and community services. It should also consider historic demographic trends associated with other new settlements in determining appropriate affordable tenure mixes. Market housing mix should also be viewed in context of affordable housing aspirations and the development industry's ability to deliver to these levels of proposed house types.	PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach in Policy HG/2 is entirely consistent with Government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance. The HNS identified a need for 89% of all new properties to be 1 and 2 bedroom. Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. The issue of housing mix at Northstowe is dealt with under separate representations on the Northstowe Area Action Plan. Policy HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8144 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	<p>Houses have become more efficient and compact. Small households have aspirations for larger family accommodation.</p> <p>Take account of affordable housing requirement on developments (primarily smaller 1 &amp; 2 bedroom) - it will not result in balanced communities on larger developments. Mix does not make reference to the circumstances or locations that this broad requirement might differ, nor does it distinguish the need for particular consideration on large sites (60 dwellings or 2 ha).</p> <p>Prescriptiveness is contrary to PPG3 and a blanket policy does not accord with Planning for Mixed Communities. Would impact on the viability of a site which would deter developers from providing housing and have an adverse effect on housing supply.</p>	<p>PPG3 says that the majority of projected growth will be in one-person households and that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach in Policy HG/2 is entirely consistent with Government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance. It is acknowledged that some smaller households would prefer to have a home larger than the minimum that they require. However, in an area of high house prices, affordability is also a relevant factor. The HNS took account of both what people would like and what they expect in identifying a need for 89% of all new properties to be 1 and 2 bedroom. The HNS also identified an affordable housing need equating to a target of 80.1%. Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. Policies HG/2 and HG/3 provide flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different market housing mix or affordable housing provision. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the HNS will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.</p>	
7986 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	<p>The Draft Consultation Paper 'Planning for Mixed Communities' states in para 5 that 'local planning authorities should ensure that their policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- are based on an up-to-date assessment of the full range of housing demand across the plan area over the plan period</li> <li>- are developed in partnership with stakeholders</li> </ul> <p>The housing evidence data base is out of date and there is no reference to the involvement of stakeholders. Delete HG/2 and replace with a policy that is based on up-to-date research in conjunction with key stakeholders.</p>	<p>PPG3 says that local authorities should adopt policies which take full account of changes in housing needs in their areas and which will widen the range of housing opportunities to allow these to be met, including to secure an appropriate mix of dwelling size. It says that they should take account of assessments of local housing need in determining type and size of additional housing. The approach in Policy HG/2 is entirely consistent with Government guidance and responds to the failure of the market to reflect local needs, as now identified in the Housing Needs Survey (HNS). The HNS (2002) was conducted in accordance with Government guidance and remains current, covering the period to 2007. A Plan, Monitor, Manage approach and reviews of the HNS will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7823 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	It is wrong for policies to be too prescriptive about housing mix when trends in demand can alter during the lifetime of an LDF. It is the experience of the house building industry that sales are directly related to thorough market research and if there was a clear cut demand for high density then market forces respond. There remains a requirement for high density (subject to the character of the area) set by PPS3. To prescribe a housing mix in addition to this is creating undue interference in the market and possible prejudicing best design in layouts. Delete the policy.	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with paragraph 2 of PPG3. Policy HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed. Policy HG/1 requires minimum densities of 30 dph in accordance with PPG3. Such densities can be accomplished through good design and should not have a bearing on achievement of housing mix.	
9706 - GO-East	Object	The policy in its current form appears overly onerous and uncertain. It is also overly prescriptive and inflexible in that it does not indicate how the policy will be applied to individual development sites relative to their scale, location and local need. It is not clear that the mix is appropriate across the district. The policy and supporting text should be reviewed to address these matters prior to inclusion in the submission DPD. The burden of proof is overly onerous on applicant and "demonstrated to the satisfaction of the District Council" is a subjective test.	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey (HNS) identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with paragraph 2 of PPG3. The housing mix is indicative of the housing need at the present time, as identified by the HNS. Policy HG/2 provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. Therefore, the inclusion of an approximate mix provides clarity to applicants as to the appropriate housing mix that will be required at any given time. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed. This approach need not be burdensome on developers as the justification may simply rely on observations of the type of residential development in the village, and if there are already a large number of smaller units it may be appropriate for a different mix incorporating more larger units.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8093	Object	I support the provision of smaller properties but I do not believe this will be achieved by biasing the requirement on the number of bedrooms. There is an example in Linton where a developer has marketed houses as two bedroom, with study, which are standard three bed designs with one bedroom redesignated. To achieve smaller house the criteria should be the size of the property expressed in floor area	It is general practice to seek market housing mix in accordance with the number of bedrooms, although it is recognised that this in itself will not necessarily bring about smaller homes. However, the requirement for developers to make best use of land and to provide an appropriate mix of market housing to meet local needs should help assist in the delivery of smaller dwellings. In addition, in an area of high house prices and where affordability is a big issue, the housing market could influence houses sizes, in terms of saleability. The issue of study / extra bedroom can also be addressed through the development control process, for example, through design. Indeed, it would difficult to determine a minimum / maximum / average size threshold for floorspace. Whilst there have been occasions where developers have built a larger number of rooms (marketed as a study or an additional bedroom) or a smaller number of bedrooms in a larger footprint (i.e. a two bedroom house in the footprint of a three bedroom house), for example, for people seeking more bedrooms without the additional living area, thus keeping the price down, or seeking a larger living area without extra bedrooms, this provides greater choice in the housing market.	
9074 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The proposed housing mix is too prescriptive.	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The HNS identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with paragraph 2 of PPG3. HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix.	
7991 - Cambridgeshire ACRE	Support	Strongly support the proposed Market Housing Mix as there is a severe shortage of one and two bedroom properties in South Cambridgeshire to cater for smaller households.	Support noted.	
9414 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
10231 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University welcomes the proposed dwelling mix in Policy HG/2 and the emphasis on the provision of 1 and 2 bed dwellings. The University's own research has shown a significant demand for this size of property among University employees who are looking to gain access to the housing market.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11102 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support.	Support noted.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 4</i>				
9277 - David Wilson Homes (S Midlands)	Object	Housing developers are generally in a far better position to advise on what is required in a local housing market (build the wrong product and it will not sell). Whilst the need for smaller homes is recognised, the policy is unduly weighted towards 1 and 2 bed dwellings, with the possibility of local market demand being for a different mix appearing as somewhat of an afterthought in the policy.	Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The Housing Needs Survey identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. Policy HG/2 also provides flexibility, allowing applicants to demonstrate where local circumstances may require a different mix. This approach is in accordance with PPG3.	
<i>5.3</i>				
11104 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The greater number of 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings will have an impact on the number of children these developments generate. If, in the future certain sites are expected to have a certain housing mix, the County Council would wish to be involved at an early date to begin pupil forecasting to determine the size and numbers of schools to be built.	Greater clarity on population profile is likely to be achieved through inclusion of a specified housing mix. Partnership working with Cambridgeshire County Council will also ensure this is addressed.	
7988 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	The paragraphs rely on old data, have little regard to certain elements of the ODPM Consultation Paper on 'Planning for Mixed Communities' and makes inappropriate comments on housing market failure. Relevant to Policy/Paragraph 5.3-5.7	The Housing Needs Survey (HNS) 2002 was prepared in accordance with Government guidance and covers the period to 2007. Despite policies in the 1993 and 2004 Local Plans seeking a mix of house types and sizes, the market has not responded to need over the last 10 years or more with approximately half of all new housing being 4 or more bedroom, and targets are therefore set to address identified need. The HNS identified a need for smaller dwellings. The prescribed mix will help to balance communities in many existing settlements which already have a plentiful supply of larger properties of 4 or more bedrooms. This approach is in accordance with paragraph 2 of PPG3. Plan, Monitor, Manage and reviews of the Housing Needs Survey will ensure that any changes throughout the plan period are addressed.	
<i>5.4</i>				
8275	Support	There is a need for lower priced smaller homes in Great Wilbraham which predominantly is of larger higher priced property.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>5.5</i>				
10393 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The 2002 HNS is flawed and the detailed findings are therefore not accepted as robust for a number of reasons.	The Housing Needs Survey is prepared in accordance with Government guidance.	
<i>HG/3 Affordable Housing</i>				
10694 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	The proposed target of "approximately 50%" is unreasonable and will lead to many schemes, especially very small schemes, becoming unviable. It will therefore not achieve any significant improvement in affordability nor in provision of affordable housing. The proviso that the precise percentage will be determined having regard to development costs is welcomed, but what is not clear is how the Council will determine such matters in a reasonable and objective fashion that does not undermine financial confidentiality issues. Affordable housing requirements should not apply to small-scale employment development designed to provide local employment opportunities in villages and this should be made clear in both policies.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances. The Supplementary Planning Document will provide detail on the application of the policy, including the determination of development costs.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8983 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	<p>Policy HG/3 sets out the affordable housing requirements. The Policy is too prescriptive, particularly in respect of the level of affordable housing which is significantly higher than the provision in Policy P9/2 of the adopted Structure Plan. The Policy is also too prescriptive in the requirement for affordable housing relating to employment development. Proposed Amendment - The figure for the level of affordable housing should be substantially reduced and the final sentence of the Policy should be deleted.</p>	<p>The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Structure Plan Policy P9/1 also states "employment developments will also be expected to contribute towards affordable housing". This approach has been tested by Oxford City Council through their Local Plan Inquiry, and Policies HG/3 and ET/2 are in accordance with the Oxford City Local Plan Inspector's recommendations. The amount of affordable housing required by employment development will be of a scale and kind to the development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9371 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Object	Whilst it is reasonable to have a District target, this should not be a blanket percentage applied inflexibly to all sites regardless of viability or differing types of housing need. The provision of high levels of affordable housing in addition to other much needed community benefits could, in certain circumstances, render a development unviable, in which case the community receives no benefit at all. The policy should be reworded to recognise that a lower contribution and a more flexible housing mix may be acceptable in some circumstances.	Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area." The approach in HG/3 is consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. Viability issues are material considerations to be taken into account in relation to planning applications. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessment of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in light of their own detailed assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances.	
11129 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to the statement in Policy HG/3 that the council will seek the provision of affordable housing on all sites of two or more dwellings (see also Policy DP/3, paragraph 1). This is unjustified as guidance in Circular 6/98 states that the threshold for developments on which affordable housing can be sought should be housing developments of 25 or more dwellings or residential sites of 1 hectare or more (unless the specific area is in Inner London or in settlements in rural areas with a population of 3000 or fewer) (Paragraph 10a). It has not however been demonstrated that affordable housing should be provided on all sites of two dwellings or more.	The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. The consultation paper relating to the review of PPG3: Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (2003), paragraph 10 states "Affordable housing should not normally be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings. Where affordable housing is to be sought on smaller sites this should be justified by local planning authorities in their local plan." Given the high level of affordable housing need (80.1%) identified in the Housing Needs Survey and the lower target of 50%, the district council feels this justifies a lower threshold on all sites. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10312 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	Needs From Employment Development, ET/2 Meeting Housing Needs From Employment Development We object in principle to these policies which require the provision of affordable housing resulting from employment development, on the basis that it is unreasonable.	Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states "employment developments will also be expected to contribute towards affordable housing". This approach has been tested by Oxford City Council through their Local Plan Inquiry, and Policies HG/3 and ET/2 are in accordance with the Oxford City Local Plan Inspector's recommendations. The amount of affordable housing required by employment development will be of a scale and kind to the development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9154 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships wishes to see the policy become more flexible. It should include scope for the use of emerging methods of assessing and agreeing affordable housing levels and housing mix, including those in Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations. This may include the use of third party mediators for negotiations and robust development analysis and sensitivity testing on a site by site basis, taking into account development constraints, site conditions, other policy considerations, viability, economic impact, development phasing and market conditions.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area. "The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. Viability issues are material considerations to be taken into account in relation to planning applications. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessment of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in light of their own detailed assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. Paragraph 4 of Policy HG/3 allows flexibility in determining the appropriate mix of affordable housing according to "identified needs and funding priorities at the time of development", whilst paragraph 5.13 provides an indicative mix which is flexible where local circumstances suggest a different mix would better meet local needs. One such evidence base is the Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance. Therefore there is sufficient flexibility for the negotiation of the appropriate mix provided it will address the identified local need.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11133 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview New Homes object to the statement in Policy HG/3 that the council will seek the provision of approximately 50% affordable housing. This is unjustified as guidance in Circular 6/98 clearly states that policies for affordable housing should set "indicative" targets for specific sites and should not other set a fixed quota. As such, the expected target provision should not be included within the document other than as an indicative target. Also, Policy P9/2 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan states that 40% or more of the new housing in the Sub-Region should be affordable. There should also be scope included in the policy to consider the particular merits of each case.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 requires the provision of approximately 50% affordable housing, which is flexible enough to take account of local circumstances, including development costs.	
10323 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We consider that the policy should be amended to enable Registered Social Landlords to influence the extent to which affordable housing is distributed within development schemes.	Whilst it is important that Registered Social Landlords are involved in determining the distribution of affordable housing within developments, there is no need to change the wording of Policy HG/3 as it is sufficiently flexible. It requires clusters of "typically of 6 to 8 units", which can vary according to the site, location and other local circumstances, including maintenance and management issues.	
10279 - Stannifer	Object	On small sites, the provision of one or two affordable homes is not effective from the management point of view. These are economies of scale of the Registered Social Landlord with affordable housing being developed in groups rather than as isolated separate dwellings.	Policy HG/4 recognises there can be specific issues around deliverability and management on small sites and provides flexibility in such circumstances, for example through off-site contributions.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10230 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Object	Neither the Council's proposed affordable housing target of 50% nor the recommendations upon which this is based are properly justified. An overall target of up to 30% is likely to prove more appropriate and realistic in all the circumstances.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10050 - House Builders Federation	Object	The policy and its reasoned justification are considered in parts to be at important variance from: Circular 6/98; PPG3 Housing - Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (July 2003); and ODPM Consultation Paper 'Planning for Mixed Communities' (January 2005). The suggested threshold of approximately (more than?) 50% affordable housing provision (but not less than 40%) is not considered to be either realistic or achievable. It is not evident whether the Council has given proper consideration to the viability of individual developments as required by Government guidance.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area. "The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances. Viability issues are material considerations to be taken into account in relation to planning applications. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessment of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in light of their own detailed assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9973 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Justification for the 50% target should be re-examined via a rigorous economic and viability testing exercise before the next version of the Local Development Framework is published for consultation. The economic assessment must make allowance for other infrastructure contributions that will also affect the inherent viability of proposals as recommended in paragraph 10 of Circular 06/98	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area. "The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. Viability issues are material considerations to be taken into account in relation to planning applications. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessment of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in light of their own detailed assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9971 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The 50% target is not supported by the Structure Plan as a blanket goal and is unsuitable for some villages. The Structure Plan actually proposes 'at least 40%'. An unrealistically high target will delay the orderly release of housing sites counter to the main objective of securing the completion of more affordable housing in the Cambridge area.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances.	
9287 - David Wilson Homes (S Midlands)	Object	The realism of seeking 50% affordable housing across the board is challenged. LPAs must understand that increasing developer obligations and affordable housing quotas will make development opportunities unviable and land will not come forward. The policy should contain a stronger reference to the costs of bringing land forward being a mitigating factor against providing the full quota of affordable housing.	Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8335 - The Marshall Group	Object	Affordable housing should be provided at a rate of 30%, in accordance with the Panel's recommendations on the adopted Structure Plan. Affordability of housing is dynamic. Too high a level of affordable housing could threaten both economic and social viability. In Cambridge, with its dynamic economy, there is a need for a higher proportion of intermediate housing for key workers, to achieve a split of 30% for intermediate housing and 20% social rented.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area. "The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. Viability issues are material considerations to be taken into account in relation to planning applications. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessment of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in light of their own detailed assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances. The affordable housing mix identified at paragraph 5.13 reflects the identified housing needs. However, it is flexible enough to allow for local circumstances to demonstrate where an alternative mix of affordable housing would better meet local needs.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9263 - Defence Lands Ops North	Object	The policy is too prescriptive and should make allowances for the viability of provision at this level, for example larger sites where there is a high level of infrastructure provision associated with the development, or community facilities. The policy should be altered to require affordable housing in accordance with an up to date assessment of need. The distribution in small groups / clusters is inappropriate and can have a negative impact on the marketing of a site and the value of the market cost housing. The LDF, once adopted, will need to conform to RSS14 - Policy SS13 requires at least 30% with the overall aspiration to achieve 40% where housing warrants higher provision.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area. "The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. Viability issues are material considerations to be taken into account in relation to planning applications. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessment of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in light of their own detailed assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. The requirement for clusters of affordable housing in larger developments is designed to avoid overly large groupings and achieve better integration into the wider development and / or community. There is flexibility in the wording "typically of 6 to 8 units", which can vary according to the site and location. This approach is in accordance with PPG3 which seeks to achieve mixed and balanced communities.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10278 - Stannifer	Object	The limit on the size of development where affordable housing is necessary is unreasonable and does not reflect the guidance set out in national planning policy and conditions. The limit of affordable housing does not make clear the distinction between strategic sites on the edge of Cambridge and within the Rural Areas. The need for affordable housing on the strategic sites is very different to those needs within the smaller villages.	The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. The consultation paper relating to the review of PPG3: Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (2003), paragraph 10 states "Affordable housing should not normally be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings. Where affordable housing is to be sought on smaller sites this should be justified by local planning authorities in their local plan." Given the high level of affordable housing need (80.1%) identified in the Housing Needs Survey and the lower target of 50%, the district council feels this justifies a lower threshold on all sites. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs.	
9078 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The policy and supporting text is too prescriptive. The amount of affordable housing sought should be a maximum figure that is in line with the Regional Spatial Strategy and/or National Planning Policy.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8905 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	Objection is lodged to the level of affordable housing sought in HG/3. There has to be an appropriate balance of affordable housing and market housing, in new communities, to create a sustainable, inclusive and balanced community. Applied to Northstowe, a 50% target would represent an over concentration of affordable housing. When justifying affordable housing thresholds local authorities must give consideration to economics of provision and to the need to create balanced communities. A lower District affordable housing target would give a greater degree of consistency with national and regional planning guidance.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs.	
9034 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	This policy and/or the supporting text should make clear that some types of employment - such as health care provision - should not be required to make financial or other provision for affordable housing or other community infrastructure requirements. These facilities are part of the community's social infrastructure and development of these services is a response to increasing population and development is not a driver of the population increase.	Agree, there should be greater clarity over the types of employment development to which Policy ET/2 will apply. The appropriate Use Classes should be set out in a footnote to the policy for consistency with Cambridge City Council, to ensure a consistent approach across the Cambridge Sub-Region. This list includes health care. Addenbrooke's is the chief generator of Key Worker housing demand within the Cambridge area and it is essential that they continue to play their part in facilitating housing provision for their own staff. Policy ET/2 specifically provides that where Key Worker employers are providing or contributing towards the provision of Key Worker housing that this will satisfy the affordable housing requirement of the policy and there would be no expectation for a separate contribution. However, it is right that no blanket exemption is made now which would enable the Trust to scale back its housing activities in the future.	Add the following footnote to Policy ET/2: "Employment developments to which this policy will apply are: - B1(a) Offices. - B1(b) High tech and related industries, and services concerned mainly with commercial research and development. - C2 Hospitals, including healthcare teaching and research. - D1 educational uses and associated sui-generis research institutes and academic research institutes."
7990 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	The evidence base is not up to date and there is no reference to participation of key stakeholders especially private house builders as contained in the ODPM Consultation Paper 'Planning for Mixed Communities'.	The Housing Needs Survey 2002 was prepared in accordance with Government guidance and covers the period to 2007.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7955 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Object	The suggested proposals for 50% affordable housing provision split 30% social rented and 20% intermediate housing (including for key workers) are not preferred. The percentage of affordable housing agreed should, as with the existing planning policy framework, consider the local area need rather than having a standard percentage provided that this does not have a demonstrably detrimental impact upon the feasibility of a development. Arlington would not support high affordable housing.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. The affordable housing mix identified at paragraph 5.13 reflects the identified housing needs. However, it is flexible enough to allow for local circumstances to demonstrate where an alternative mix of affordable housing would better meet local needs.	
9818	Object	The Authorities should give special consideration to school leavers' needs for affordable housing, as trainees have limited income, the young people should be encouraged to find work in the Cambridge Sub-Region, as they will be the future workers that will help the Cambridge Sub-Region to continue to prosper.	Policy HG/3 does not make explicit references to all groups of people considered within the remit of key worker housing, as this will change over the plan period. Rather it retains flexibility in its application. Although there is no explicit reference to school leavers, the last sentence of paragraph 5.9 provides flexibility to include other groups of workers in housing need where employers are facing recruitment and retention problems related to housing costs.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8145 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The requirement to provide 50% affordable housing on all sites is unreasonable and the Council should retain the thresholds in the current adopted plan. The approach is contrary to PPG3 and Circular 6/98, which seek to ensure that affordable housing is only required on sites which are large enough to accommodate a reasonable mix of types and sizes of housing.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area." The consultation paper relating to the review of PPG3: Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (2003), paragraph 10 states "Affordable housing should not normally be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings. Where affordable housing is to be sought on smaller sites this should be justified by local planning authorities in their local plan." Given the high level of affordable housing need (80.1%) identified in the HNS, the district council feels this justifies a lower threshold. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. The affordable housing mix identified at paragraph 5.13 reflects the identified housing needs. However, it is flexible enough to allow for local circumstances to demonstrate where an alternative mix of affordable housing would better meet local needs. The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14, PPG3 and the emerging PPG3 review. The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14, PPG3 and the emerging PPG3 review.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8337 - Barker Parry Town Planning	Object	The suggested affordable housing provision of 50% on sites of two or more dwellings is considered excessive. The effect of such a policy will be to prevent land for development being brought forward.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area." The consultation paper relating to the review of PPG3: Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (2003), paragraph 10 states "Affordable housing should not normally be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings. Where affordable housing is to be sought on smaller sites this should be justified by local planning authorities in their local plan." Given the high level of affordable housing need (80.1%) identified in the HNS, the district council feels this justifies a lower threshold. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14, PPG3 and the emerging PPG3 review.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9974 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The threshold of 2 units above which an affordable housing requirement is sought is too low for an entire District and contrary to sound economics, Structure Plan and government policy (Circular 06/98). Whilst the District is predominantly rural the Council should justify why such a low threshold is proposed across the whole of its administrative area when the Rural Centres LDD states that there are 15 villages with a population of over 3,000.	Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area." The consultation paper relating to the review of PPG3: Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (2003), paragraph 10 states "Affordable housing should not normally be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings. Where affordable housing is to be sought on smaller sites this should be justified by local planning authorities in their local plan." The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Given the high level of identified need and a lower target, the district council feels this justifies a lower threshold to bring forward affordable housing on more sites to help address this need. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances. The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14, PPG3 and the emerging PPG3 review.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10129 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Notwithstanding Policy HG/4, which states that in exceptional circumstances, the council may negotiate a lower proportion of affordable housing units to be provided, Fairview object to the requirements in Policy HG/3 and consider that a site threshold should be set on which affordable housing will be sought on individual sites within the Cambridge East area, which accords with Circular 6/98.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area." The consultation paper relating to the review of PPG3: Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (2003), paragraph 10 states "Affordable housing should not normally be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings. Where affordable housing is to be sought on smaller sites this should be justified by local planning authorities in their local plan." Given the high level of affordable housing need (80.1%) identified in the HNS, the district council feels this justifies a lower threshold. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances. The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14, PPG3 and the emerging PPG3 review.	
8479 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	Council strongly supports the requirement for both housing and employment land should provide affordable housing.	Support noted.	
9583	Support	The issue of affordable housing is one of the most serious issues facing the District now and in coming years. House prices are such that the young cannot afford to live where they were born and brought up. I therefore regard policy HG/3 as of very high importance.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10488 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The County Council in its previous representations supported approximately 50% affordable housing but subject to the requirement that the overall viability of the development being taken into account. This particular caveat is not included in the policy. However it is recommended that the policy is supported subject to the 50% target not undermining the viability of the development and putting the delivery of both affordable and market homes at risk. In addition it is considered that requirement for all housing sites of 2 or more dwellings to provide affordable housing will be difficult to achieve. As such we propose the threshold should be increased. As we consider that the current threshold could undermine the ability of the District Council to provide sufficient affordable housing.	The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. The consultation paper relating to the review of PPG3: Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (2003), paragraph 10 states "Affordable housing should not normally be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings. Where affordable housing is to be sought on smaller sites this should be justified by local planning authorities in their local plan." Given the high level of affordable housing need (80.1%) identified in the Housing Needs Survey and the lower target of 50%, the district council feels this justifies a lower threshold on all sites. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances.	
9816	Support	HG/3 Affordable Housing and HG/4 Affordable Housing Subsidy - I support policy for affordable housing as long as it is provided for all sections of the communities in areas where it is needed.	Support noted.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
9215 - Januarys	Object	This policy should be amended so that express reference is also made to private sector employees who may be in "housing need". It would be inequitable to limit occupation of intermediate affordable housing to 'key workers' only, who are deemed to be public sector workers.	Whilst intermediate housing includes key worker housing, it is not limited to it. Paragraph 5.13 suggests an affordable housing mix with approximately 20% intermediate housing, including for key workers. The last sentence of paragraph 5.9 provides flexibility to include other groups of workers in housing need where employers are facing recruitment and retention problems related to housing costs. Therefore, there is already sufficient flexibility in the application of HG/3.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8146 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The Policy is vague and lacks clarity. What is the 'agreed mix'? What is 'key Worker housing? Is this in addition to affordable housing? The Policy lacks clarity and certainty required for the 'Plan-led' system.	The affordable housing mix is identified at paragraph 5.13, which states the indicative mix is likely to be approximately 30% social rented and approximately 20% intermediate housing (including for key workers), to reflect the identified housing needs. However, there is flexibility to allow for local circumstances to demonstrate where an alternative mix of affordable housing would better meet local needs. Key Worker Housing is defined in paragraph 5.9 as housing "which is allocated on the basis of need for those who currently live in or are employed in the locality of the site in the public sector and / or who are involved in the care and comfort of the community or as may otherwise be defined by the District Council in the future". The requirement for the provision of Key Worker Housing is a part of the overall affordable housing requirement, not an additional requirement, as detailed in paragraph 5.13.	
9962 - Levvel Ltd	Object	The council must take into account site suitability and have a full and robust evidence base in place, which has not been done. The policy does not say who agrees the mix of housing, it will differ from site to site and with local need, this needs to be backed up by a full and robust evidence base from the council. The Council should clearly identify how they will determine their aspirations in relation to housing mix, providing reassurance that this will be informed by a credible and robust evidence base, and should 'seek to negotiate with developers/landowners'.	The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. Paragraph 5.13 provides an indicative mix, based on the local need identified in the HNS, which is flexible where local circumstances suggest a different mix would better meet local needs. Therefore there is sufficient flexibility for the negotiation of the appropriate mix provided it will address the identified local need.	
11184 - Levvel Ltd	Object	We don't believe it necessarily needs to refer separately to key workers but the full range of housing, to create a mixed and balanced community.	Affordable housing is an umbrella term which includes a range of house types to address identified local needs. Key worker housing is one type of affordable housing. As Key Worker housing can be delivered through a variety of tenures (as set out in paragraph 5.8), it was considered appropriate to include reference in the text of Policy HG/3, which requires the provision of a mix of affordable housing to meet local needs.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
10232 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	The University would support a Policy that sought to achieve a minimum of 40% affordable housing and up to 50% where achievable. Greater clarity is required in the wording of this policy to indicate the % of affordable housing the District Council will normally seek and the circumstances in which it will be prepared to accept a reduced level of provision. The University is concerned that the threshold for the provision of affordable housing set out in paragraph 2 of the Policy is too low and doesn't reflect the guidance set out in Circular 6/98.	The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. Housing needs are assessed on the basis of survey and projections. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Policy HG/3 is clear in that it requires approximately 50% affordable housing, unless the need for a lower level can be demonstrated, for example due to development costs. The consultation paper relating to the review of PPG3: Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (2003), paragraph 10 states "Affordable housing should not normally be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings. Where affordable housing is to be sought on smaller sites this should be justified by local planning authorities in their local plan." Given the high level of affordable housing need (80.1%) identified in the HNS, the district council feels this justifies a lower threshold.	
8340 - CPRE	Object	Ref. 'The amount of affordable housing sought will be approximately 50% of the dwellings for which planning permission may be given on all sites of two or more dwellings'. Wish to see inclusion of word 'capable'. That is '...permission may be given to all sites capable of two or more dwellings.' This would prevent a developer building a house on half the site, and coming back some years later requesting permission for a house of the other half and thus avoid providing 50% affordable or applying to build a large single house to avoid an affordable element.	Policies DP/5 (Cumulative Development) and HG/1 (Housing Density) should prevent the sub-division or under-development of sites. Therefore, it would be unnecessary duplication to incorporate the change into Policy HG/3.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10147 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 10176 10179 10172 9970 10029 9997 9995 9990 9986 10026 10247 10266 10158	Object	The proposed target of "approximately 50%" is unreasonable and will lead to many schemes, especially very small schemes, becoming unviable. It will therefore not achieve any significant improvement in affordability nor in the provision of affordable housing. The proviso that the precise percentage will be determined having regard to development costs is welcomed, but what is not clear is how the Council will determine such matters in a reasonable and objective fashion that does not undermine financial confidentiality issues.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances. The Supplementary Planning Document will provide detail on the application of the policy, including the determination of development costs.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9963 - Levvel Ltd	Object	50% affordable housing target, will this achieve delivery of affordable housing in the District? It may hinder rather than promote. The council needs to look at deliverability, with a full and credible evidence base. The plan fails to provide adequate evidence that the policy target is achievable locally.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10010 - Laing Homes North Thames	Object	HG/3 seeks to achieve approximately 50% of total dwellings to be affordable on any new development with a minimum threshold of two dwellings. We suggest that this figure would seriously prejudice many brownfield sites from coming forward for development if half of the dwellings proposed have to be affordable. There are a number of implications for adopting such a high target figure which may result in developers compromising on other community benefits which would result in wider benefits to the whole local community rather than only the occupiers of the new development. A lower figure would therefore be more appropriate having regard to the above concern.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area." The consultation paper relating to the review of PPG3: Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (2003), paragraph 10 states "Affordable housing should not normally be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings. Where affordable housing is to be sought on smaller sites this should be justified by local planning authorities in their local plan." Given the high level of affordable housing need (80.1%) identified in the HNS, the district council feels this justifies a lower threshold. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances. The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14, PPG3 and the emerging PPG3 review.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9715 - GO-East	Object	The requirement of seeking 50% affordable housing also needs to be justified and demonstrated as being realistic and achievable, and in particular relative to development economics in South Cambridgeshire.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area." The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9714 - GO-East	Object	There is no evidence provided that the two dwelling or more threshold is justified and the final policy in the submission DPD should include justification for the threshold proposed. Additionally, consideration should be given to taking a comprehensive approach to thresholds by including a site-size threshold as well as one based on scheme size.	Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area." The consultation paper relating to the review of PPG3: Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (2003), paragraph 10 states "Affordable housing should not normally be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings. Where affordable housing is to be sought on smaller sites this should be justified by local planning authorities in their local plan." The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Given the high level of identified need and a lower target, the district council feels this justifies a lower threshold to bring forward affordable housing on more sites to help address this need. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances. The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14, PPG3 and the emerging PPG3 review.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10795 - Jesus College (Cambridge)	Object	The blanket application of a 50% affordable housing contribution across the district is objected to. The policy should provide for flexibility in the approach taken to the provision of affordable housing. PPG3 encourages the identification of suitable sites for the provision of affordable housing. In some instances previously developed sites are incapable of delivering provision as high as 50%. Redevelopment should not therefore be unduly constrained by policy HG/3 and a more flexible approach should therefore be reflected in its wording.	Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area." The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Given the high level of identified need affordable housing will be sought on all sites developed for housing, therefore, there is no requirement to identify individual sites. Policy HG/3 requires the provision of approximately 50% affordable housing, which is flexible enough to take account of local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances.	
10838 - Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Object	The level of 50% is higher than set by Policy SS13 RSS (30% with aspiration to secure 40% where need warrants it). The Structure Plan seeks 40%. 50% affordable would create an imbalance in the community of new developments by undermining the creation of much needed larger family homes. Replace 50% by 40%. There are particular costs related to infrastructures provision that will mean for Northstowe 30% is more appropriate. Hence affordable housing provision in the Northstowe Area Action Plan needs to acknowledge this and cross reference to this be included in HG/3.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. It is also proposed to amend the market housing mix for Northstowe to approximately 40% 1 and 2 bedrooms; 30% 3 bedrooms and 30% 4+ bedrooms. This should help with the creation of a more balanced community, in accordance with PPG3.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9274 - Januarys	Object	The Council should remove the reference to affordable housing being sought at the rate of 50% irrespective of site size. This does not strike a reasonable balance between securing affordable housing and encouraging the development that will help to deliver it. The Council's settlement strategy and limitations on housing development in different categories of settlements is equally not helping. The policy should be reverted to 30% on all sites of 10 or more dwellings, irrespective of the population of the village concerned.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey (HNS), prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area." The consultation paper relating to the review of PPG3: Influencing the Size, Type and Affordability of Housing (2003), paragraph 10 states "Affordable housing should not normally be sought on sites of less than 0.5 hectares or developments of less than 15 dwellings. Where affordable housing is to be sought on smaller sites this should be justified by local planning authorities in their local plan." Given the high level of affordable housing need (80.1%) identified in the HNS, the district council feels this justifies a lower threshold. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances. The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14, PPG3 and the emerging PPG3 review.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10571	Object	The provision of 50% affordable housing is too high and coupled with the other obligations contained in the draft policies will threaten the viability, and incentive to deliver housing. The policy lacks any sense of priorities and balance to promote the delivery of the overall Structure Plan housing requirements. It fails to recognise the uncertainty of subsidy referred to in Policy HG/4 and fails to recognise the reality of diminishing subsidy levels from Central Government.	The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. Housing needs are assessed on the basis of survey and projections. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need, and this is incorporated into Policy HG/3, which also allows flexibility according to local circumstances. The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances.	
8147 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The Policy fails to explain how affordable housing will be secured. For example, will this simply involve the transfer of sufficient land to an RSL?	This is a matter of detail for the Supplementary Planning Document.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 3</i>				
9966 - Level Ltd	Object	3rd para - There are many other considerations in addition to particular costs and the wider planning gain package, these include: site suitability; site specific circumstances; the need to create mixed and balanced communities; availability of public subsidy.	Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances, including development costs. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances.	
10234 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Object	Policy HG/3 quite rightly states that account will be taken of any particular costs associated with the development as well as 'identified needs and funding priorities'. Further advice on the evaluation of the 'development economics' of sites should be provided within supporting paragraph 5.12.	This is a matter of detail for the Supplementary Planning Document.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10090 - Bellway Homes	Object	The requirement for 50% of dwellings to be affordable on any site of two or more dwellings could seriously prejudice sites coming forward, particularly small sites within villages where smaller applicants may not be able to cope with such a stringent requirement. Other community benefits may have to be compromised in order to pay for affordable housing.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The Cambridge sub-region section of draft RSS14, paragraph 5.114 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region needs to be affordable housing". The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Paragraph 14 of PPG3 states "where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs - as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information - local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments." Paragraph 15 goes on to state "local plan policies for affordable housing should indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area."The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with the adopted Structure Plan, draft RSS14 and PPG3. Policy HG/3 allows flexibility according to local circumstances. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 4</i>				
9967 - Levvel Ltd	Object	4th para - Should seek to negotiate the appropriate mix and should also take into account the need to create mixed and balanced communities and site specific circumstances.	Policy HG/3 (Paragraph 4) allows flexibility in determining the appropriate mix of affordable housing according to "identified needs and funding priorities at the time of development". Paragraph 5.13 provides an indicative mix, which is flexible where local circumstances suggest a different mix would better meet local needs. Therefore there is sufficient flexibility for the negotiation of the appropriate mix provided it will address the identified local needs.	
10233 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Support	Policy HG/3 seeks to provide an appropriate mix in terms of housing tenures and house sizes of affordable housing within a development in response to identified needs and funding priorities at the time of the development, we welcome this sensible and realistic approach. The tenure mix should not be prescribed in the policy.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 5</i>				
8148 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	What is a 'small group or cluster'?	Paragraph 5.14 explains that clusters are "typically of 6 to 8 units", although there is flexibility, allowing for variation according to the site, location and other local circumstances, including maintenance and management issues.	
11135 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to the requirement in Policy HG/3 that affordable housing 'will' be distributed through the development in small groups or clusters. While it is advisable to distribute affordable housing through a development, where a Housing Association requires a specific care of a building, for example, to keep service charges low, this principle may not always be possible. The word 'should' or 'where practical' should be used in the policy.	The requirement for clusters of affordable housing in larger developments is designed to avoid overly large groupings and achieve better integration into the wider development and / or community. There is flexibility in the wording "typically of 6 to 8 units", which can vary according to the site, location and other local circumstances, including maintenance and management issues. This is an important approach to achieve mixed and balanced communities in accordance with PPG3.	
9969 - Levvel Ltd	Object	5th para - 'Challenging Perceptions' produced by the Housing Corporation (April 2005, P4) suggests that 'dispersed tenure developments involve irreconcilable sets of conflicting interests and hence an element of risk for everyone involved.' We would be cautious of this wording of the policy as each development will vary from site to site.	The requirement for clusters of affordable housing in larger developments is designed to avoid overly large groupings and achieve better integration into the wider development and / or community. There is flexibility in the wording at paragraph 5.14 "typically of 6 to 8 units", which allows for variation according to the site, location and other local circumstances, including maintenance and management issues. This is an important approach to achieve mixed and balanced communities in accordance with PPG3.	
8429 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Object	New clusters (minimum 6) opposed, as it takes no account of existing stock/management/maintenance arrangements which may already exist in the village. Could severely limit any opportunity for provision of affordable housing as part of a development on a small village site.	There is no minimum size requirement for a cluster. The requirement for clusters of affordable housing in larger developments is designed to avoid overly large groupings and achieve better integration into the wider development and / or community. There is flexibility in the wording at paragraph 5.14 "typically of 6 to 8 units", which allows for variation according to the site, location and other local circumstances, including maintenance and management issues.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 6</i>				
10578	Object	<p>The proposed policy in respect of employment development is objected to for the following reasons:</p> <p>(i) Employment policies effectively limit new proposals to activities essential to the economy of the Sub-Region. The proposal will inhibit the provision of said development.</p> <p>(ii) Provision of affordable housing should be based on local needs based assessments and the impact on employment proposals will be spread over wider areas - the impact of employment development proposals will be impossible to assess.</p> <p>(iii) The proposals will tend to inhibit new investment in the economy.</p> <p>(iv) The proposed supplementary planning document should be published and assessed prior to the assessment of the policies.</p>	<p>The Cambridge area is economically buoyant and unemployment rates are below the county and national averages. Viability issues are material considerations to be taken into account in relation to planning applications. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessment of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in light of their own detailed assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need and included in Policy HG/3. Therefore, to help address the shortfall, it is appropriate for employment development to contribute as they generate further demand for affordable housing over and above existing levels of demand. More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document to amplify the policy, in accordance with PPS12.</p>	
10148 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 10177 10180 10173 9972 10030 9998 9996 9993 9987 10028 10250 10267 10160	Object	<p>The requirement that employment development proposals "likely to have an impact on the demand for affordable housing" will be expected to mitigate such impacts, does not explain how this will be applied in terms of judging the "impact". It should not apply to small-scale employment development designed to provide local employment opportunities in villages and this should be made clear in both policies.</p>	<p>Affordable housing will only required on employment sites generating additional demand for affordable housing, and the amount of required will be of a scale and kind to the demand generated by the development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. Further detail on the application of this policy will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8149 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The policy lacks clarity and certainty. When will proposals be 'likely to have an impact on the demand for affordable housing'? How will this be determined? The requirement will discourage investment in new employment development in the district, to the harm of the local economy and nationally important development.	The Cambridge area is economically buoyant and unemployment rates are below the county and national averages. Viability issues are material considerations to be taken into account in relation to planning applications. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessment of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in light of their own detailed assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document.	
<i>5.8</i>				
11105 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Specific reference is made to trigger on affordable housing requiring information on both net and gross median household incomes for South Cambridgeshire. The only source for this is from the marketing research company CACI that has to be subscribed to. There is "free" access to data on earnings of full-time employees (ASHE from Office of National Statistics); maybe this should be re-stated to include a freely available data source.	Noted. This is a matter of detail which could be addressed in the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.	
7992 - Stamford Homes Limited	Object	The evidence is not up to date and there is no reference to participation of key stakeholders especially private housebuilders. Reference to policy/paragraph 5.8 - 5.16.	The Housing Needs Survey was prepared in accordance with Government guidance in 2002 and includes housing needs requirements to 2007.	
11375 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University welcomes the text supporting Policy HG/3 that makes it clear that housing for other groups of workers not included in the 'key worker' definition will be included as affordable housing provided it is supported by evidence that their employers are facing recruitment and retention difficulties related to housing costs and that employees cannot afford to rent or buy suitable housing locally to meet their housing needs.	Support noted.	
10229 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 10394 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	The definition of Affordable Housing and the types of subsidised housing to fall under this umbrella contained within paragraph 5.8 is clear. In particular we welcome the definitions of Intermediate Housing and Key Workers Housing, within paragraphs 5.8 and 5.9, and the further clarification in terms of Supported Housing within paragraphs 5.23-5.28.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>5.9</i>				
10237 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	The University wishes to see the definition of 'key workers' include those employed in Higher Education as we understand that teachers including Further Education employees are included in the current definition. We would also wish to see the phrase 'or sustaining the local economy' added to line 4 of paragraph 5.9 after ...'comfort of the community'... This would make the definition consistent with that contained in the approved Structure Plan.	Policy HG/3 does not make explicit references to all groups of people considered within the remit of key worker housing, as this will change over the plan period. Rather it retains flexibility in its application. Although there is no explicit reference to higher education teachers, the last sentence of paragraph 5.9 provides flexibility to include other groups of workers in housing need where employers are facing recruitment and retention problems related to housing costs.	
9950 - Levvel Ltd	Object	The document sourced in this paragraph is not referenced in the guidance notes as a supporting document. Instead another Key Worker Research report is listed. The council needs to be clearer as to what documents are used in their evidence base and also to put together and up-to-date, full and robust evidence base in order to gain a clearer picture as to the needs of the area.	Agree it is important that the LDF refers to documents by their correct title at all times and that all relevant documents are included in the list of supporting documents.	Amend any incorrect references to supporting documents in the LDF and ensure a complete list is incorporated into the list of supporting documents.
10395 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	The definition of affordable housing and the types of subsidised housing to fall under this umbrella contained within paragraph 5.8 is clear. In particular we welcome the definitions of Intermediate Housing and Key Workers Housing within paragraphs 5.8 and 5.9, and the further clarification in terms of Supported Housing within paragraphs 5.23 - 5.28.	Support noted.	
<i>5.11</i>				
9951 - Levvel Ltd	Object	Custom and practice is not a robust basis for determining the percentage of an affordable housing requirement. The 2002 HNS fails to be a housing market assessment and as such does not consider the housing needs of the entire market, it is solely an assessment of the need for affordable housing. We would recommend a Housing Market Assessment be undertaken. Furthermore, need can only be considered in the context of housing supply. There is no evidence of the Council having undertaken a detailed assessment of the sources of housing supply over the plan period. As previously mentioned the Council should also take into account the need to create a mixed and balanced community, the availability of grant funding and site specific circumstances. There is no basis for 50% affordable housing target. It is premature to identify such a target given the failure to prove deliverability. This target percentage could frustrate and not encourage development.	The Housing Needs Survey is prepared in accordance with Government guidance and has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. Housing needs are assessed on the basis of survey and projections. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need, and this is incorporated into Policy HG/3, which also allows flexibility according to local circumstances and to achieve mixed and balanced communities. In recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances. Policy ST/1 sets out the development strategy for accommodating 20,000 dwellings over the plan period. The Annual Monitoring Report will ensure policies in the development plan remain relevant, including policies on housing supply and affordable housing.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11106 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The Housing Needs survey has an inadequate coverage of the full needs of in-migrants; these reports concentrate on the housing needs of migrants who cannot afford the private market (sale or rent). The Structure Plan forecasts a need for net additional households of 20,000 in 17 years or 1,176 a year. This is higher than the 1087 apparently arising from the housing needs survey which undercounts additional demands by migrants (net) for affordable private sector housing.	The Housing Needs Survey is prepared in accordance with Government guidance. Housing needs are assessed on the basis of survey and projections. If the Structure Plan average figure of 1,176 dwellings per annum is used the affordable housing requirement as a proportion of all housing is reduced from 80.1% to 74.1%. However, this is still clearly well above the 50% target in Policy HG/3.	
<i>5.12</i>				
10396 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	Policy HG/3 quite rightly states that account will be taken of any particular costs associated with development as well as "identified needs and funding priorities". Further advice on the evaluation of the "development economics" of sites should be provided within the supporting paragraph 5.12.	This is a matter of detail for the Supplementary Planning Document.	
<i>5.13</i>				
8928 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	The Paragraph is unduly prescriptive in setting out a mix of affordable housing. There should be more flexibility and negotiation with an applicant when assessing the mix of affordable housing. Proposed Amendment - The Paragraph should be deleted and replaced with 'The District Council will seek to negotiate with an applicant on the level of socially rented and the level of intermediate housing to include Key Worker housing.'	The affordable housing mix identified at paragraph 5.13 reflects the identified housing needs. However, it is flexible enough to allow for local circumstances to demonstrate where an alternative mix of affordable housing would better meet local needs.	
10489 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Amend paragraph as follows: 'It is envisaged that the indicative mix of affordable housing is likely to be: 1. Approximately 30% social rented housing 2. Approximately 20% intermediate housing, including for key workers; giving a total of 50% affordable housing, unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the District Council or where land is in ownership of public body that the local circumstances suggest a different mix would better meet local needs.'	Paragraph 5.13 is already flexible enough to allow for local circumstances to demonstrate where an alternative mix of affordable housing would better meet local needs. This could include sites in ownership of a public body. The proposed amended wording is unnecessary.	
10238 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Object	Paragraph 5.13 suggests an indicative mix of 30% social rented and 20% intermediate housing, including key workers. Whilst we welcome the mix of both social rented and intermediate provision we reiterate that the Council's overall target of 50% is unjustified and wholly unrealistic. Within a reduced overall headline figure, we would suggest that an even 50:50 split between social rented and intermediate housing, including key workers is more appropriate.	The Housing Needs Survey has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need. Policy HG/3 also allows flexibility according to local circumstances. The affordable housing mix identified at paragraph 5.13 reflects the identified housing needs. However, it is flexible enough to allow for local circumstances to demonstrate where an alternative mix of affordable housing would better meet local needs.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9953 - Levvel Ltd	Object	In reality the affordable housing provision will vary from site to site, depending on mixed and balanced communities, type of development and availability of public subsidy, as such the question is considered to be too prescriptive when sites have not yet been identified.	The affordable housing mix identified at paragraph 5.13 reflects the identified housing needs. However, it is flexible enough to allow for local circumstances to demonstrate where an alternative mix of affordable housing would better meet local needs.	
9040 - Addenbrooke's Hospital	Object	The Trust supports the need for a significant proportion of new housing to be affordable; the needs of key workers are specific and a high priority that needs to be met. This can be achieved by specifying the proportion of key worker housing to be sought. This proportion could vary according to the location, with a higher proportion in closer proximity to public service facilities, such as a major hospital.	Support noted. The affordable housing mix identified at paragraph 5.13 reflects the identified housing needs, and includes key worker housing within the 20% intermediate housing criteria. However, it is flexible enough to allow for local circumstances to demonstrate where an alternative mix of affordable housing would better meet local needs.	
9372 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Object	The mix suggested in paragraph 5.13 of the supporting text is too prescriptive.	The affordable housing mix identified at paragraph 5.13 reflects the identified housing needs. However, it is flexible enough to allow for local circumstances to demonstrate where an alternative mix of affordable housing would better meet local needs.	
<i>5.14</i>				
9952 - Levvel Ltd	Object	The council seeks to have clusters of 6 to 8 Units of Affordable Housing. Again, until the type of development and housing mix are determined this is considered to constitute excessive detail at this stage in the LDF process.	The requirement for clusters of affordable housing in larger developments is designed to avoid overly large groupings and achieve better integration into the wider development and / or community. There is flexibility in the wording "typically of 6 to 8 units", which can vary according to the site and location. This approach is in accordance with PPG3 which seeks to achieve mixed and balanced communities.	
11376 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 10399 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	The mention of 6 - 8 dwellings as being 'typical' is inappropriate since there will be circumstances where groupings of up to 20 - 30 dwellings are appropriate.	The requirement for clusters of affordable housing in larger developments is designed to avoid overly large groupings and achieve better integration into the wider development and / or community. There is flexibility in the wording "typically of 6 to 8 units", which can vary according to the site and location. This approach is in accordance with PPG3 which seeks to achieve mixed and balanced communities.	
10240 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 10398 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	The Council rightly states within paragraph 5.14 that in order to create sustainable communities, affordable housing should be distributed throughout the development in groups or clusters. We agree that the appropriate size of affordable housing groups should be determined on a site by site basis.	Support noted. There is flexibility in the wording "typically of 6 to 8 units", which can vary according to the site and location.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>5.15</i>				
8150 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	This statement is 'sweeping' and is refuted. The majority of jobs created on new developments will provide employment for existing residents in the area. How will a direct link between the funding of affordable housing and employees on the development be secured? Will the housing funded only be available for the business's own staff? What if the staff chose not to live in the area or are not in housing need? If staff/tenants change jobs will they be required to vacate the property? How will the requirement be assessed where the business is not known?	There is currently an imbalance between the numbers of jobs and houses in the Cambridge Sub-Region. The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified an affordable housing need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need and included in Policy HG/3. Therefore, to help address the shortfall, it is appropriate for employment development to contribute as they generate further demand for affordable housing over and above existing levels of demand. Affordable housing will only required on sites generating additional demand for affordable housing, and the amount of required will be of a scale and kind to the demand generated by the development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document to amplify the policy, in accordance with PPS12.	
<i>5.16</i>				
8354 - The Marshall Group	Object	The application of the affordable housing policy is to be the subject of a supplementary planning document (para 5.16). It is preferable for this issue to be dealt within the LDF where it can be subject to proper consultation followed by scrutiny in front of the LDF Inspector.	The approach adopted in the affordable housing policies and paragraph 5.16 is in accordance with PPS12 (paragraphs 2.31 and 2.44). Policy HG/3 contains all the issues for which it is relevant to be considered by an independent Inspector through the public examination process, whilst the SPD will expand and supplement upon the application of the policy.	
8151 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	Given the potentially serious financial consequences for new development and impact on the local economy, this policy must be addressed in the Development Document not SPD.	The approach adopted in the affordable housing policies and paragraph 5.16 is in accordance with PPS12 (paragraphs 2.31 and 2.44). Policy HG/3 contains all the issues for which it is relevant to be considered by an independent Inspector through the public examination process, whilst the SPD will expand and supplement upon the application of the policy.	
<i>HG/4 Affordable Housing Subsidy</i>				
9954 - Levvel Ltd	Object	There is no reference to The Housing Strategy 2004-2007 in the core strategy. Within this document you reference the high cost of land and the need for subsidy, otherwise the number of affordable housing units will be "significantly reduced" (P27, Housing Strategy 2004-2007). Quantum and mix of affordable provision will, as recognised in para 4 of HG/3, will be required to reflect funding priorities. There is no evidence that the Council have considered whether sufficient funding will be in place to support 50% provision of affordable housing and as such the policy proposals are not proven to be deliverable.	Policy HG/3 requires the provision of approximately 50% affordable housing. It recognises the costs associated with development and is flexible. However, in recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances, whilst according with the adopted and saved Structure Plan Policy P9/1 which clearly states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable".	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10706 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	Whilst welcoming the recognition that availability of public subsidy is a critical factor in the ability of new development to provide affordable housing, it is still unreasonable to require a minimum 40% provision even in exceptional circumstances. It is also unreasonable to expect very small schemes to make financial contributions in lieu of provision and even more unreasonable and contrary to Government advice in Circular 05/2005, to propose to use the monies received for schemes unrelated to the development either functionally or geographically. The policy and text should be amended to provide for a more reasonable approach that is in accordance with Government policy.	The adopted and saved Structure Plan Policy P9/1 clearly states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". Para 5.17, which requires a minimum of 40% even in exceptional circumstances, is in accordance with the Structure Plan and is necessary in order to meet the identified housing need. Policy HG/4 provides flexibility in recognition of difficulties there may be with developing small sites, without which there would be a requirement for affordable housing provision on-site. Where appropriate, contributions in lieu of on-site provision will be directly related to the scale of site and the equivalent provision of affordable housing that should have been provided on-site. Therefore any contributions are in-kind to the development and functionally related.	
9980 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The question of subsidy needs to be addressed in the main policy HG/3. The suite of affordable housing policies must operate within the parameters of market forces and against an assumed level of subsidy. The economic assessment should examine what levels of subsidy can be expected and set headline targets accordingly rather than rely on a fall back opt out policy HG/4. There is real concern that unless the underlying economic assumptions are properly examined and exposed, the suite of policies proposed will hold back the provision of all forms of housing contrary to Regional and Structure Plan growth ambitions.	Policy HG/3 requires the provision of approximately 50% affordable housing. It recognises the costs associated with development and is flexible. However, in recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances, whilst according with the adopted and saved Structure Plan Policy P9/1 which clearly states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable".	
9080 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The policy and supporting text is too prescriptive.	Policy HG/3 requires the provision of approximately 50% affordable housing. It recognises the costs associated with development and is flexible. However, in recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances, whilst according with the adopted and saved Structure Plan Policy P9/1 which clearly states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable".	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10051 - House Builders Federation	Object	Local planning authorities should balance the need for affordable housing against the likely development potential of sites. This relationship may vary across the plan area. This will mean taking into account the implications of competing land uses and making realistic assumptions about levels of public subsidy likely to be available (based on priorities set out in the regional housing strategy and discussions with the Housing Corporation)". An important failure of the Plan is its complete failure to make reference to the availability of public funding, or on the use of a cascade of fallback mechanism where public funding is lacking.	Policy HG/3 requires the provision of approximately 50% affordable housing. It recognises the costs associated with development and is flexible. However, in recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances, whilst according with the adopted and saved Structure Plan Policy P9/1 which clearly states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable".	
10490 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Whilst supporting the general aim of the policy it should be made clear that every effort must be made to find every available source of subsidy for affordable housing before a lower proportion is agreed to.	Agree. The policy clearly states that it is only in exceptional circumstances that a more lenient approach will be permitted. It will be for the applicant to demonstrate that they have explored all possible avenues first.	
9817	Support	HG/3 Affordable Housing and HG/4 Affordable Housing Subsidy - I support policy for affordable housing as long as it is provided for all sections of the communities in areas where it is needed.	Support noted.	
8152 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Support	The recognition of potential funding problems and the proposed flexibility is supported.	Support noted.	
10397 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Support	Paragraph 5.17 rightly identifies the current and longer term uncertainties regarding funding affordable housing. We welcome the recognition by the Council that there is a need for an element of flexibility. Policy HG/4 is commended as a possible solution where there are insurmountable subsidy issues.	Support noted.	
10236 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Support	Policy HG/4 is commended as a possible solution where there are insurmountable subsidy issues.	Support noted.	
8346 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall welcomes the flexibility which this policy seeks to achieve to address available levels of subsidy.	Support noted.	
9160 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships feels both options should be retained for consideration on a site by site basis taking into account robust site development analysis and the ability or otherwise for affordable housing to be delivered by third parties on other sites in a realistic and agreed schedule/time frame. Policies should also have the ability to respond to potential future changes in funding mechanisms over the Plan period.	Support noted. Policies HG/3 and HG/4 provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need and the adopted and saved Structure Plan Policy P9/1 which clearly states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". The Annual Monitoring Report will ensure the policies remain relevant with regards future changes in funding.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>1st Policy Paragraph</i>				
8906 - Gallagher Longstanton Limited	Object	With the levels of affordable housing set as they are in HG/3, it is unlikely that the circumstances where the provision cannot be provided will be exceptional. The word 'exceptional' should be replaced. Nor is the lack of subsidy the only reason why the target cannot, or ought not, to be met. A revised policy wording is proposed which addresses the other circumstances which are established through guidance. Policy HG/4 should be amended to read: Where there are insurmountable subsidy issues, or issues arising from the site development costs, the additional planning objectives to be achieved or the need to secure an appropriate balanced community overall, the Council may negotiate a lower proportion of built affordable housing units to be provided on site.	Policy HG/3 requires the provision of approximately 50% affordable housing. It recognises the costs associated with development and other planning considerations and is flexible. However, in recognition of the uncertainties over the future funding of affordable housing and to provide flexibility in order to realise the affordable housing target set out in accordance with the assessed housing need, Policy HG/4 has been introduced. It provides further flexibility in exceptional circumstances, whilst according with the adopted and saved Structure Plan Policy P9/1 which clearly states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable".	
<i>2nd Policy Paragraph</i>				
10151 - Cambridge Joinery Ltd 10185 10186 10184 9975 10040 10006 10004 10003 10002 10038 10252 10268 10161	Object	Whilst welcoming the recognition that availability of public subsidy is a critical factor in the ability of new development to provide affordable housing, it is still unreasonable to require a minimum 40% provision even in exceptional circumstances. It is also unreasonable to expect very small schemes to make financial contributions in lieu of provision and even more unreasonable and contrary to government advice in Circular 05/2005, to propose to use the monies received for schemes unrelated to the development either functionally or geographically. The policy and text should be amended to provide for a more reasonable approach that is in accordance with government policy.	The adopted and saved Structure Plan Policy P9/1 clearly states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". Para 5.17, which requires a minimum of 40% even in exceptional circumstances, is in accordance with the Structure Plan and is necessary in order to meet the identified housing need. Policy HG/4 provides flexibility in recognition of difficulties there may be with developing small sites, without which there would be a requirement for affordable housing provision on-site. Where appropriate, contributions in lieu of on-site provision will be directly related to the scale of site and the equivalent provision of affordable housing that should have been provided on-site. Therefore any contributions are in-kind to the development and functionally related.	
8358 - The Marshall Group	Object	There is no need for the policy to include a reference to 'or smaller sites'. Such a qualification is unnecessary.	Policy HG/4 only applies in exceptional circumstances, in recognition of specific issues around deliverability and management on small sites, therefore it is necessary to qualify "on smaller sites". Policy HG/3 is the general affordable housing policy and provides flexibility in recognition of developer costs and other planning considerations.	
<i>5.17</i>				
8356 - The Marshall Group	Object	There is no need to refer to a minimum of 40%.	The adopted and saved Structure Plan Policy P9/1 clearly states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". Therefore paragraph 5.17, which requires a minimum of 40%, is in accordance with the Structure Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8153 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	To ensure flexibility the reference to a 40% limit should be removed.	The adopted and saved Structure Plan Policy P9/1 clearly states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". Therefore paragraph 5.17, which requires a minimum of 40%, is in accordance with the Structure Plan.	
9373 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Object	The target of 40% set out in the supporting text is an inflexible target which may still render many developments unviable. As Social Housing Grant becomes less available for many private schemes, and it is generally recognised that site-specific assessments will be required, sites will have a different capacity to fund affordable housing out of residential land value. The use of fixed percentages should therefore be avoided.	The adopted and saved Structure Plan Policy P9/1 clearly states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". Para 5.17, which requires a minimum of 40% even in exceptional circumstances, is in accordance with the Structure Plan and is necessary in order to meet the identified housing need.	
10235 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Support	Paragraph 5.17 rightly identifies the current and longer term uncertainties regarding funding affordable housing. We welcome the recognition by the Council that there is a need for an element of flexibility.	Support noted.	
<i>HG/5 Exceptions Sites for Affordable Housing</i>				
10325 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We object to the principle of requiring 100% affordable housing schemes as an exception to the policies. The development of brownfield sites should be undertaken in a sustainable and balanced way, and we consider that it is both unreasonable and impracticable for brownfield sites within or adjoining villages to be required to provide 100% affordable housing. Each application and site should be assessment individually, based on its merits.	Policy HG/5 is in accordance with PPG3, which allows the development of sites outside village framework for 100% affordable housing, on an exceptional basis, in order to meet identified local affordable housing needs. These sites are only permitted where there is an identified affordable housing need and the type and scale of development permitted is such that will address the identified need. It is not the intention of the policy to bring forward all brownfield sites for residential development per se, although it is conceivable some brownfield sites may be suitable for affordable housing where they meet the requirements of Policy HG/5. Development other than exceptions sites for affordable housing outside village framework would not be sustainable, and not accord with PPG3 and PPS7.	
9415 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
9690 - Foxton Parish Council	Object	Object to erosion of Green Belt. Wish to change wording of para after criteria 5 to read "In the case of all sites, before permission is granted for such development..."	All exceptions sites are only permitted where there is an identified need and the scale of development permitted is such that will address the identified need, in accordance with the strict criteria, including ensuring they are well related to the built-up area of the settlement, and facilities and services in the village. As the policy is worded, the applicant will need to demonstrate that there are no other suitable sites adjoining a settlement available prior to the consideration of any sites in the Green Belt. This approach accords with PPG2 and PPG3.	
<i>1st Bullet</i>				
9112 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust	Object	This policy is critical to the successful delivery of the target to 'Improve the quality of life and independence of vulnerable older people by supporting them to live in their own homes.' It is not clear if the special needs identified and the provision of lifetime homes relate to both market housing as well as affordable housing. Market housing also needs to be designed to enable easy adaptation that will allow access to all rooms if residents need access to those rooms. For example, this should include the ability to install a stair lift.	Paragraph 5.24 states "although not specifically set out in policy, the District Council will expect a proportion of new homes to be provided to meet the needs of the above [referring to lifetime homes in the previous paragraph], in accordance with PPG3: Housing." This refers to all new homes, regardless of whether affordable or market housing.	
10054 - House Builders Federation	Object	5.23 - 5.28 The lifetime homes standard has no status as far as town and country planning legislation is concerned. PPS1 and PPS12 make this absolutely clear. The HBF considers that this is largely a matter already dealt with by way of Part M of the building regulations. Thus whilst it may be appropriate for planning authorities to seek to negotiate with developers for a proportion of dwellings to be built to lifetime homes standards, it is considered excessive and unwarranted to require a specific percentage to be built to such standards.	Paragraph 2 of PPG3 states "Local planning authorities should plan to meet the housing requirements of the whole community, including those in need of affordable and special needs housing." Paragraph 13 goes on "this should include affordable housing and housing to help meet the needs of specific groups - the elderly, the disabled..." Therefore, the approach in paragraphs 5.23-5.28 are consistent with PPG3 in terms of delivering housing to meet the needs of the whole community.	
<i>2nd Bullet</i>				
9611	Object	I did not see anything in the LDF documentation about residential issues and the travelling community.	This is addressed in paragraphs 5.23-5.28. The Council will also be producing a separate DPD on Travellers, as detailed in the Local Development Scheme.	
<i>5.28</i>				
7987 - Meldreth Parish Council	Object	Suitable sites for travellers should be planned in the LDF.	The needs of travellers is considered in paragraphs 5.23 & 5.24. There is no requirement for the inclusion of sites for travellers in LDFs. However, paragraph 5.28 explains that a separate DPD on Gypsies and Travelling Showpeople will follow. The Local Development Scheme provides detail on the programme of its delivery.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>HG/6 Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside</i>				
9416 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
<i>3.</i>				
8154 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The 50% limitation should incorporate flexibility to allow for additions to very small properties.	Whilst it is acknowledged that some properties could be extended substantially without having a detrimental impact, the Council has identified through the Housing Needs Survey a requirement for more smaller dwellings to meet local needs. Policy HG/6 seeks to ensure the existing stock of smaller dwellings is not unduly diminished by extending dwellings into larger properties. There is flexibility in Policy HG/6 which allows extensions of up to 50% of the original floor area.	
<i>5.</i>				
9717 - GO-East	Object	Prevailing case law indicates that abandonment has occurred when, amongst other matters, works have been undertaken on the building to render it abandoned. Additionally, the effect of the paragraph after the criteria appears to be to say that the exception to application of criteria 2 and 3, is where it can be shown the use of the dwelling has not been abandoned, whereas in practice, if the building had been abandoned and was no longer in residential use, then the application would have to be considered against policy requirements other than those set out in Policy HG/6.	Agree, the references to "abandoned" should be deleted from Policy HG/6 and replaced with wording consistent with PPS7.	Amend criteria 5 to read: "The dwelling is of permanent design and construction."  Amend 2nd paragraph to read: "In exceptional circumstances material considerations may justify an exception to criteria (2) and (3), for example, dwellings with a very small original footprint which do not meet modern living standards."
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
9718 - GO-East	Object	Prevailing case law indicates that abandonment has occurred when, amongst other matters, works have been undertaken on the building to render it abandoned. Additionally, the effect of the paragraph after the criteria appears to be to say that the exception to application of criteria 2 and 3, is where it can be shown the use of the dwelling has not been abandoned, whereas in practice, if the building had been abandoned and was no longer in residential use, then the application would have to be considered against policy requirements other than those set out in Policy HG/6.	Agree, the references to "abandoned" should be deleted from Policy HG/6 and replaced with wording consistent with PPS7.	Amend criteria 5 to read: "The dwelling is of permanent design and construction."  Amend 2nd paragraph to read: "In exceptional circumstances material considerations may justify an exception to criteria (2) and (3), for example, dwellings with a very small original footprint which do not meet modern living standards."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>HG/7 Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside</i>				
9720 - GO-East	Object	The policy and supporting text should be reworded to make it clear whether an additional volume of 15% over and above that of the dwelling to be replaced is or is not permitted and whether the existence of previous extensions or not will be considered. Additionally, the Council should satisfy itself that a blanket 15% is what they intended to apply irrespective of the other restrictions placed on extensions by the GPDO i.e. if the dwelling is located within a conservation area.	Policy HG/7 clearly states that one-for-one replacement dwellings are permitted where there is the need for a satisfactory internal layout and amenities and the level of expansion allowed is up to a maximum 15% of volume, as permitted under the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO). Criteria 2 and paragraph 5.31 state that the replacement should be similar in size and height to the original that it replaces. Policy HG/7 does not apply a blanket rate of 15% enlargement but rather allows a maximum level of expansion up to 15% enlargement in volume in keeping with the GPDO, which will vary according to local circumstances. Where a larger replacement property is permitted, it may be controlled by conditions to prevent further expansion.	Add the following before the last sentence of paragraph 5.31: "The District Council may control the further expansion of replacement dwellings by the use of planning conditions to remove the rights under the General Permitted Development Order."
9693 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy HG/7.	Support noted.	
9417 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
8281 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	Objection is lodged in respect of the maximum enlargement of 15% of volume. It should be recognised that some sites can accommodate larger replacement properties without harmful impact. Furthermore, to achieve modern living standards and expectations an increase in the volume of more than 15% may in certain instances be reasonable and necessary. In light of the above the reference to the 15% limitation should be replaced with the text in Paragraph 5.31 'that replacements ought to be similar in size and height to the original structure'.	Whilst it is acknowledged that some sites could potentially accommodate larger properties without detriment impact, the Council has identified through the Housing Needs Survey a requirement for more smaller dwellings to meet local needs. Policy HG/7 seeks to ensure the existing stock of smaller dwellings is not unduly diminished by the replacement of dwellings with substantially larger properties. In addition, there is the need to consider the impact of the replacement dwelling on the countryside, and new dwellings, particularly larger dwellings, will tend to be less acceptable with regards their impact on the countryside. Given that properties benefit from permitted development rights, allowing an expansion up to 15%, this is deemed a suitable maximum scale for enlargement for a replacement dwelling. Policy HG/7 offers flexibility to provide satisfactory internal layout and amenities. This approach is consistent with PPS7 (paragraph 19) which states that local planning authorities should clarify the permissible scale of replacement buildings.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 3</i>				
7933 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	The intention to prevent the replacement of mobile homes with permanent homes outside the village limits should be subject to two tests: the first where there is a need for a farm or other business; the second is to allow replacement where the mobile home would remain permanently because the construction of a small dwelling would be more sustainable and energy efficient.	The need for a permanent dwelling in the countryside will be considered in accordance with Policy HG/9, and this applies equally to proposals for the replacement of a caravan with a permanent dwelling. This approach is in accordance with PPG3 and PPS7.	
<i>HG/8 Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use</i>				
10796 - Jesus College (Cambridge)	Object	The policy should be amended in order to provide greater flexibility in the determination of planning applications for conversions of buildings in the countryside to residential use. As the policy is worded, all such proposals should be refused. In some instances buildings lying within the countryside can provide a sustainable opportunity for new residential development. This should be reflected in the policy.	Allowing the reuse of buildings in the countryside to residential use would not be sustainable, given that it will generate additional trips, most likely by car, in order to access all facilities and services, even if these are provided in nearby settlements. The approach in Policy HG/8 is consistent with Government guidance in PPS7 (paragraph 8 (ii)) and PPG3.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9723 - GO-East	Object	The policy requires that development resulting in significant scale must be located near to a larger settlement. It would be helpful to indicate in the supporting text what size of settlement is considered to be larger; this might be related to the hierarchy of settlements set out in the Core Strategy i.e. Rural Service Centre etc. Additionally, it would also be helpful to indicate what matters will be considered in determining whether a site is near to a settlement or not e.g. distance to the settlement by road relative to the service catchment of the settlement type, or that the settlement should be accessible from the development by means other than the private car etc. Additional text should be included to provide clarification on these matters.	Agree the 4th paragraph of Policy HG/8 could be made clearer and more consistent with the development strategy, and there is a need for more reasoned justification.	Amend the 4th paragraph of Policy HG/8 to read: "Development must be in scale with the rural location. Residential uses must be located close to local services and facilities, and in an accessible location with a choice of means of travel, including non-car modes. The cumulative impact of the conversion of a number of buildings on adjoining sites or the local area will also be considered."  Add a new paragraph after paragraph 5.32: "Residential conversion, particularly on a large scale involving several residential units, will only be appropriate in locations close to local service centres such as Cambridge, the market towns and larger villages, including Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres. Development must also be in a location with, or capable of providing, a sufficient standard of accessibility to offer an appropriate choice of travel by non-car modes, in accordance with Policy TR/1."
9726 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds	Object	Whilst the RSPB supports the re-use of existing buildings, we have concerns that the potential of these buildings to support wildlife has not been fully recognised. We note that this policy requires any potential re-use proposal for existing buildings to perform well against the issues in policy DP/2 which does refer to nature conservation interest. However, the RSPB believe that policy HG/8 should specifically refer to the need to determine and fully consider any wildlife interest prior to re-developing existing buildings. The RSPB therefore objects to this policy.	Policy HG/8 allows for the conversion of buildings which are structurally sound and as such, it is unlikely that they would have fallen into such a state of disrepair to be inhabited by wildlife. However, if this were to be the case, Policy DP/2 requires the conservation or enhancement of environmental assets. Therefore it is not necessary to repeat this requirement in Policy HG/8.	
9695 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy HG/8.	Support noted.	
9419 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>HG/9 Dwelling to Support a Rural-based Enterprise</i>				
9727 - GO-East	Object	The policy, in not applying to all rural based enterprises in an equal way, does not appear to accord with PPS7. The authority should either justify treating equestrian based enterprises differently to other businesses in the Green Belt, or the second paragraph after criterion c. should be deleted. The last paragraph should also be amended to extend its application to the relaxation of occupancy conditions to other rural enterprises as well as agriculture and forestry.	Agree, PPS7 (Annex A, paragraph 15) states that local planning authorities should apply the same stringent levels of assessment to applications for dwellings for rural businesses as for agricultural and forestry workers' dwellings, and Policy HG/9 should be amended so far as rural enterprises are concerned. However, a different approach is justified towards dwellings for equestrian use within the Green Belt, as paragraph 5.39 explains. Paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 identifies appropriate uses within Green Belts, and equestrian uses are not listed. Therefore, the approach in Policy HG/9 accords with PPG2.	Amend Policy HG/9 as follows:  Delete "exceptionally" from 1st paragraph.  Amend second to last paragraph to read: "Where a new dwelling is permitted, this will be the subject of a condition ensuring the occupation will be limited to a person solely or mainly working, or last working in the locality in agriculture, forestry or a rural enterprise, or a surviving partner of such a person, and to any resident dependents.  Amend 1st sentence of the last paragraph to read: "The relaxation of an occupancy condition will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the dwelling is no longer required by the unit or those working, or last working, in the locality in agriculture, forestry or a rural enterprise, or a surviving partner of such a person, and to any resident dependents."
7934 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	The introduction to this policy recognises that dwellings may be required for rural businesses other than farming or forestry, but permission should not be 'exceptional' where there is a proven need. Such housing should be permitted where it is necessary and justified (with financial and functional tests). The proposed condition links all such dwellings to agriculture and forestry and a rural business form of words should also be included. The need for security should be taken into account when assessing schemes.	Agree. PPS7 (Annex A, paragraph 15) states that local planning authorities should apply the same stringent levels of assessment to applications for dwellings for rural businesses as for agricultural and forestry workers' dwellings.	Amend Policy HG/9 as follows:  Delete "exceptionally" from 1st paragraph.  Amend second to last paragraph to read: "Where a new dwelling is permitted, this will be the subject of a condition ensuring the occupation will be limited to a person solely or mainly working, or last working in the locality in agriculture, forestry or a rural enterprise, or a surviving partner of such a person, and to any resident dependents."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9420 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
9696 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy HG/9.	Support noted.	
<i>Objectives</i>				
9083 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The objectives of the Plan should also support sport and recreation as important contributor to the economy and potentially to tourism. Support should also be given to education and education-related employment.	Sport and recreation are addressed by objectives in the services and facilities chapter of the Development Control Policies DPD.	
11224 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	Whilst supporting the bulk of the policies in this section Cambourne Parish Council is concerned with the Policies as they do not reflect the proposed development of Cambourne set out in the Masterplan with the Market Square, High Street. Containing a range of shops and offices these are essential to ensure the sustainability of Cambourne and therefore should be identified within the LDF.	Such site specific measures would be covered by the Site Specific Policies DPD. A specific objective in this section relating to the development of Cambourne is not required.	
9729 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds	Object	The RSPB note and support the objectives listed under Chapter 6 Economy and Tourism in principle. However, we are disappointed that there is not an over-arching objective which acknowledges the potential of habitat creation schemes to enhance the tourism experience within the district and the contribution that nature reserves make to the local economy. We are therefore objecting to the policy as currently worded and would recommend inclusion of an additional objective which supports habitat creation schemes providing a focus for countryside based tourism.	Not accepted. The change sought seeks a highly specific measure within the strategic objectives. Enhanced biodiversity and landscapes are included in the Natural Environment objectives. Strategic open space, is also covered by the Services and Facilities chapter of the plan.	
9983 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally support	Support noted.	
10239 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University supports the Objectives ET/a-f in relation to the economy and tourism. In particular the University welcomes the objective ET/a to support the Cambridge Area's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, higher education and research, particularly through the development of clusters. The University would expect that planning applications which seek to strengthen the Cambridge Area's position as a world leader in these respects will be supported by the District Council.	Support for the economy and tourism objectives noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>ET/a</i>				
11108 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	There is reference to the need to monitor the LDF in relation to the RSS yet nowhere is there any reference to the likely overall employment growth/change envisaged for either South Cambs or South Cambs/Cambridge City combined - although the latter figures are included in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan Technical report. There should be a discussion of how valid these still are. It is crucial that employment is monitored over time. Otherwise there will be no way that we can check that the sub-region "aspirational" employment figures in RSS are still robust. This is effectively an issue of "non-compliance" between the LDF and the RSS.	The draft East of England Plan includes the target of 70,500 job growth 2001 to 2021. It is agreed that an indicator measuring job growth and comparison to working population should be included in the LDF Monitoring Strategy, and subsequent Annual Monitoring Reports. This will be prepared in partnership with the County Council, to ensure country and regional consistency of approach.	Include in annual monitoring report and Monitoring Strategy indicators measuring job growth and comparison to working population.
10196 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University welcomes the inclusion as part of the Strategic Vision and the chapter on the Economy of the objective to support the Cambridge Area's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, higher education and research, particularly through the development of clusters. The University would expect that planning applications which seek to strengthen the Cambridge Area's position as a world leader in these respects will be supported by the Council.	Support for objective ET/a noted.	
9772 - Anglia Polytechnic University	Support	Anglia Polytechnic University (APU) is intent upon improving and expanding its presence in Cambridge as an accessible higher education facility, thereby contributing to the world-wide reputation of Cambridge as an educational centre of excellence. APU supports Objective ET/a in the context of its expansion plans and the need to overcome the current inadequacies of its East Road Campus.	Support for objective ET/a noted.	
<i>ET/b</i>				
8284 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	Objection is lodged in respect of the second objective. In accordance with the Structure Plan the aim should be to manage new employment development in the areas close to Cambridge and not the district as a whole.	The Structure Plan refers to the fact that the policy is not intended to cover the entire Cambridge Sub-Region. This is an area much larger than simply the District of South Cambridgeshire, and includes the ring of market towns around the City. It is not sustainable to exclude rural areas on the edge of the South Cambridgeshire District as these areas would be generally inappropriate for large-scale employment development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9773 - Anglia Polytechnic University	Support	<p>Anglia Polytechnic University (APU) needs further space in Cambridge to fulfil its plans for improvement and expansion of its facilities in the City. Development pressures in the City are intense.</p> <p>Policy 26 and the supporting text of Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia (RPG6), recommends discrimination in favour of uses that have an essential need for a Cambridge location, specifically referring to higher education. This is followed up by Policy P9/7 of the Cambridgeshire &amp; Peterborough Structure plan 2003. APU supports Objective ET/b in the context of its expansion plans and the need to overcome the current inadequacies of its East Road Campus.</p>	Support noted.	
<i>ET/I Limitations On The Occupancy of New Premises In South Cambridgeshire</i>				
9086 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The policy and supporting text are too prescriptive. The policy is too inflexible and gives insufficient reasoning and justification.	The policy is prescriptive by necessity, in order to implement to policy in RSS6, Draft RSS14, and the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003. Making the policy overly flexible would undermine its implementation.	
8911 - Carisbrooke Alliance	Object	It is excessive to include the whole of South Cambridgeshire District within the so-called "Cambridge Area", where occupation restrictions will apply. Carisbrooke's business park at Buckingway (near Swavesey alongside the A14) does not have a local user restriction on the overarching outline planning permission. Other more peripheral sites in the District similarly are not so constrained. The extent of the Cambridge Area needs to be looked at again. Buckingway Business Park should be excluded from it.	The Structure Plan refers to the fact that the policy is not intended to cover the entire Cambridge Sub-Region. This is an area much larger than simply the District of South Cambridgeshire, and includes the ring of market towns around the City. It is not sustainable to exclude rural areas on the edge of the South Cambridgeshire District; as these areas would be generally inappropriate for large-scale employment development.	
8288 - D H Barford + Co Limited 8574 - John Gloag	Object	The policy should apply specifically to new employment premises in locations that have a close association with Cambridge itself, not the district as a whole.	The Structure Plan refers to the fact that the policy is not intended to cover the entire Cambridge Sub-Region. This is an area much larger than simply the District of South Cambridgeshire, and includes the ring of market towns around the City. It is not sustainable to exclude rural areas on the edge of the South Cambridgeshire District; as these areas would be generally inappropriate for large-scale employment development.	
8988 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	There is a case to make specific reference to ensuring that head offices of Cambridge connected companies remain in the Sub-region.	A specific reference to this is not required. The Structure Plan, and report of the EIP panel, makes clear that offices serving a regional function will be the exception, and this is primarily a response to the regional government role of the city.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9774 - Anglia Polytechnic University	Support	Anglia Polytechnic University (APU) needs further space in Cambridge to fulfil its plans for improvement and expansion of its facilities in the City. Existing buildings at the East Road Campus do not meet APU's existing or future quantitative space requirements. Much of the space is poor in qualitative terms and the Campus as a whole is a somewhat incoherent assembly of individual buildings lacking a strong identity and image. APU is supportive of Policy ET/1 on the basis that new (APU) university facilities fall within the ambit of uses that are acceptable under this policy and will therefore be supported in principle.	Support noted.	
<i>1.</i>				
7957 - Arlington Development Services Ltd	Object	Policy ET/1 proposes that employment development, including change of use, will only be permitted if developers can demonstrate that it falls into one or more of a certain criteria. One of these criteria is in relation to office or other development, in the use class B1(a) and states that the only office or B1 development permissible will be that which will offer an essential service for Cambridge. Arlington believes that this is potentially too restrictive and would recommend that this definition is expanded to include other offices which will contribute towards the economic development of the area.	The selective management of employment policy is required to reserve scarce employment land for uses specifically requiring a Cambridge location. It is required by the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, RSS6 and Draft RSS14. The term 'contributing to the economic development of the area' would be open to too broad an interpretation, and would not provide the necessary tools for selective management.	
<i>2.</i>				
8978 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	Reference should be made to services that are concerned primarily with research and development to ensure consistency with Structure Plan Policy P9/7. It is suggested that this section of the policy be amended by the insertion of 'and services' following 'High technology and related industries'.	Agree.	Amend Policy ET/1 point 2 to 'high technology and related industries AND SERVICES...'
10931 - Carter Jonas	Support	We would support those employment policies which are explicitly supportive of high technology research and development industries, their ability to expand if required, and the continuation of existing clusters.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<b>3.</b>				
10241 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge 8985 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	Objection to the proposed limitation incorporated paragraph 3 of Policy ET/1 which restricts D1 educational uses and sui generis research establishments to those which can demonstrate they are required 'in the national interest'. This is an unacceptable and unnecessary restriction. This wording is not consistent with that contained in the approved Structure Plan (Policy P9/7). The Policy should be amended by omitting the phrase 'in the national interest' and the wording revised to accord with the approved Structure Plan Policy.	Paragraph 9.48 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan makes clear that being in the national interest is a material consideration in consideration of future proposals for educational and research establishments.	
<b>4.</b>				
8305 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The 1,850 sq.m limitation for B1(c), B2 and B8 development does not take account of particular development requirements, business needs or the location. For example, larger development in a village may be more appropriate to meet a specific need.	1850sq m provides a suitable maximum size, to enable operation of the selective management of employment policy. It is detailed in Cambridgeshire Structure Plan Paragraph 9.54. Providing greater flexibility within the policy could undermine its implementation.	
8292 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The policy is ambiguous and lacks clarity. How will a use that contributes 'to a greater range of local employment opportunities, particularly if it contributes to the development of locally based skills or expertise' be determined. This needs to be explained.	The policy utilises the wording from Structure Plan Policy P9/7, and the Draft RSS14. It emphasises the reasoning behind permitting employment uses of this type.	
<b>Policy Paragraph 2</b>				
7935 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	The intention to limit the occupation of business units for the first 10 years could undermine farm diversification schemes funded with loans. While a size limit is acceptable for most such schemes, this should be the only restriction on converted farm buildings; otherwise there needs to be flexibility of occupier to be sure of an adequate demand from potential occupiers throughout the repayment period.	The policy provides a degree of flexibility for other users to take on a unit if they meet the criteria of the policy. To exclude converted farm buildings could significantly weaken the policy, and promote unsustainable developments in rural areas. The size thresholds of the policy also mean that small scale conversion of farm buildings may not include occupancy conditions.	
<b>6.1</b>				
8294 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The statement does not justify why Policy ET/1 should be applied to the whole district and it is not accepted this conforms with Policy P9/7 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan.	The Structure Plan refers to the fact that the policy is not intended to cover the entire Cambridge Sub-Region. This is an area much larger than simply the District of South Cambridgeshire, and includes the ring of market towns around the City. It is not sustainable to exclude rural areas on the edge of the South Cambridgeshire District; as these areas would be generally inappropriate for large-scale employment development.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9775 - Anglia Polytechnic University	Support	Anglia Polytechnic University (APU) needs further space in Cambridge to fulfil its plans for improvement and expansion of its facilities in the City. Existing buildings at the East Road Campus do not meet APU's existing or future quantitative space requirements. Much of the space is poor in qualitative terms and the Campus as a whole is a somewhat incoherent assembly of individual buildings lacking a strong identity and image. APU is supportive of Policy ET/1 on the basis that new (APU) university facilities fall within the ambit of uses that are acceptable under this policy and will therefore be supported in principle.	Support noted.	
<i>6.2</i>				
9776 - Anglia Polytechnic University	Support	Anglia Polytechnic University (APU) needs further space in Cambridge to fulfil its plans for improvement and expansion of its facilities in the City. Existing buildings at the East Road Campus do not meet APU's existing or future quantitative space requirements. Much of the space is poor in qualitative terms and the Campus as a whole is a somewhat incoherent assembly of individual buildings lacking a strong identity and image. APU is supportive of Policy ET/1 on the basis that new (APU) university facilities fall within the ambit of uses that are acceptable under this policy and will therefore be supported in principle.	Support noted.	
<i>6.3</i>				
8302 - D H Barford + Co Limited 8912 - Carisbrooke Alliance	Object	It is inappropriate for this to be included as lower case text and the intention to resist large scale manufacturing distribution and warehousing should be clearly be stated as planning policy.	The mechanism by which large scale distribution, warehousing and manufacturing will be resisted is already included within policy ET/1, point 4. This sets a maximum size for this type of activity. A change to the policy is not required.	
9447 - Carisbrooke Alliance	Object	Carisbrooke take exception to the proposal that the limitation on certain forms of commercial development should apply across the whole district. This is considered unnecessarily restrictive, and the limitation should relate to an area much more tightly related to Cambridge. The company's business park at Buckingway, alongside the A14 at Swavesey, should be excluded from any definition of the "Cambridge Area".	The Structure Plan refers to the fact that the policy is not intended to cover the entire Cambridge Sub-Region. This is an area much larger than simply the District of South Cambridgeshire, and includes the ring of market towns around the City. It is not sustainable to exclude rural areas on the edge of the South Cambridgeshire District; as these areas would be generally inappropriate for large-scale employment development.	
<i>6.4</i>				
8303 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Support	This statement is supported, however it does not reflect the text in Policy ET/1.	Support noted. Paragraph 6.4 reflects ET/1 point 4.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>6.5</i>				
9777 - Anglia Polytechnic University	Support	Anglia Polytechnic University (APU) needs further space in Cambridge to fulfil its plans for improvement and expansion of its facilities in the City. Existing buildings at the East Road Campus do not meet APU's existing or future quantitative space requirements. Much of the space is poor in qualitative terms and the Campus as a whole is a somewhat incoherent assembly of individual buildings lacking a strong identity and image. APU is supportive of Policy ET/1 on the basis that new (APU) university facilities fall within the ambit of uses that are acceptable under this policy and will therefore be supported in principle.	Support noted.	
<i>6.6</i>				
8914 - Carisbrooke Alliance	Object	It is not considered that there is any logic in the "exceptional" approach promoted by the Structure Plan relative to the location of regional offices to be limited to the City of Cambridge alone. The Structure Plan refers to the "Cambridge Sub-Region" which relates to more than just the City of Cambridge. South Cambridgeshire should also be a potential receptor of such facilities if they are justified in an "exceptional" manner.	Although paragraph 9.52 states that exceptionally office style employment serving a regional function may be located within the sub region, the proliferation of regional offices was not the intention of the Structure Plan. The paragraph reflects that fact that there are already regional government uses in Cambridge. It is correct that Cambridge as the sub-regional centre remains the focus for such uses.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>ET/2 Meeting Housing Needs From Employment Development</i>				
10222 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 10400 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd	Object	This Policy is contrary to paragraphs B3, B12 and B14 of Circular 05/2005.	National Planning Policy does not preclude the provision of affordable housing from employment development. Paragraph B3 of Circular 05/2005 states "planning obligations might be used to...mitigate a development's impact. The outcome of these uses of planning obligations should be that the proposed development concerned is made to accord with published local, regional or national planning policies." Paragraph B12 states "However, there may be certain circumstances, which should be specified in the Local Development Framework, where it may not be necessary for provision to be on-site, and where provision on another site or a financial contribution may represent a more appropriate option." Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states "employment developments will also be expected to contribute towards affordable housing". This approach has been tested by Oxford City Council through their Local Plan Inquiry, and Policies HG/3 and ET/2 are in accordance with the Oxford City Local Plan Inspector's recommendations. Policy ET/2 requires affordable housing from employment development where additional demand is placed on affordable housing to mitigate its impact, the provision of which can be on or off-site. This is in accordance with Circular 05/2005 and Structure Plan Policy P9/1.	
8986 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	The Policy is inflexible in that it seeks affordable housing provision or contributions for all employment development 'likely to have an impact on the demand for affordable housing'. There is no flexibility in the Policy to take account of circumstances where employment development forms part of a sustainable mixed-use new settlement or urban extension where there will already be significant provision of affordable housing in line with other policies within the DPD. In addition, the Policy does not set out the ways in which the impact on the demand for affordable housing will be assessed or measured.	Mixed-use schemes would need to be considered on its merits. The residential element will be required to provide affordable housing in accordance with Policy HG/3. The employment element would then be considered separately against the provisions of Policy ET/2. Where the affordable housing is intended to meet the affordable housing needs of the employment development itself the provisions of Policy ET/2 would be satisfied. This could arise for example in relation to an employer of key workers. Otherwise where new employment development is proposed that could have an impact on the demand for affordable housing it is reasonable that that impact be mitigated. In all cases the policy would only apply where it can be shown that there would be a material impact on the demand for affordable housing arising from the development. More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document to amplify the policy, in accordance with PPS12.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8989 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	A distinction needs to be drawn between new employment developments which will add to Sub-regional housing pressures, and employment developments which form an integral part of mixed use communities. Clarification is required to ensure that the affordable housing contribution associated with the latter form of employment development is set aside.	Mixed-use schemes would need to be considered on its merits. The residential element will be required to provide affordable housing in accordance with Policy HG/3. The employment element would then be considered separately against the provisions of Policy ET/2. Where the affordable housing is intended to meet the affordable housing needs of the employment development itself the provisions of Policy ET/2 would be satisfied. This could arise for example in relation to an employer of key workers. Otherwise where new employment development is proposed that could have an impact on the demand for affordable housing it is reasonable that that impact be mitigated. In all cases the policy would only apply where it can be shown that there would be a material impact on the demand for affordable housing arising from the development. More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document to amplify the policy, in accordance with PPS12.	
9100 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The policy does not accord with National Planning Policy. The policy should not relate to all forms of employment generating development. The provision of affordable housing should be dependant on the viability of its provision in relation to the employment use and should not undermine the likelihood of other beneficial employment uses being developed.	National Planning Policy does not preclude the provision of affordable housing from employment development and this approach has been tested by Oxford City Council through their Local Plan Inquiry. The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need and included in Policy HG/3. Therefore, to help address the shortfall, it is appropriate for employment development to contribute as they generate further demand for affordable housing over and above existing levels of demand. The appropriate Use Classes should be set out in a footnote to the policy for consistency with Cambridge City Council. Viability issues are material considerations to be taken into account in relation to planning applications. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessment of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in light of their own detailed assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document.	Add the following footnote to Policy ET/2: "Employment developments to which this policy will apply are: - B1(a) Offices. - B1(b) High tech and related industries, and services concerned mainly with commercial research and development. - C2 Hospitals, including healthcare teaching and research. - D1 educational uses and associated sui-generis research institutes and academic research institutes."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9976 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	The application of the policy to employment developments is novel and not supported by Structure Plan or government policy and should be deleted. The policy does not explain the circumstances under which the policy would operate and should be deleted for lack of clarity and scope for complicating planning negotiations.	National Planning Policy does not preclude the provision of affordable housing from employment development and this approach has been tested by Oxford City Council through their Local Plan Inquiry. The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need and included in Policy HG/3. Therefore, to help address the shortfall, it is appropriate for employment development to contribute as they generate further demand for affordable housing over and above existing levels of demand. More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document.	
10093	Object	The requirement that employment development proposals "likely to have an impact on the demand for affordable housing" will be expected to mitigate such impacts, does not explain how this will be applied in terms of judging the "impact". It should not apply to small-scale employment development designed to provide local employment opportunities in villages and this should be made clear in both policies.	Affordable housing will only required on sites generating additional demand for affordable housing, and the amount of required will be of a scale and kind to the demand generated by the development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document.	
10579	Object	The proposed policy in respect of employment development is objected to for the following reasons: (i) Employment policies effectively limit new proposals to activities essential to the economy of the Sub-Region. The proposal will inhibit the provision of said development. (ii) Provision of affordable housing should be based on local needs based assessments and the impact on employment proposals will be spread over wider areas - the impact of employment development proposals will be impossible to assess. (iii) The proposals will tend to inhibit new investment in the economy. (iv) The proposed supplementary planning document should be published and assessed prior to the assessment of the policies.	The Cambridge area is economically buoyant and unemployment rates are below the county and national averages. Viability issues are material considerations to be taken into account in relation to planning applications. The actual level of affordable housing secured as part of planning permissions will be determined at the time of an application having regard to detailed assessment of all the calls on the development and in negotiation with the developer who will have the opportunity to demonstrate in light of their own detailed assessments of their proposals whether the policy target is achievable or not. The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need and included in Policy HG/3. Therefore, to help address the shortfall, it is appropriate for employment development to contribute as they generate further demand for affordable housing over and above existing levels of demand. More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document to amplify the policy, in accordance with PPS12.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8186 - Lovejoy	Object	The basis for this policy is understood, but it is not equitable to require existing employers who are expanding their operations, as opposed to new employers coming into the District, to make such contributions. The policy should be revised by adding the word 'New' at the start of the preamble to the policy and by a reference in the supporting text at 6.7 that the provisions of ET/ 2 do not apply to existing employers.	Policy ET/2 applies to all new employment development whether it is an incoming employment development or expansion of an existing, and will not apply to businesses which are relocating within the Cambridge Sub-Region. There is an imbalance between the numbers of jobs and houses in the Cambridge Sub-Region, therefore the provision of further employment will exacerbate this imbalance and generate further demand for housing, including for affordable housing. The level of affordable housing secured will be in scale and kind of development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.	
8304 - D H Barford + Co Limited 8581 - John Gloag	Object	The Policy lacks clarity and certainty and is unreasonable. When will proposals be 'likely to have an impact on the demand for affordable housing'? The requirement to make a financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing off site is not justified. The majority of jobs created on new developments will provide employment for existing residents in the area. How will the affordable housing requirement be assessed when the business is not known?	Affordable housing will only required on sites generating additional demand for affordable housing, and the amount of required will be of a scale and kind to the demand generated by the development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. Paragraph B14 of Circular 05/2005 justifies financial contributions towards the provision of off-site affordable housing, stating "there may be certain circumstances, which should be specified in the Local Development Framework, where it may not be necessary for provision to be on-site, and where provision on another site or a financial contribution may represent a more appropriate option." More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document to amplify the policy, in accordance with PPS12.	
10310 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	We object in principle to these policies which require the provision of affordable housing resulting from employment development, on the basis that it is unreasonable.	Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states "employment developments will also be expected to contribute towards affordable housing". This approach has been tested by Oxford City Council through their Local Plan Inquiry, and Policies HG/3 and ET/2 are in accordance with the Oxford City Local Plan Inspector's recommendations. Policy ET/2 will only require a contribution in those instances whereby additional demand will be generated for affordable housing. It does not apply a blanket requirement for affordable housing from all employment development and the level of affordable housing secured will be in scale and kind of development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10243 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	While the University welcomes the paragraph in this policy that indicates that if employers of staff recognised as key workers, can demonstrate that they are providing or contributing to the provision of key worker housing for their staff, this will satisfy the requirement of this policy (where the employment development is to be occupied by that employer.) The University would however like the policy to be clarified to make it clear that the provision by the University of key worker housing will obviate the need for employers in University associated research establishments and institutions, whether commercial or non commercial, to provide affordable housing.	Support noted. Policy ET/2 will only require a contribution in those instances whereby additional demand will be generated for affordable housing. It does not apply a blanket requirement for affordable housing from all employment development. Therefore, if an applicant can demonstrate no further demand, no contribution will be sought.	
8347 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall is troubled about the possible requirement to contribute to affordable housing arising from employment development. When it brings forward such proposals on its own land, it will be able to demonstrate that most, if not all its employees are already in the Cambridge area. With only very few likely to be attracted from beyond Cambridge, requiring a contribution seems inequitable. In such circumstances, South Cambridgeshire might accept that employment development would not have an impact on the demand for affordable housing.	Policy ET/2 will only require a contribution in those instances whereby additional demand will be generated for affordable housing. It does not apply a blanket requirement for affordable housing from all employment development. Therefore, if an applicant can demonstrate no further demand, no contribution will be sought. Where additional demand results from the development, the level of affordable housing secured will be in scale and kind of development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10695 - Cambridgeshire Recycling	Object	The proposed target of "approximately 50%" is unreasonable and will lead to many schemes, especially very small schemes, becoming unviable. It will therefore not achieve any significant improvement in affordability nor in provision of affordable housing. The proviso that the precise percentage will be determined having regard to development costs is welcomed, but what is not clear is how the Council will determine such matters in a reasonable and objective fashion that does not undermine financial confidentiality issues. Affordable housing requirements should not apply to small-scale employment development designed to provide local employment opportunities in villages and this should be made clear in both policies.	The Structure Plan Policy P9/1 states that "40% or more of the new housing in the sub-region will be affordable". It does not set an upper limit. The draft RSS14 says that "affordable housing must constitute at least 30% of housing supply in all local authority areas, though the overall aspiration is to secure at least 40% where housing stress warrants higher provision. Provision in excess of 30% will be defined and justified in local development documents and housing strategies, informed by local housing assessments". In the Cambridge sub-region section, paragraph 5.114 says that "40% or more" of new housing will be affordable. If this overall target of all new housing development is to be achieved, affordable housing will need to be higher than 40%. The Housing Needs Survey 2002 identifies a high level of housing need in South Cambs and recommends a target of 50%. The approach in HG/3 is therefore consistent with both the adopted Structure Plan and draft RSS14. Structure Plan Policy P9/1 also states "employment developments will also be expected to contribute towards affordable housing". This approach has been tested by Oxford City Council through their Local Plan Inquiry, and Policies HG/3 and ET/2 are in accordance with the Oxford City Local Plan Inspector's recommendations. Policy ET/2 will only require a contribution in those instances whereby additional demand will be generated for affordable housing. It does not apply a blanket requirement for affordable housing from all employment development and the level of affordable housing secured will be in scale and kind of development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations.	
8480 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Support	Council strongly supports the requirement for both housing and employment land should provide affordable housing.	Support noted.	
<i>6.7</i>				
10223 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Object	This Policy is contrary to paragraphs B3, B12 and B14 of Circular 05/2005.	Affordable housing will only required on sites generating additional demand for affordable housing, and the amount of required will be of a scale and kind to the demand generated by the development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. Paragraph B3 concerns itself with making acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms and suggests planning obligations may be used to prescribe the nature of a development and uses the example of securing a proportion of affordable housing. Paragraph B12 continues this approach. Paragraph B14 of Circular 05/2005 justifies financial contributions towards the provision of off-site affordable housing. Therefore Policies HG/3 and ET/2 are consistent with Circular 05/2005.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8308 - D H Barford + Co Limited 8586 - John Gloag	Object		There is currently an imbalance between the numbers of jobs and houses in the Cambridge Sub-Region. National Planning Policy does not preclude the provision of affordable housing from employment development and this approach has been tested by Oxford City Council through their Local Plan Inquiry. The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need and included in Policy HG/3. Therefore, to help address the shortfall, it is appropriate for employment development to contribute as they generate further demand for affordable housing over and above existing levels of demand. Affordable housing will only required on sites generating additional demand for affordable housing, and the amount of required will be of a scale and kind to the demand generated by the development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document to amplify the policy, in accordance with PPS12.	
8306 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The comment 'new employment development increases pressure on the housing market' is sweeping and not necessarily factual. This does not provide justification for contributions towards affordable housing.	There is currently an imbalance between the numbers of jobs and houses in the Cambridge Sub-Region. National Planning Policy does not preclude the provision of affordable housing from employment development and this approach has been tested by Oxford City Council through their Local Plan Inquiry. The Housing Needs Survey, prepared in accordance with Government guidance, has identified a need equating to a target of 80.1%. However, in taking into account custom and practice, a target of 50% is considered justifiable to meet the need and included in Policy HG/3. Therefore, to help address the shortfall, it is appropriate for employment development to contribute as they generate further demand for affordable housing over and above existing levels of demand. Affordable housing will only required on sites generating additional demand for affordable housing, and the amount of required will be of a scale and kind to the demand generated by the development, in accordance with Circular 05/2005 on Planning Obligations. More detail will be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document to amplify the policy, in accordance with PPS12.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>ET/3 Promotion of Clusters</i>				
8990 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	The importance of cluster promotion is supported and is generally consistent with the approach adopted in the emerging East of England Plan. However, the Policy should recognise that this is not a static concept but, rather, one which may well evolve significantly over the plan period in response to changing conditions in the global economy.	The policy as written provides sufficient flexibility to deal with future changing circumstances. In particular it allows for consideration of other clusters as they emerge. It also provides flexibility through implementation, where measures can be explored through development, including Northstowe and urban extensions to Cambridge, to best support cluster development.	
10748 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Ltd is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. As a consequence, Policy ET/3 needs amending as follows; (Final paragraph 2nd line) "especially suited for cluster development are Northstowe, Hanley Grange, and the urban extensions to Cambridge .....".	A new settlement at Hanley Grange has not been allocated in the Local Development Framework. A consequential change to this policy is therefore not required.	
11109 - Cambridgeshire County Council 11110 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	There should be reference to monitoring employment in these key clusters (through the County Council's employer's database which is part-funded by SCDC).	Development in the key clusters is included as an indicator in the Local Development Framework Monitoring Strategy.	
10248 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	The Policy should however reflect the intention and wording of the approved Structure Plan and recognise North West Cambridge as a strategic employment location and make specific reference to it in the last paragraph of the policy. Proposed Change : Request amendment to Policy ET/3 to make specific reference to North West Cambridge as a location especially suited to cluster development.	The final policy paragraph refers to the urban extensions of Cambridge, of which North west Cambridge is one. A specific reference is not required in this policy.	
10459 - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust	Object	Policy ET/3 which promotes the development of clusters, including those associated with medicine, is supported. A cluster is defined as, 'a group of independent companies operating in a specific field of industrial or economic activity' This definition is considered to be too narrow, and should also be extended to incorporate medical facilities associated with NHS Hospitals. It is proposed that either this policy be amended to incorporate National Health medical institutions, or a separate policy be incorporated.	Policy ET/3 is sufficiently broad to acknowledge cover the clustering of medical facilities. However, an amendment to paragraph 6.8 is proposed.	Amend paragraph 6.8 'a cluster is a group of independent ORGANISATIONS OR companies....
10251 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge 9985 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support for Policy ET/3 in respect of the development of Clusters.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10932 - Carter Jonas	Support	We would support those employment policies which are explicitly supportive of high technology research and development industries, their ability to expand if required, and the continuation of existing clusters.	Support noted.	
<i>7.</i>				
11381 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	The University is concerned that point 7 of Policy ET/3 relates only to locally driven high technology clusters and this could prove limiting for the University's research programmes. It is suggested that the wording of point 7 be revised to read 'other significant high technology areas of research as they emerge'	Point 7 of the policy utilises the phrase 'other locally driven clusters..' reflecting Structure Plan Policy P9/6.	
<i>6.8</i>				
11382 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	The wording of paragraph 6.8 line 2 should refer to independent 'organisations' not companies as this definition incorporates institutions which are not usually companies.	Agree.	Amend paragraph 6.8 'a cluster is a group of independent ORGANISATIONS OR companies.'
<i>ET/4 Development In Established Employment Areas In The Countryside</i>				
9656 - GO-East	Object	The policy is uncertain in its reference to 'appropriate infill development'. Additionally, there is no apparent definition of 'employment' uses, which we assume means uses in Classes B1, B2 and B8. The policy and supporting text should be amended/expanded to clearly indicate what matters will be considered in determining if infill development is appropriate e.g. scale of development, type of development such as office uses which pursuant to PPS6 should be directed to other more central and accessible locations, traffic generation relative to location or the form of the development etc. Additionally, a definition should be included as to what constitutes employment uses.	Following representations, an amendment is proposed to remove the restriction to infilling, as it was agreed that in some cases suitable development may go beyond this narrow definition. Considerations of what constitutes appropriate development must also take account of the development principles policies. This includes consideration of scale of development to location. Employment development is defined by policy ET/1.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9316 - Vantico Ltd 8922 - Carisbrooke Alliance	Object	The principle and tenor of this policy is supported, but it should go further in that appropriate development on established employment sites should not be limited to the redevelopment of existing sites and "infilling" alone.	It is agreed that there may be cases where appropriate development would go beyond the definition of infilling as defined. An amendment to the policy is therefore proposed.	Amend 1st and last paragraphs of policy ET/4 In defined Established Employment Areas In The Countryside, redevelopment of existing buildings, and appropriate [infill] development for employment use may be permitted. [Infilling is defined as filling small gaps between built development. Cumulative impact of proposals will be considered.] Permission will be refused where there would be a negative impact on surrounding countryside, or landscape character area. Developments will be subject to other policies in the plan, in particular policy ET/6 on the expansion of existing firms. Amend paragraph 6.11: Within these areas, appropriate [infill] DEVELOPMENT and redevelopment will be permitted, subject to consideration of land supply across the District, and other policy concerns. This will enable more efficient use of the sites, and allow them to be adapted for the needs of existing and future users.
8378 - Mr. P Hutchinson (Gamlingay, Old Windmill Site Potton Road)	Object	The document fails to acknowledge the existing established employment site at Potton Road Gamlingay where there are existing employment premises and planning permission for further development granted by the Council under references S/0131/96/F (implemented) and S/2238/04/F.	This small site comprises an isolated employment use in the countryside, and does not warrant designation.	
11111 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	There is no mention in this chapter of the need to monitor actual jobs, workplace populations and employment densities. We are working with SCDC to identify how this should be done.	Such issues have been addressed through the Monitoring Strategy that will accompany the Local Development Framework. In particular the development of employment land, and employment in key sectors will be monitored.	
10792 (Cottenham, Land at Beach Road)	Object	Dataracks, Beach Road, Cottenham is an established employment site, and should be recognised as a defined established site in the Countryside at Policy ET/4. The site should be recognised as being a site as identified at paragraph 6.14 (Policy ET5), that is capable of sensitive small scale employment that can help sustain the economy, and achieve a wider range of employment opportunities, and where there is potential to cluster related firms.	This site comprises two buildings and associated hardstanding on the road frontage. The rest of the land to the rear is currently green field. Due to the isolated nature of these buildings, not forming apart of a larger are of employment uses, the site does not warrant designation as an Established Employment Area.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10461 - Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust (Fulbourn, Fulbourn MDS Area's 1, 2, 3 & 4)	Object	Large National Health sites, including those of the Ida Darwin and Fulbourn Hospital, are significant providers of employment and should be treated as such in the emerging LDF. It is considered appropriate for the Fulbourn and Ida Darwin site to be identified as either an established employment area in the countryside, or as a cluster, on which matter separate representations have been submitted. It is considered that the employment generated by the Fulbourn site far exceeds many other established employment areas identified in policy ET/4, and this reason justifies the identification of the hospital site within this category. Such a designation would facilitate further development within the site, thereby accommodating the required needs of the hospital trust.	Due to its location, the Ida Darwin and Fulbourn Hospital site has been designated as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. As such, it is considered under policy GB/5. Its designation under policy ET/4 would be inappropriate, and the reasoned justification to the policy makes clear it excludes sites in the green belt.	
9988 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support	Support noted, although the policy has been amended.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
8187 - Lovejoy 11384 - Chancerygate Asset Management Ltd	Object	The limitation of acceptable development in such area to 'redevelopment of existing buildings, and appropriate infill development' is too restricted, particularly given the definition of 'infilling' in the latter part of the policy. The purpose and thrust of the policy would not be diminished if the word 'infill' was deleted from the opening paragraph of the policy, and the definition, in the first sentence of the last paragraph of the policy, also deleted.	It is agreed that there may be cases where appropriate development would go beyond the definition of infilling as defined. An amendment to the policy is therefore proposed.	Amend 1st and last paragraphs of policy ET/4  In defined Established Employment Areas In The Countryside, redevelopment of existing buildings, and appropriate [infill] development for employment use may be permitted.  [Infilling is defined as filling small gaps between built development. Cumulative impact of proposals will be considered.] Permission will be refused where there would be a negative impact on surrounding countryside, or landscape character area. Developments will be subject to other policies in the plan, in particular policy ET/6 on the expansion of existing firms.  Amend paragraph 6.11:  Within these areas, appropriate [infill] DEVELOPMENT and redevelopment will be permitted, subject to consideration of land supply across the District, and other policy concerns. This will enable more efficient use of the sites, and allow them to be adapted for the needs of existing and future users.
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
8428 - Gamlingay Parish Council	Object	Councillors require feedback on the status of the Station Road, Gamlingay site, is this classed as developed or not? Surely this site needs to be classified or be referred to in this policy. Clarification on how this site fits into these policies is requested.	The site at Station Road Gamlingay is proposed to be allocated for Employment class B1 and B2. It also has the benefit of planning permission, which has yet to be implemented. Once implemented, it may be designated as a site under ET/4, but this would be considered through a future review of the Development Control Policies DPD.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9067 - South Cambridgeshire Primary Care Trust (Fulbourn, Fulbourn MDS Area's 1, 2, 3 & 4)	Object	The PCT endorses the view of the Cambridge and Peterborough Mental Health Partnership NHS trust that large National Health sites, including those of the Ida Darwin and Fulbourn Hospital, are significant providers of employment and should be treated as such in the emerging LDF. It is considered appropriate for the Fulbourn and Ida Darwin site to be identified as either an established employment area in the countryside, or as a cluster, on which matter separate representations have been submitted.	Due to its location, the Ida Darwin and Fulbourn Hospital site has been designated as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt. As such, it is considered under policy GB/5. Its designation under policy ET/4 would be inappropriate, and the reasoned justification to the policy makes clear it excludes sites in the green belt.	
<i>3.</i>				
9017 - Chancerygate Asset Management Ltd	Support	Chancerygate can offer some general support for this policy, which establishes the principle of additional employment development at land north Cambridge Research Park, Landbeach, through redevelopment and infilling.	Support noted.	
<i>8.</i>				
10315 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	The Council now refers to the site within the DPD as 'Vantico' (as opposed to 'Ciba Polymers/Hexcel' in the Council's Preferred Approach). The site should be referred to as the 'Huntsman/Hexcel' site and the text within the DPD should be amended accordingly.	A change was made at the preferred options stage following representations, however there still appears to be disagreement on the site name by owners / occupiers of the site. It is therefore appropriate to provide a neutral reference utilising the location of the site.	Replace name 'Vantico South of Duxford', with 'Land at Hinxton Road, South of Duxford'.
11385 - Lovejoy (Duxford, Land East of Ickleton Road)	Object	Hexcel is currently considering the possible development of a new facility on the site. This would necessitate a new process building, and associated development. Initial assessments of possible locations within/ adjacent to the existing operational area indicate that land owned by Hexcel on the west side of the existing site would, in operational terms, be the optimum location for such development, in that development would be linked directly into existing services/ production processes, without involving significant (and expensive) site rearrangement and or redevelopment. Some of this area is currently developed, either with buildings./ structures, or is hard standing / unused rail infrastructure. It would not be possible to accommodate the above scale of development on land in Hexcel's ownership within 'the Established Employment Area in the Countryside' defined on the Proposals Map.	Not accepted. Including an area of undeveloped land within the Established Employment Area would effectively allocate it for development. Sufficient land supply has already been identified for employment to meet the Structure Plan 2003 guidelines. The main focus for additional employment land is the strategic employment sites at Northstowe and the urban extensions to Cambridge. Given the search sequence detailed in policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire structure plan, an additional employment allocation in the rural area is not appropriate.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8190 - Lovejoy (Duxford, Land East of Ickleton Road)	Object	The defined extent of site 8, as shown on the Proposals Map, does not reflect the actual operational area on the site used by Hexcel and others. The current boundary to the Existing Employment area appears to have been drawn around some, but not all of the buildings on site and ignores other operational elements such as areas of hardstanding, roads, and structures. Policy SP/16 Rail Freight seeks to protect - presumably for use in association with the existing uses - sidings at Duxford. There is a paradox in a policy that seeks to protect rail infrastructure off site - presumably for the benefit of development - and a site-specific policy that excludes rail lines from an existing employment area. The defined extent of site 8 should be revised to provide flexibility for future development.	It is agreed that the policy should be amended to better reflect the site. The sidings do form a part of the established employment area, and should be included.	Amend boundary of Established Employment Area south of Duxford, to include existing buildings and sidings, but not additional areas of undeveloped land.
10313 - Huntsman Advanced Materials (Duxford, Land South of Rectory Road)	Object	We support in principle the Council's draft DPD which identifies the site south of Duxford as an 'Established Employment Area in the Countryside' (previously referred to as a Major Employment Area) allocation, subject to the site boundary being redefined to acknowledge the release of part of the site for residential-led development.(attached map shows land to be released for residential development).	Representations proposing the allocation of part of the site south of Duxford for residential development have been considered through the appropriate policy in the Site Specific Policies DPD. The land has not been allocated for housing, and should remain as an established employment area in the countryside.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>ET/5 New Employment Development</i>				
9657 - GO-East	Object	We suggest that consideration is given to defining small-scale by other means than the numbers of employees that might vary over time and be difficult to establish prior to the business being operational, particularly where a development is proposed that does not have specific end user. An alternative way of defining small-scale is to set floor area thresholds relative to the typical use types. The policy and supporting paragraph 6.16 should be amended to address these matters prior to submission of the DPD.	Agreed. Policy ET/5 also needs to differentiate itself from those employment policies which will apply in the major growth areas (the Area Action Plans and at the main employment sites (policy ET/4) and such sites the Cambridge Science Park. Employment densities are available from the English Partnerships publication "Employment densities: a simple guide."	Amend policy ET/5 "New Employment Development in Villages" to read: "Planning permission will be granted at an appropriate scale for new small-scale employment in the B1 - B8 Use Classes provided that the development would contribute to a greater range of local employment opportunities, or facilitate cluster development within village frameworks, and on previously developed sites adjoining or very close to the village frameworks of rural centres or minor rural centres. Small scale employment development in villages is defined as employing no more than 25 people as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Offices B1(a): 400 sq.m.</li> <li>2. High tech/R&amp;D (B1b): 725 sq.m.</li> <li>3. Light industry (B1c): 800 sq.m.</li> <li>4. General industry (B2-B7): 850 sq.m.</li> <li>5. Warehousing (B8): 1250 sq.m."</li> </ol>
9820	Object	Policy ET/5 New Employment Development - I object to this policy that employment class B1 - B8 should be located within or close to the Village Framework. Please see my NS/2 representation, which provides details of businesses in Longstanton that employ people from outside the village and travel to work by car. Businesses next to residential areas are creating environmental and other problems to residents. Consideration should be given to the fact that lots of businesses today work longer hours, some 24 hours 7 days a week. Land should be allocated for business where they would have easy access to major roads and not through residential areas.	Whilst the Local Development Framework does allocate employment land, particularly through the Area Action Plans, small scale employment opportunities within villages provide opportunities for people to access employment while reducing the need to travel. They also can enhance the vitality of rural centres, supporting the rural economy. This is consistent with policy P2/6 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003. Other policies in the plan, particularly the development principles, provide appropriate policies for considering the impact of proposals with regard to their scale and location.	
10100	Object	Limiting new small-scale employment development adjoining village frameworks to previously developed sites is unreasonable and will prevent the satisfactory rationalisation and improvement of existing premises, such as our client's land at Willingham. The policy should be amended to allow for such opportunities to be realised.	PPS1 (paragraph 27) requires development plans to promote the use of suitably located previously developed land and buildings, in order to seek efficient use of land. The policy provides a degree of flexibility outside the village frameworks of the more relatively sustainable villages, in order to achieve this. Widening this approach to green field sites would be at odds with proposed policy DP/8, and policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10751 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Ltd is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. As a consequence, Policy ET/5 needs amending as follows ;  (amend '2' as follows) "2 Within Northstowe, Hanley Grange and Cambridge East; or .....".	A new settlement at Hanley Grange has not been allocated in the Local Development Framework. A consequential change to this policy is therefore not required.	
9107 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The provisions of the policy are too prescriptive. Small scale B1 uses should also be considered appropriate and supported by the LPA in other locations. Provision should not be excluded in other locations such as local centres etc.	The policy allows for appropriate small scale employment development, which includes B1 uses, within all village frameworks. An amendment to the policy is not required.	
9989 - Bayer CropScience Ltd 10933 - Carter Jonas	Support	Support for policy ET/5.	Support noted.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
8309 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The policy and text fails to adequately define 'small scale employment development'. Although Paragraph 6.16 refers to businesses employing 25 people or less, this does not reflect different uses. For example, a 50,000 sq.ft. warehouse might employ less than 25 people, yet this would be a large development. The Policy is therefore ambiguous and lacks clarity. For the avoidance of doubt there should be reference to floor area.	Agreed. Policy ET/5 is proposed to be amended to include floorspace figures which would provide up to 25 jobs for each of the use classes B1 - B8 based on the English Partnerships publication "Employment densities: a simple guide".	Amend policy ET/5 "New Employment Development in Villages" to read: "Planning permission will be granted at an appropriate scale for new small-scale employment in the B1 - B8 Use Classes provided that the development would contribute to a greater range of local employment opportunities, or facilitate cluster development within village frameworks, and on previously developed sites adjoining or very close to the village frameworks of rural centres or minor rural centres. Small scale employment development in villages is defined as employing no more than 25 people as follows:  1. Offices B1(a): 400 sq.m. 2. High tech/R&D (B1b): 725 sq.m. 3. Light industry (B1c): 800 sq.m. 4. General industry (B2-B7): 850 sq.m. 5. Warehousing (B8): 1250 sq.m."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
2. 8348 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshalls is concerned to see the qualification that it should be for small-scale employment, where employees total 25 people or less. That seems an unnecessary imposition in this new urban quarter.	It is agreed that such a restriction should not apply within urban frameworks. The policy should be revised accordingly.	Amend policy ET/5 "New Employment Development in Villages" to read: "Planning permission will be granted at an appropriate scale for new small-scale employment in the B1 - B8 Use Classes provided that the development would contribute to a greater range of local employment opportunities, or facilitate cluster development within village frameworks, and on previously developed sites adjoining or very close to the village frameworks of rural centres or minor rural centres. Small scale employment development in villages is defined as employing no more than 25 people as follows:  1. Offices B1(a): 400 sq.m. 2. High tech/R&D (B1b): 725 sq.m. 3. Light industry (B1c): 800 sq.m. 4. General industry (B2-B7): 850 sq.m. 5. Warehousing (B8): 1250 sq.m."
8359 - The Marshall Group	Support	Marshall welcomes the identification of Cambridge East at ET/5.2 as an appropriate employment site.	Support noted, although the policy has been modified.	
6.14 7936 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Support	The CLA welcomes the recognition given to small scale employment provision in rural areas. This should extend to farm shops as well as to any commercial or manufacturing businesses.	Support noted. It should be noted that farm shops in the countryside are dealt with under policy SF/6.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<b>6.16</b>				
9658 - GO-East	Object	We suggest that consideration is given to defining small-scale by other means than the numbers of employees that might vary over time and be difficult to establish prior to the business being operational, particularly where a development is proposed that does not have specific end user. An alternative way of defining small-scale is to set floor area thresholds relative to the typical use types. The policy and supporting paragraph 6.16 should be amended to address these matters prior to submission of the DPD.	Agreed. A an amendment to policy ET/5 is proposed which provides a floorspace figure for small scale employment for all of the uses B1 - B8 which would provide for up to 25 jobs to be created by any single development.	Amend paragraph 6.16 to read: "Small scale is defined as the employment of up to 25 people. The actual scale of new employment which would be appropriate in any village will be determined having regard to the size of each village and the amount of locally available employment. 25 jobs is converted into floorspace using the English Partnerships publication 'Employment densities: a simple guide'."
<i>ET/6 Expansion of Existing Firms</i>				
8310 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	Policy ET/6 fails to provide for the expansion of established businesses located in the countryside on sites not included in Policy ET/4. These businesses may be there because of difficulties in finding alternative sites and serve an existing local workforce. In a rural area this could be an important source of local employment. The policy should support the continued success of these businesses, providing that any expansion does not conflict with other policies in the plan.	The policy is consistent with policy DP/8 Village Frameworks, restricting development in the countryside. Any expansion would have to be considered as an exception to policy.	
9668 - GO-East	Object	It is uncertain what constitutes a non-conforming use as it is not defined. It also appears unreasonable to predetermine that an expansion of such a use will not be permissible before the merits of any application are considered. The policy might be better and more positively framed by setting out any additional matters that will be taken into consideration in the determination of applications to expand non-conforming uses. The Council must clarify what matters must be addressed if a non-conforming use is to be permitted.	It is agreed that a definition of non-conforming uses should be included. A further change to the policy is not required, as it correctly only allows expansion in appropriate circumstances.	Add footnote to Policy ET/6. Non-conforming Use - a use which does not conform to the general provisions of the development plan for the area in which it is located, and may have an adverse impact on an area's principal use.
10752 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Ltd is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. As a consequence, Policy ET/6 needs amending as follows; (amend '2' as follows) "2 Within Northstowe, Hanley Grange and Cambridge East; or ....".	A new settlement at Hanley Grange has not been allocated in the Local Development Framework. A consequential change to this policy is therefore not required.	
8349 - The Marshall Group 9991 - Bayer CropScience Ltd 10934 - Carter Jonas	Support	Support for policy ET/6.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
4. 8191 - Lovejoy	Object	<p>Policy ET/6 is supported in principle. However criterion (4) is considered too restrictive and should be revised to "Within, or immediately adjacent to, Established Existing Employment areas in the Countryside listed in Policy ET/4."</p> <p>Hexcel is currently considering the possible development of a new facility on the site. This would necessitate a new process building, and associated development. Initial assessments of possible locations within/ adjacent to the existing operational area indicate that land owned by Hexcel on the west side of the existing site would, in operational terms, be the optimum location for such development, in that development would be linked directly into existing services/ production processes, without involving significant (and expensive) site rearrangement and or redevelopment. Some of this area is currently developed, either with buildings./ structures, or is hard standing / unused rail infrastructure. It would not be possible to accommodate the above scale of development on land in Hexcel's ownership within 'the Established Employment Area in the Countryside' defined on the Proposals Map.</p>	Not accepted. Such a change would have the impact of allowing additional green field land to be developed for employment the countryside, which would be at odds with proposed policy DP/8, and policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i> 8933 - Carisbrooke Alliance	Object	Traditionally, we understand that a firm has had to have had premises in the area for two years to qualify as an "existing" firm. Extending this to five years seems somewhat draconian. Two years is a reasonable period of time.	In order to develop a consistent approach in the Cambridge area, 5 years has been utilised in the policy . this is considered a reasonable time for a firm to be considered as established.	
6.17 9669 - GO-East	Object	Paragraph 6.17 should be expanded to define the terms non-conforming use.	It is agreed that a definition of non-conforming uses should be included.	Add footnote to Policy ET/6. Non-conforming Use - a use which does not conform to the general provisions of the development plan for the area in which it is located, and may have an adverse impact on an area's principal use.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>ET/7 Loss of Rural Employment to Non-Employment Uses</i>				
9984 - Laing Homes North Thames	Object	Whilst we would generally support this policy we would suggest that the Council acknowledge that there are a number of industrial sites within villages which are considered to be non-conforming uses in that they cause noise, pollution or other unacceptable impacts on neighbouring properties or the highway network and therefore the redevelopment of these sites for other uses may be appropriate.	General support for the policy is noted. The existence of sites generating environmental problems is acknowledged in the policy. This policy is proposed to be modified.	
10476 - Balsham (Building) Ltd	Object	Objection is made to the fact that all planning applications for change of use of employment land to non employment uses will have to be accompanied by evidence that the property has been marketed for a period not less than 12 months. There will inevitably be cases where the site of an existing employment use is entirely unsatisfactory on account of its incompatibility with neighbours, vehicular access etc. In such cases, the policy's should be flexible to allow changes of use to occur without the required advertising.	It is agreed that for two of the criteria, the requirement for a 12 month marketing period may not be appropriate.	Amend Policy ET/7 to read: The conversion, change of use or re-development of existing employment sites to non-employment uses within village frameworks should be resisted unless one of the following criteria is met: 1. It is demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use to continue having regard to market demand. Applications [for change of use of premises in, or last occupied by, employment use] will need to be accompanied by documentary evidence that the sites are not suitable or capable of being made suitable for continued employment use. Evidence would be required that the property has been adequately marketed for a period of not less than twelve months on terms that reflect the lawful use and condition of the premises.or 2. The overall benefit to the community of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises; or 3. The existing use is generating environmental problems such as noise, pollution, or unacceptable levels of traffic.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10091 - Bellway Homes	Object	Whilst we understand the logic behind this policy, the Council must acknowledge that there are a number of outmoded industrial sites, which in some instances are environmental eyesores. If this is the case the local planning authority should consider redevelopment to other more appropriate uses. In addition, the 12 month marketing period required is excessive; 6 months would be an adequate period for marketing of a property to show that there is a lack of demand.	The existence of sites generating environmental problems is acknowledged in the policy, however it is acknowledged that the policy could be restructured for clarity, and that marketing of such sites may not be required. A 6 month marketing period is considered too short to fully assess demand for the site.	Amend Policy ET/7 to read:  The conversion, change of use or re-development of existing employment sites to non-employment uses within village frameworks should be resisted unless one of the following criteria is met:  1. <input type="checkbox"/> It is demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use to continue having regard to market demand. Applications [for change of use of premises in, or last occupied by, employment use] will need to be accompanied by documentary evidence that the sites are not suitable or capable of being made suitable for continued employment use. Evidence would be required that the property has been adequately marketed for a period of not less than twelve months on terms that reflect the lawful use and condition of the premises. or  2. <input type="checkbox"/> The overall benefit to the community of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises; or  3. <input type="checkbox"/> The existing use is generating environmental problems such as noise, pollution, or unacceptable levels of traffic.
9994 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support	Support noted, although the policy has been modified.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>ET/8 Conversion Of Rural Buildings For Employment</i>				
9730 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds	Object	The RSPB object to this policy for the conversion of rural buildings for employment because it does not recognise and provide for the protection of wildlife interest which may exist in the buildings where redevelopment is proposed. We recommend that the policy be amended to incorporate specific reference to the need to identify any nature conservation value of the buildings to be redeveloped and that provision must be made within the development to provided alternative habitat for species affected.	Not accepted, issues of biodiversity are dealt with in the Natural Environment chapter of the Development Control Policies DPD, in particular relevant issues are dealt with by policy NE/6. This also requires mitigation measures where appropriate. Additional wording added to this policy would create repetition.	
9999 - Bayer CropScience Ltd 7937 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Support	Support for policy ET/8.	Support noted.	
<i>ET/9 Replacement Buildings In The Countryside</i>				
9673 - GO-East	Object	Policy ET/9 repeats PPS7. PPS12 indicates that development control policies should not duplicate national policy but rather should explain how national policy applies at the local level. Policy ET/9 should either be expanded to indicate what local criteria will be applied to replacement buildings for employment use in the countryside, or if national policy is to be relied on, Policy ET/9 should be deleted with the reference to PPS7 retained in the supporting text (paragraph 6.22).	Agree that the policy reflects PPS7, however the final paragraph is a local consideration, and should remain in the policy.	<p>Amend policy ET/9, including deleting points 1-3:</p> <p>When considering proposals for replacement buildings in the countryside for employment use, any increase in floor area will be strictly controlled, and must be for the benefit of the design, or in order to better integrate the development with its surroundings.</p> <p>[1.□The buildings are not makeshift in nature, and are of permanent, substantial construction;</p> <p>2.□It would bring about an environmental improvement in terms of the impact of the development on its surroundings and the landscape;</p> <p>3.□It would result in a more acceptable and sustainable development than might be achieved through conversion.]</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7938 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	The CLA is very pleased to see this policy which may result in the replacement of some buildings to achieve an enhanced development to benefit the landscape and the wider environment; redevelopment may also result in more sustainable and lower energy buildings - BUT the policy should also provide for the provision of new small scale developments in line with PPS7.	The provision of new employment development in the countryside is addressed by other polices in the plan.	
8311 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Support	Support for the policy is confirmed as this reflects the advice in PPS7.	Support noted, however the policy has been amended.	
<i>ET/10 Farm Diversification</i>				
8314 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The Policy should also allow for schemes that assist in producing additional income for the farming enterprise and where there may be benefit in an activity/business being located in the countryside. For example, making provision for an established small local business employing local people to operate from a farm. These businesses may not necessarily need to be located in the countryside but there may be clear benefits in sustainability terms in providing for this. The policy should acknowledge this.	Policy ET/10 repeats the phrase utilised in policy DP/8, restricting development outside frameworks to those uses which need to be located in the countryside, it is agreed therefore that it is not required in this policy. It can be argued that a variety of uses need to be located in the countryside if they are part of a farm diversification scheme, therefore its continued inclusion in policy DP/8 is sound.	Amend 1st paragraph of policy ET/10: Well conceived farm diversification schemes [involving uses that need to be located in the countryside], where they are directly related to supporting a working farm will be permitted if...'
10000 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support	Support noted, although the policy has been modified.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
9645 - GO-East	Object	Policy ET/10 refers to permissible farm diversification schemes being those, which involve uses 'that need to be located in the countryside'. PPS7 indicates however that local planning authorities should be supportive of business purposes that contribute to sustainable development objectives and help sustain the agricultural enterprise and are consistent in scale with their rural location, a more flexible approach than requiring at the outset that uses in farm diversification schemes are restricted to those that need to be located in the countryside. The policy should be amended to remove reference to the need to be located in the countryside to comply with PPS7.	Policy ET/10 repeats the phrase utilised in policy DP/8, restricting development outside frameworks to those uses which need to be located in the countryside, it is agreed therefore that it is not required in this policy. It can be argued that a variety of uses need to be located in the countryside if they are part of a farm diversification scheme, therefore its continued inclusion in policy DP/8 is sound.	Amend 1st paragraph of policy ET/10: Well conceived farm diversification schemes [involving uses that need to be located in the countryside], where they are directly related to supporting a working farm will be permitted if...'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
9646 - GO-East	Object	The policy also indicates that applications may be supported by a farm plan, but it is uncertain as to when farm plan would be beneficial e.g. in relation to particular types of diversification schemes such as on-site or off-site schemes or the scale of development. The supporting text could be helpfully expanded on to indicate in what circumstances as farm plan should be submitted.	It is agreed that the policy and paragraph could be clarified. As the policy requires farm diversification projects to be directly related to a working farm, it is reasonable to require a farm plan to be submitted to demonstrate this.	Amend last paragraph of policy ET/10: Applications must include a farm plan, to demonstrate how the proposal will support a working farm.'  Replace paragraph 6.25 with: 'It is important that diversification proposals are well founded in terms of effectively contributing to the farm business and the rural economy and integrating new activities into the environment and the rural scene. Farmers are therefore encouraged to submit a farm plan with any planning application for diversification. This should include details of existing farm activities, the need for diversification, details of the proposal and implications of the proposal on, for example, the rural economy and the environment.'
<i>ET/11 Tourism Facilities</i>				
9647 - GO-East	Object	Policy ET/11 is a very general single criteria policy that repeats policy elsewhere in the DPD. It therefore unnecessary and duplicative and should be deleted.	Agree that policy repeats development principles established elsewhere in the plan.	Delete policy ET/11, and consequentially paragraphs 6.26 and 6.27.
10001 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support	Support noted, but policy is proposed to be deleted as it repeats principles established in the development principles.	
<i>ET/12 Tourist Facilities and Visitor Accommodation</i>				
8690 - Houston Crest Properties (UK) Ltd	Object	Policy ET/12 should be recast to the effect that the Local Authority will view proposals for overnight visitor accommodation favourably, subject to an assessment of visual and traffic impact. There should be no mention in the policy of developments only being permissible if they do not involve "significant" extensions. The terms is vague and what may be significant in one case may be wholly insignificant in another.	The aim of the policy is to focus development of visitor accommodation into sustainable locations. It therefore aims to restrict new development in the countryside consistent with policy DP/8 on Village Frameworks. Removing the restriction on the size of replacement buildings would effectively provide potential for any size of building, which could have implications for sustainability, weakening the strategy of the plan. The policy provides sufficient flexibility in the terms it uses for permitting extensions. The size of an extension can be judged on a case by case basis within the limits of the policy. Adding the terms 'and suitable ancillary facility facilities' would not be appropriate, and this would be extremely open to interpretation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10007 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Support - Provided the policy is interpreted positively to facilitate the regeneration of large brownfield sites such as the Bayer CropScience Ltd water treatment plant site	Support noted, although the policy does not refer to the regeneration of large brownfield sites.	
<i>SF/g</i>				
11113 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The objective for protection and enhancement of open space/strategic open space and the creation of connectivity with existing rights of way is supported.	Support noted.	
8992 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	Support this objective. Users of the countryside for informal pleasure, recreation and leisure are often faced with problems caused by a fragmented network, having to make use of motorised routes to connect rights of way into the countryside.	Support noted.	
7884 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	We support very strongly the need for the connectivity of RoW, both between parishes within Cambridgeshire, and also between our adjacent counties. A typical Ramblers Association Saturday group walk, from Audley End Station to Royston [some 12 miles], involves RoW in three counties, and it vital to walkers, whether a more formal group, or as individuals can count on some consistency of signing and maintenance throughout the length of such a walk.	Support noted.	
7882 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	We believe this section ties in closely with GB6, and would merely wish to reinforce our concern that undue emphasis will be given to the high profile capital intensive projects, such as sports hall, tennis courts [whose development we would of course welcome], to the detriment of the less obvious but valuable addition to informal recreation with which we are more concerned.	Support noted. Informal recreation is being addressed across the Cambridge sub region through strategic open space standards. The open space standards detailed in policy SF/13 also include an element of informal open space.	
<i>SF/1 Protection Of Village Services and Facilities</i>				
11114 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	As stated previously, the second matter for consideration in determining loss would carry more weight if the term "High Quality Public Transport" (as defined in Policy P8/6 of the Structure Plan) were substituted for "Good quality Public Transport", which is not defined.	High quality is unlikely to be achieved in many South Cambridgeshire villages, making the test largely unattainable. The term good was used in the Local Transport Plan (LTP), but is not longer in the replacement 'Provisional LTP'. This provided a realistic level of public transport provision to judge proposals against. Structure Plan Policy P8/6 refers to 'good local services'. This can be used as a replacement.	Replace with 'good local services', as used in Structure Plan 2003 Policy P8/6.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7939 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	The CLA is keen to ensure that existing village services are protected and improved for the benefit of local residents and businesses. Reducing services in many villages has a damaging effect on the community and undermines the social and economic aspects of sustainable development. When assessing rural development proposals consideration should be given to the extent to which they will help to sustain existing community services.	It is acknowledged that protection and enhancement of rural services and facilities is important, but it should not be used to permit unsustainable development. It would be unsustainable to allow large developments in most of the smaller villages as it would generate a disproportionate number of additional journeys. It is unclear whether modest developments would be sufficient to support significant gains in local services, with an overall benefit to sustainability. It would also be contrary to policy P1/1 of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan.	
9584	Support	I feel that policy SF/1 is very important in helping to maintain the vitality of villages by opposing the loss of facilities that would cause an unacceptable reduction in the level of community or service provision in the locality.	Support noted.	
9709 - Foxton Parish Council 9421 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy SF/1.	Support noted.	
<i>SF/2 Retail Hierarchy</i>				
10245 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Object	TMLC seek clarification of where local centres fit into the retail hierarchy set out in Policy SF/2.	As the policy states, Rural Centres fulfil the role of local centres, but are not appropriate locations for shopping developments which serve urban areas which are subject to the sequential test.	
10679 - Atkins Property Development Ltd	Object	The hierarchy for retail centres must be based on the amount of existing retail floorspace which currently exists or has planning permission for. Thus, there is a need to reappraise the situation in light of this otherwise a theoretical hierarchy as presently suggested may affect the viability and vitality of existing retail centres.	The retail hierarchy takes account of existing and planned floorspace, as well as the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan, and guidance in PPS6.	
11225 - Cambourne Parish Council	Object	Whilst supporting the bulk of the policies, Cambourne Parish Council is concerned with Policy SF/2 Retail Hierarchy, as it does not reflect the proposed development of Cambourne set out in the Masterplan with the Market Square, High Street. Containing a range of shops and offices these are essential to ensure the sustainability of Cambourne and therefore should be identified within Policy SF/2.	The role of Cambourne in serving a rural catchment area is acknowledged by its status as a Rural Centre. It is not an appropriate location for shopping facilities that serve urban areas, therefore a status higher up the retail hierarchy is not appropriate.	
9168 - English Partnerships	Object	Whilst English Partnerships supports the proposed retail hierarchy for South Cambridgeshire as proposed and welcomes the development of Northstowe as a town centre, English Partnerships feel that significant comparison retail provision could be serviced at Northstowe through future household growth without any diversion of existing trade from key centres such as Cambridge. Retail provision should be allowed to grow based on retail capacity at Northstowe.	Cambridgeshire Structure Plan 2003 policy P9/10 makes clear that there is no further need for major sub-regional shopping provision in the structure plan period. Paragraph 7.4 makes clear that there will be a need for some retail above the size thresholds defining what constitutes major sub-regional shopping provision, in order to support a sustainable new settlement. However Northstowe is not intended to perform a sub regional shopping role. The level of retail permitted should be commensurate with the size of the planned new town, and such issues will be addressed by the Area Action Plan.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8351 - The Marshall Group	Object	The retailing element at Cambridge East should be properly identified as a town centre rather than a district centre, given the scale of development intended for Cambridge East. Town centre designation is compatible and a proper interpretation of Structure Plan policy P3/2, requiring shopping proposals to be of a scale appropriate to the function within the catchment area.	Disagree, Cambridge East is correctly designated as a District Centre. This is due to the location relative to Cambridge City Centre, and the role it will play in retail provision.	
9786 - GO-East 11388 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Object	The retail hierarchy, and supporting information, should be placed on the Core Strategy.	Agree.	Move Policy SF/2, and paragraphs 7.2 to 7.5 to the Core Strategy DPD.
10171 - East of England Regional Assembly	Object	Add a note to the effect that the Draft East of England Plan has a different terminology of the retail hierarchy, but that this is not inconsistent with the application of policy SF/2.	Agree.	Add to end of paragraph 7.2: 'Policy E9 of Draft Regional Spatial Strategy sets out the regional structure of retail centres. Although it uses a different terminology, it is not incompatible with policy SF/2.'
10753 - Jarrow Investments Ltd	Object	In order to accommodate its due share of development in the London / Stansted / Cambridge / Peterborough growth area, a second new settlement will be required. Jarrow Investments Ltd is proposing a second new settlement at Hanley Grange near Hinxton. As a consequence, Policy SF/2 needs amending as follows; (a) (Point 1) "New Towns of Northstowe and Hanley Grange" (b) (4th paragraph) "The new towns of Northstowe and Hanley Grange will also be considered as town centres in the hierarchy".	A new town at Hanley Grange has not been allocated in the Local Development Framework. A consequential change to this policy is therefore not required.	
9711 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy SF/2.	Support noted.	
<b>2.</b>				
11389 - GO-East	Object	In relation to Cambridge East, we also question whether a district centre designation (as defined in Annex A to PPS6) is of sufficient scale relative to the scale of the development overall and its catchment. The Council should give further consideration to this in finalising the designation of the centre for Cambridge East (see also our representation in respect of this issue on the Cambridge East AAP).	The designation of Cambridge East as a District Centre is correct, although it will be a large district centre. This is due to the location relative to Cambridge City Centre, and the role it will play in retail provision.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<b>3.</b>				
8919 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Object	Wm Morrison notes that the retail centre at Cambourne is defined as a Rural Centre (equivalent to a Local Centre) within the retail hierarchy set out at Policy SF/2, as clarified by Policy ST/3. In our client's view the centre should be defined as a District Centre in a similar way to the proposed centre at Cambridge East.	The role of Cambourne in serving a rural catchment area is acknowledged by its status as a Rural Centre, however, it is not an appropriate location for shopping facilities that serve urban areas. Annex A of PPS6 also states that in rural areas large villages may perform the role of a local centre. This definition is appropriate for the location. The need for additional retail development at Cambourne to meet the needs of additional development can be addressed through revisions to the masterplan.	
<i>SF/3 Applications for New Retail Development</i>				
9174 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships notes that national planning policy guidance in PPS6 states that within existing or proposed town centres such as Northstowe, there should be no need to satisfy the test of new retail development set out in paragraphs 1 to 3. Therefore English Partnerships would suggest that the first sentence of the policy is reworded to refer to: 'planning permission for retail development will not be granted outside town centres unless the applicant.'	Policy SF/2 makes clear that Cambridge is at the top of the local retail hierarchy. Given that Northstowe is not intended to perform a sub-regional shopping role, it is correct that development is required to accord to the centres position in the hierarchy, and be of an appropriate scale to the location.	
8995 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	Within existing or proposed town centres, the guidance in PPS6 suggests that there should be no need to satisfy the test of new retail development set out in paragraphs 1 to 3. Accordingly the rewording of the first sentence of the Policy is proposed to refer to 'planning permission for retail development will not be granted outside town centres unless the applicant'. This will address the tests of soundness (iv) and (vii) as set out in para. 4.24 of PPS12 are met.	Policy SF/2 makes clear that Cambridge is at the top of the local retail hierarchy. Given that Northstowe is not intended to perform a sub-regional shopping role, it is correct that development is required to accord to the centres position in the hierarchy, and be of an appropriate scale to the location.	
<b>7.3</b>				
8921 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Object	Paragraph 7.3 of the Development Control Policies DPD asserts that there is no further need for major sub-regional shopping provision in the Cambridge Sub-Region in the period to 2016, other than that granted permission in Cambridge. However, there is no evidence that the Council has completed a retail need assessment to back up this assertion, or to identify what levels of food and non-food retail capacity are likely to arise up to 2016.	The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan Review Retail Study 2001 (CB Hillier Parker) provided an assessment of capacity and need for convenience and comparison shopping over the plan period. Further studies are also required by the Area Action Plans, to explore the type of retail, and the floorspace required, in the major new developments.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>7.4</i>				
8997 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	The town centre should be large enough to create a vital and attractive centre that underpins the new town yet which does not impact on Cambridge. To text might helpfully be clarified accordingly: 'However the District Council does not intend that Northstowe should perform a sub-regional role that has a significant impact on the role of Cambridge'. The proposed amendments would be consistent with the Structure Plan.	Agree.	Add to paragraph 7.4:  'However the District Council does not intend that Northstowe should perform a sub-regional shopping role THAT HAS A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE ROLE OF CAMBRIDGE'.
<i>SF/5 Retailing In Villages</i>				
8923 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Object	Wm Morrison notes that Policy SF/5 stipulates that the size and attraction of retail proposals within villages should be of a scale appropriate to the size of the village. In our client's view the key test when assessing 'scale' is the actual role and function of the retail centre; not simply the size of the settlement.	The role some villages play in providing services to a rural hinterland is acknowledged by designation as rural centres, and to a lesser extent minor rural centres. It is agreed that this should be acknowledged in SF5.	Amend policy SF5 as follows: '...will only be permitted where the size and attraction of the shopping development is of a scale appropriate to the FUNCTION AND size of the village.'
<i>SF/6 Retailing In The Countryside</i>				
9787 - GO-East	Object	The policy is uncertain as to how the term majority is undefined in terms of how it will be determined, for instance, is it based on floor area given over to the sale of the goods or the proportion of income derived from those goods. Clarification on this matter should be included in the supporting text.	Such a consideration can be made on a case by case basis, at the planning application stage. Additional detail in the policy is not required.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
7940 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	While the thrust of this policy for retailing on farms and other properties in the countryside is welcomed, the CLA is concerned that planning conditions should not undermine the viability of schemes by imposing conditions on what may be sold which are too rigid. This is not to request an unrestricted retail policy but viability is a key factor for farm retail schemes, and the requirements of each specific proposal should be given full and individual consideration.	Point 2 in the policy provides a degree of flexibility that may support a farm retail scheme.	
<i>SF/7 Public Art and New Development</i>				
9298 - David Wilson Homes (S Midlands)	Object	The policy to seek between 1-5% of development costs for public art is a nonsense. The expectations should be more realistic.	Disagree, the amount sought reflects the 'percent for art' mechanism, widely applied in Europe and the United States. A higher figure may be appropriate on some applications, for the benefit of a development. The plan makes clear that is will be sought by negotiation, and is not a mandatory requirement.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10068 - House Builders Federation	Object	The policy must make it clear that the Council will seek to negotiate with developers for the provision of, or contributions towards public art, where appropriate, rather than requiring it in all circumstances. Whilst the Council does not actually state that it will require such provision, it is implied in the policy and its reasoned justification.	Disagree. The Plan states in paragraph 7.11 that public art will be sought through negotiation, but is not a mandatory requirement. The policy also states that the council will 'encourage' a contribution, and does not state that it is required in order for an application to be successful. The Council's 'Public Art Guide to Developers', involves a specific process and commissioning mechanisms suited to larger applications. This is the reason why a threshold is included in the policy.	
10254 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University welcomes the approach adopted in Policy SF/7 towards the provision of Public Art whereby contributions will not be mandatory but will be sought through negotiation.	Support noted.	
<i>I.</i>				
10092 - Bellway Homes	Object	Whilst the principle of this policy is supported we consider that the minimum threshold should be 100 dwellings or more before public art contributions are required.	A scheme of 10 dwellings or more is considered an appropriate scale for the implementation of a public art scheme. Having a higher threshold would miss many opportunities to improve the built environment.	
<i>7.11</i>				
11352 - House Builders Federation	Object	The statement in paragraph 7.11 that precise plans and budgets will need to be agreed in association with the District Council's officers prior to planning approval is both inappropriate and worrying. It is not the place of the Council's officers to decide how much should or should not be spent on arts provision. The text needs to be amended in order to reflect this.	Public art has an important role to play in improving the quality of developments. The key to a successful Public Art project is to plan for the involvement of artists at the earliest opportunity in the development process, ensuring that any costs are considered as part of the process. The Council's Public Art policy provides a clear guide as to what is sought, but also sufficient flexibility to deal with a wide variety of developments and circumstances. It provides clarity, making clear what will be sought by negotiation through the development process.	
11410 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	The strategy as indicated in paragraph 7.11 needs to be agreed before commencement of development rather than before planning approval.	The key to a successful Public Art project is to plan for the involvement of artists at the earliest opportunity in the development process, ensuring that any costs are considered as part of the process and that alternatives to a financial contribution are fully explored. The Council's 'Public Art Guide to Developers', makes clear the level of detail that will be sought at the outline planning applications stage, and at the full or reserved matters stage. It is agreed that the third sentence of paragraph 7.11 could be miss leading, therefore an amendment it proposed.	Amend 3rd sentence of paragraph 7.11: 'Plans and budgets will need to be agreed in association with the District Council's officers prior to planning approval, AT A LEVEL APPROPRIATE TO THE TYPE OF APPLICATION.'

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9000 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	A contribution of between 1% and 5% of the total cost of development could appear to be very high. The justification for such a figure cannot be examined through the DPD and ought not to be included, leaving the precise contribution to negotiation, or in due course, further SPD in relation to planning obligations.	The amount sought reflects the 'percent for art' mechanism, widely applied in Europe and the United States. A higher figure than 1 % may be appropriate on some applications, for the benefit of a development. Including an indication of the amounts that will be sought through negotiation provides clarity, as opposed to providing standard purely in supplementary guidance.	
<i>SF/8 Telecommunications</i>				
9788 - GO-East	Object	Policy SF/8 effectively repeats PPG8. PPS12 indicates that development control policies should not duplicate national policy but rather should explain how national policy applies at the local level. Policy SF/8 should either be expanded to indicate what local criteria will be applied to telecommunications apparatus, or if national policy is to be relied on, Policy SF/8 should be deleted with the reference to PPG8 included in the supporting text (paragraphs 7.12 or 7.13).	While PPG8 calls for criteria based policies to be present in local plans, it is acknowledged that the criteria within the policy are covered by national policy. It is therefore proposed that the policy be deleted.	Delete Policy SF/8 delete paragraphs 7.12 and 7.13 and replace with:'PPG8: Telecommunications sets out national policy on telecommunications installations. It includes requirements to consider the design and siting of apparatus and impact on amenity and appearance. It also makes clear that Local planning authorities may reasonably expect applicants for new masts to show evidence that they have explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure.'
<i>3.</i>				
9789 - GO-East	Object	It is also noted that criterion 3 relates to radio masts in terms of demonstration that alternative sites or locating on existing structures have been explored, however, PPG8 indicates that this a material consideration in relation to mobile phone masts as well. We are therefore unsure whether the specificity of the application of the criterion was intentional or whether it was intended to apply to other telecommunications masts other than just radio masts.	Policy is proposed to be deleted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>SF/9 Underground Pipes, Wires, Fibres And Cables</i>				
9791 - GO-East	Object	Policy SF/9 indicates that the Council will strongly urge utility companies to place utilities e.g. wires and cable underground. However, the mechanism of how this will be achieved is not clear and accordingly the policy is more a statement of intent and aspirational in nature. The policy could be amended so as to expand on the specific circumstances where under grounding of cables or wires is of importance such as in a conservation area or an area where existing services are underground. A stronger emphasis should also be placed in the text on the mechanism that will be used to deliver the undergrounding of services such as the Council's comments on proposals or any alternative mechanisms.	The Council is concerned about the impact of the proliferation the utility companies services on the built and natural environment regardless of whether they are located within Conservation Areas. The Council recognises that it cannot require the utility companies to underground their services in all instances but nevertheless considers that this policy is appropriate.	Amend policy SF/9 "Underground Pipes, Wires, Fibres and Cables" to read:  "Utility companies will be strongly urged to place all pipes, fibres, wires and cables underground where this would not damage identified areas of ecological or archaeological importance or have other unacceptable environmental impacts (e.g. on the landscape or agricultural land quality). In such circumstances, careful line routing would usually be the most appropriate way to minimise the visual impacts of overhead wires and cables.  In view of the substantial practical, technical and cost disadvantages involved, the under-grounding of high voltage power lines (275kV and above) will only be sought in exceptional circumstances. Underground services can be damaging to the water environment and advice should be sought from the Environment Agency on any mitigation measures.
9712 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy SF/9.	Support noted.	
<i>SF/10 Lord's Bridge Radio Telescope</i>				
10260 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge (Proposed Enlarged Lordsbridge Consultation Area)	Object	The boundary of the consultation area does not however reflect that previously requested and the University would wish to see the boundary extended. A Plan showing the boundary of the consultation area required is in course of preparation and will be forwarded under a separate cover.	The goal of the policy is to seek to protect the radio telescope. If there is potential from interference from a wider area the university should be consulted, as required by Structure Plan paragraph 9.56.	Extend the boundary of the Lords Bridge Consultation Area.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10258 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University supports the proposed safeguarding policy for the Mullard Radio Astronomy Observatory at Lords Bridge (Policy SF/10). This will ensure that developments that potentially could cause interference and which would disrupt the work of the Observatory will be refused unless the interference caused and the potential harm to the Observatory could be overcome by the use of conditions or planning obligations. The boundary of the 'restricted' area shown on the Proposals Map is correct.	Support noted.	
<i>SF/11 Protection of Existing Recreation Areas</i>				
9348 - Sport England East 9422 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Policy SF11 is supported as it provides for the protection of existing recreation areas which accords with Government guidance in PPG17 and Sport England's planning policies.	Support noted, although policy has been modified.	
<i>1.</i>				
9349 - Sport England East	Object	Objection is made to criterion 1 because this no longer accords with Government guidance in PPG17.	Accept.	Delete point 1 of the policy.
<i>3.</i>				
9008 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	The policy approach is supported although the wording is unnecessarily restrictive. For a greater degree of consistency with PPG17 (para 12), and to address the test of soundness (iv) outlined in PPS12 and the circumstances that may well apply in larger developments, we recommend the following amendment: 'the proposed development includes provision for the open space, sports and recreation facilities of sufficient benefit to outweigh the loss'.	It is acknowledged that the wording should be clarified to include other recreational uses as well as purely sport.	Modify point 3 of the policy to read: 'The proposed development [is for an outdoor or indoor sports facility] INCLUDES PROVISION FOR OPEN SPACE, SPORTS AND RECREATION FACILITIES of sufficient benefit to RECREATION PROVISION to outweigh the loss.'
<i>4.</i>				
9350 - Sport England East	Object	Objection is made to criterion 4 because reference needs to be made to an excess of provision in both quantitative and qualitative terms being demonstrated in order to avoid ambiguity.	Accept.	Amend point 4 of the policy to read: 'An excess of provision IN QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE TERMS is clearly demonstrated.'
9012 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	This section of the policy is broadly consistent with PPG17, but not entirely so. To ensure better compliance with PPG17 and therefore to meet the test of soundness (iv) as set out in para 4.24 of PPS12 the following or similar rewording is suggested: 'Following assessment, the facility is surplus to requirements, having regard to all the functions that it can perform and to appropriate consultation.'	Not accepted. Paragraph 1 of PPG17 makes clear that Local Authorities should take account of the future needs of communities. Therefore if it is clearly established that potential future demand will mean a space is not surplus to requirements, it should be taken into account in planning decisions.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>7.17</i>				
8426 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Support	The Papworth Everard Parish Council response to the November 2004 LDF consultation included three factual corrections to the Recreation Study entries/map re Outdoor Play Space. e.g. the large Jubilee Green in the centre of the village that is used as outdoor play space was omitted from your original draft. As this draft does not contain such updates we wish to receive confirmation that the information provided has been incorporated in relevant documents and maps of the village.	This representation does not relate to the Development Control Policies DPD, and the Recreation study is not currently the subject of consultation. Following representations on the consultation draft Recreation Study in 2004, changes were made for the Recreation Study 2005. The Jubilee Green was added as informal play space to the Papworth Everard map, and two other changes were also made. It is acknowledged that further updates will need to be made, particularly in villages undergoing significant changes like Papworth Everard.	
<i>SF/12 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, and New Developments</i>				
9351 - Sport England East	Object	Policy SF/12 is objected to on the following grounds - Lack of detail of how the policy will be implemented in practice. The policy and reasoned justification should be amended to address these issues.	The Recreation and Community Supplementary Planning Document referred to in paragraph 7.21 will include details of implementation of the outdoor play space and new developments policy. It will provide details of costings and the levels of contribution required, and the quality standards required to be met by on-site provision. This reflects the requirements of planning circular 05/2005. However, it is agreed that paragraph 7.21 should be reworded for clarification.	Delete paragraph 7.21 and replace with: 'A Recreation and Community Supplementary Planning Document will detail mechanisms for implementation, including costings, and further details on standards for quantity and quality of provision.'
8999 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Object	Object to the omission of equestrian based sports. Every village in S Cambs has an equestrian population but communal facilities such as all weather surfaces, jumping arenas, hunter trial courses etc are few and far between and travel to the existing facilities requires a journey by horse box. Each village should have at least a 20m x 40m all weather riding arena.	It would be inappropriate to require all developments to provide a contribution towards equestrian facilities.	
9353 - Sport England East	Object	Policy SF/12 is objected to on the following grounds - the policy only applies to outdoor sports facilities, no reference is made to built sports facilities. The policy and reasoned justification should be amended to address these issues.	Built facilities can be addressed under Policy DP/4, on a site specific basis. They are being specifically addressed through the area actions plans, which seek appropriate provision for new communities, which are of a scale to provide them directly.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10072 - House Builders Federation	Object	In the case of very small developments the vast majority of the overall open space requirement, apart from perhaps amenity open space, would be expected to be provided off-site or via contributions in lieu of direct provision. Applying the requirement to all development is not a satisfactory way forward, regardless of the nature of existing open space provision. Instead it should only be applied to developments over a certain threshold. The policy should, therefore be amended so that it only applies to developments of 10 or more dwellings (net gain).	Disagree. Recreation facilities are required to meet the needs of new development where there is inadequate provision in terms of quantity and quality of open space. The South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study has demonstrated that there is under provision in terms of quantity and quality of all types of outdoor play space in the vast majority of villages. Therefore improvements will be needed as a direct result of a development, to meet its residents needs. The scale of the requirement (set by the proposed standards, and detailed in a supplementary planning document) will relate directly in scale and kind to the development, whether this is 1 dwelling or 100. The impact of cumulative development was explored in the South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study, making clear that growth created by smaller developments in the villages has had an impact on the level of village provision, and would continue to diminish provision without action. This new system will create clarity, and speed up the planning application process, consistent with Planning Circular 05/2005. The nature of the district, split into the geographical units of villages and parishes, provide a mechanism to ensure funding is utilised on facilities related to the development. The policy of pooling funding is also consistent with paragraphs B21 - B24 of Circular 05/2005. The mechanisms for implementation will be further developed through preparation of a supplementary planning document.	
9352 - Sport England East	Object	Policy SF/12 is objected to on the following grounds - the policy would only appear to apply to residential developments. The policy and reasoned justification should be amended to address these issues.	PPG17 companion guide advocates assessments based on population, and are not employment based. Where appropriate new employment development will be required to undertake landscaping schemes and amenity space for the benefit of employees.	
9423 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
10130 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to the requirement in Policy SF/12 that schemes including one or more new dwellings should contribute towards Outdoor Playing Space and Informal Open Space. The need for such provision should be applied on a site by site basis. Contributions should only made where there are insufficient levels of Play and Open Space which can reasonably be accessed from the site. This accords with PPG 3 which states that: "new housing developments should incorporate sufficient provision where such spaces are not already adequately provided within easy access of the new housing."	Disagree. Recreation facilities are required to meet the needs of new development where there is inadequate provision in terms of quantity and quality of open space. The South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study has demonstrated that there is under provision in terms of quantity and quality of all types of outdoor play space in the vast majority of villages. Therefore improvements will be needed as a direct result of a development, to meet its residents needs, and existing provision has been fully examined. The scale of the requirement (set by the proposed standards, and detailed in a supplementary planning document) will relate directly in scale and kind to the development, whether this is 1 dwelling or 100. This new system will create clarity, and speed up the planning application process, consistent with Planning Circular 05/2005.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 3</i>				
10094 - Bellway Homes	Object	The threshold of 10 dwellings generating full open space provision is too low, given that other obligations may well come into play within the site. It also makes no reference to the level of existing provision and whether any further space is even necessary. Therefore this issue should be dealt with on a site-by-site basis on individual merits.	The reference to 10 dwellings relates purely to on site provision, setting a scale where it is reasonable for a play space to be expected to be provided on site. Recreation facilities are required to meet the needs of new development where there is inadequate provision in terms of quantity and quality of open space. The South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study has demonstrated that there is under provision in terms of quantity and quality of all types of outdoor play space in the vast majority of villages. Therefore improvements will be needed as a direct result of a development, to meet its residents needs, and existing provision has been fully examined. The scale of the requirement (set by the proposed standards, and detailed in a supplementary planning document) will relate directly in scale and kind to the development, whether this is 1 dwelling or 100. This new system will create clarity, and speed up the planning application process, consistent with Planning Circular 05/2005.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 4</i>				
9016 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	The final two paragraphs prescribe unnecessary detail regarding financial arrangements for constructing recreational facilities which should be deleted. Such detail is more appropriate to the Recreation and Community SPD. Details relating to the provision of recreational facilities should be negotiated on a site by site basis. The proposed deletion would address the test of soundness (ix) as outlined in para. 4.24 of PPS12.	Paragraph B.25 of Circular 05/2005 states 'local planning authorities should include in their Development Plan Documents general policies about the principles and use of planning obligations - i.e. matters to be covered by planning obligations and factors to be taken into account when considering the scale and form of contributions.' This the final two paragraphs of this policy are concerned with the scale and form of contributions, and therefore should remain in the DPD.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 5</i>				
10576	Object	The section of the policy in respect of commuted sums does not accord with para. B.19 of Circular 05/05 and should be deleted.	It is acknowledged that circular 05/05 makes clear that there are the circumstances where types of costs can be sought, and it depends on the nature of the facility. Further detail can be provided in a supplementary planning document.	Delete 4th Paragraph of policy SF/12 and replace with:  'DEPENDING ON THE NATURE OF PROVISION, CONTRIBUTIONS MAY ALSO BE REQUIRED TO MEET MAINTENANCE AND / OR OPERATING COSTS EITHER AS PUMP PRIMING OR IN PERPETUITY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT.'
9443 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	The final two paragraphs prescribe unnecessary detail regarding financial arrangements for constructing recreational facilities which should be deleted. Such detail is more appropriate to the Recreation and Community SPD. Details relating to the provision of recreational facilities should be negotiated on a site by site basis. The proposed deletion would address the test of soundness (ix) as outlined in para. 4.24 of PPS12.	Delete 4th Paragraph of policy SF/12 and replace with:  'DEPENDING ON THE NATURE OF PROVISION, CONTRIBUTIONS MAY ALSO BE REQUIRED TO MEET MAINTENANCE AND / OR OPERATING COSTS EITHER AS PUMP PRIMING OR IN PERPETUITY, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT.'	
<i>SF/13 Open Space Standards</i>				
8316 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The higher standard of open space provision in excess of the established '6 acre per 1,000' standard is not justified. In assessing the requirement for open space provision regard needs to be given to the existing level of provision and the proximity to existing facilities. The Policy should therefore incorporate additional words along the lines that open space provision will take account of existing facilities.	PPG17 advocates that standards should be set locally, based on audits and assessments of need. The South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study indicated that a standard higher than the NPFA standard was appropriate. The NPFA standard also did not include informal open space. This is a new requirement which recognises the importance of informal recreation to quality of life. Recreation facilities are required to meet the needs of new development where there is inadequate provision in terms of quantity and quality of open space. The South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study has demonstrated that there is under provision in terms of quantity and quality of all types of outdoor play space in the vast majority of villages. Therefore improvements will be needed as a direct result of a development, to meet its residents needs, and existing provision has been fully examined.	
9019 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	SF/13 is a standard. There is no need for the use of the phrase 'minimum standard'. The word 'minimum' should be deleted.	Disagree. The standard is a minimum. Higher standards of some or all of types of open space may be appropriate for certain developments.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10131 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview object to the setting of open space standards in Policy SF/13. According to PPG3, local authorities should avoid the inefficient use of land. Notably, paragraph 57 states that: "Policies which place unduly restrictive ceilings on the amount of housing that can be accommodated on a site, irrespective of its location and the type of housing envisaged or the types of households likely to occupy the housing, should be avoided". Different levels of provision of open space may be appropriate in different areas. In this way, the provision of open space should be based on local circumstances giving consideration to a range of issues, including the efficient use of land as stated in PPG3.	PPG17 requires locally derived standards to be included in development plans. The South Cambridgeshire Recreation Study explored provision and need both quantitative and qualitative in the District to create standards. It demonstrates under provision of playspace in terms of quantity or quality across the vast majority of villages. Therefore improvements will be needed as a direct result of a development, to meet its residents needs, and existing provision has been fully examined. Local circumstances will still play a key role in determining how the needs of the development can best be met, for example, deciding between on site and off site provision of certain types of space, and off site improvements that can best contribute to meeting the needs of the development. This will be further explored through a Supplementary Planning Document.	
8106 - Comberton Parish Council	Support	Comberton Parish Council wish to give strong support and endorsement of Specific policy SF/13, which specifies how to calculate the amounts of outdoor play space needed by a village.	Support noted.	
7886 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	We recognise the importance of developing Standards and measures of Open Spaces requirements. We also recognise the lack of precision which can be applied to RoW compared to other facilities, and fear that the less obviously measurable will lose out to the apparently measurable. For instance the report suggests that the new development at Northstowe will have a population to justify 1.9 sports halls!	Although the policy sets a minimum standard for open space provision, it would be inappropriate to set a standard for length of rights of way. The plan does seek improvements, particularly relating to the major developments. DP/2 design of new developments policy also requires developments to link to the existing footpath network.	
9360 - Sport England East	Support	This policy is supported as this provides a basis for ensuring that adequate outdoor sports facility provision is made in new development. Furthermore, as the standard proposed for outdoor sport (1.6 ha per 1000 people) is locally derived and based on the assessment of local need that has been undertaken through the Council's Recreation Study, I consider that the standards are robust and would accord with the guidance in paragraphs 6-8 of PPG17.	Support noted.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
8353 - The Marshall Group	Object	Marshall objects to the minimum of 2.8 hectares per thousand people. At Cambridge East it proposes a hierarchy of open space which, whilst meeting the overall standard, has a different mix of space. Submitted separately to inform this objection is a report prepared by LDA Design, which addresses this point.	The Cambridge East Area Action Plan proposes that in Cambridge East the Cambridge City Council minimum open space standards. Any scheme proposed will need to be assessed to examine whether it meets the needs of the development.	

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>1.</i> 9005 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Object	Object to the omission of equestrian based sports. Every village should have at least a 20m x 40m all weather riding arena.	It would be inappropriate to require all developments to provide a contribution towards equestrian facilities.	

---

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*Councils' Assessment*

*Change to Draft DPD*

---

7.23

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11119 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>This section needs to be updated to reflect the revised definitions etc for Strategic Open Space (SOS).</p> <p>Suggest the following wording for paragraph 7.23 and 7.24 (see separate representation for revised wording to 7.24) and also that a policy be introduced for SOS.</p> <p>POLICY SF/14 Strategic Open Space The District will seek to provide Strategic Open Space to the standard of 5.1ha per 1000 people.</p> <p>7.23 □ The County and District Councils have developed the concept of Strategic Open Space (SOS). SOS provides more than a local function and spaces are generally larger, more varied, and provide a different visitor experience to village open spaces.</p> <p>Strategic Open Space is defined as: Parks, gardens and areas of natural and semi-natural greenspace that provide opportunities for informal recreation and public access, are greater than 25ha in extent (exc. woodland* and open water) and fulfil five or more of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-fulfil structure plan and/or local development objectives</li> <li>-contribute to large-scale public access schemes</li> <li>-contain a network of linear access routes</li> <li>-provide free and open access across the site</li> <li>-are secured for or have a right of public use in perpetuity</li> <li>-have a status or an intent to allow public access</li> <li>-the provision of facilities that assist public access □</li> <li>-meet Local Biodiversity Action Plan targets</li> </ul> <p>*Given the nature of Cambridgeshire and the lack of woodland in the County, publicly accessible woodland under 25ha that meets five of the above criteria and which lies within enhancement areas where the total amount of woodland exceeds 25ha should be included as it is strategically and environmentally important.</p>	<p>At the time of the Pre-Submission Public Participation draft DPD, work was still being undertaken by the County Council on a standard for strategic open space. This has subsequently been completed.</p> <p>It is correct that a standard is included in the submission DPD, with more detailed information on its implementation contained in a supplementary planning document. This will support a consistent approach across the Cambridge Sub-region.</p>	<p>Add to first paragraph of Policy SF/12 Outdoor Playspace, Informal Open Space, STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE, and New Developments:</p> <p>Schemes including one or more new dwellings will be required to contribute towards Outdoor Playing Space (including children's play and formal sports facilities) [and], Informal Open Space, AND STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE to meet the additional need generated by the development.</p> <p>Add to policy SF/13:</p> <p>STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE - 5.1HA PER 1000 PEOPLE</p> <p>Add note to Policy SF/13:</p> <p>STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE IS DEFINED AS: PARKS, GARDENS AND AREAS OF NATURAL AND SEMI-NATURAL GREENSPACE THAT PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INFORMAL RECREATION AND PUBLIC ACCESS, ARE GREATER THAN 25HA IN EXTENT (EXC. WOODLAND* AND OPEN WATER) AND FULFIL FIVE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-FULFIL STRUCTURE PLAN AND/OR LOCAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES</li> <li>-CONTRIBUTE TO LARGE-SCALE PUBLIC ACCESS SCHEMES</li> <li>-CONTAIN A NETWORK OF LINEAR ACCESS ROUTES</li> <li>-PROVIDE FREE AND OPEN ACCESS ACROSS THE SITE</li> <li>-ARE SECURED FOR OR HAVE A RIGHT OF PUBLIC USE IN PERPETUITY</li> <li>-HAVE A STATUS OR AN INTENT TO</li> </ul>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
				<p>ALLOW PUBLIC ACCESS -THE PROVISION OF FACILITIES THAT ASSIST PUBLIC ACCESS -MEET LOCAL BIODIVERSITY ACTION PLAN TARGETS</p> <p>*GIVEN THE NATURE OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND THE LACK OF WOODLAND IN THE COUNTY, PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE WOODLAND UNDER 25HA THAT MEETS FIVE OF THE ABOVE CRITERIA AND WHICH LIES WITHIN ENHANCEMENT AREAS WHERE THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF WOODLAND EXCEEDS 25HA SHOULD BE INCLUDED AS IT IS STRATEGICALLY AND ENVIRONMENTALLY IMPORTANT.'</p> <p>Delete paragraph 7.23 and replace with:</p> <p>THE COUNTY AND DISTRICT COUNCILS HAVE DEVELOPED THE CONCEPT OF STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE (SOS). SOS PROVIDES MORE THAN A LOCAL FUNCTION AND SPACES ARE GENERALLY LARGER, MORE VARIED, AND PROVIDE A DIFFERENT VISITOR EXPERIENCE TO VILLAGE OPEN SPACES.</p>
9186 - English Partnerships	Object	Form and function of open space should relate to the needs of the development. Whilst welcoming the position outlined in paragraphs 7.23 and 7.24, English Partnerships feels that the matter should be considered as a separate policy, which states that in considering the form and use of open space, regard will be had to the communities that it serves and its long-term sustainable use regarding management and function.	A policy is proposed which sets a standard for provision of Strategic open space, and further details on its implementation will be provided in supplementary planning documents. The standard reflects the needs of development, based on an assessment of existing provision and need.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10012 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	Contributions towards strategic open space should not be required unless there is a proven shortage in the vicinity established by a needs assessment and a direct link can be determined with the development. Any thing else is contrary to Circular 05/2005.	Cambridgeshire County Council have undertaken research on the provision and need for additional strategic open space in Cambridgeshire, and developed a standard accordingly. Due to the nature of existing provision, additional development would require additional provision to meet its needs, as existing provision meets the standard for the current population.	
<i>7.24</i>				
11121 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>This section needs to be updated to reflect the revised definitions etc for Strategic Open Space (SOS).</p> <p>Suggest the following wording for paragraph 7.23 (revised wording for 7.23 shown in separate representation) and 7.24 and also that a policy be introduced for SOS.</p> <p>POLICY SF/14 Strategic Open SpaceThe District will seek to provide Strategic Open Space to the standard of 5.1ha per 1000 people.</p> <p>7.24 A standard for the provision of SOS has also been developed. This will be used to ensure that new developments provide or contribute to appropriate levels of Strategic Open Space. There is also a need to deal with existing shortfalls for the current population in terms of quality, accessibility and quantity. The standard for Strategic Open Space is 5.1ha of Strategic Open Space per 1000 people. This should be provided within 5 miles of people's homes and be accessible by means other than just by car. Further specific details on Strategic Open Space will be provided in Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> <p>This standard should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-maintained in existing settlements;</li> <li>-provided for existing settlements that do not have access to SOS at the standard and;provided for new settlements. Provision may involve the creation of new sites, or the improvement of existing sites (including access provision).</li> </ul>	Accept that paragraph 7.24 should be redrafted to reflect the proposed standard.	<p>Delete paragraph 7.24 and replace with:</p> <p>A STANDARD FOR THE PROVISION OF SOS HAS ALSO BEEN DEVELOPED. THIS WILL BE USED TO ENSURE THAT NEW DEVELOPMENTS PROVIDE OR CONTRIBUTE TO APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE. THERE IS CURRENTLY A SHORTFALL IN TERMS OF QUALITY, ACCESSIBILITY AND QUANTITY. THE STANDARD FOR STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE IS 5.1HA OF STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE PER 1000 PEOPLE. THIS SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITHIN 5 MILES OF PEOPLE'S HOMES AND BE ACCESSIBLE BY MEANS OTHER THAN JUST BY CAR. PROVISION MAY INVOLVE THE CREATION OF NEW SITES, OR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING SITES (INCLUDING ACCESS PROVISION). FURTHER SPECIFIC DETAILS ON STRATEGIC OPEN SPACE WILL BE PROVIDED IN SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS.</p>
9022 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	The requirement for contributions towards the provision of strategic open space is not founded upon a robust and credible evidence base.	<p>Studies undertaken by the county council have been used to develop an appropriate strategic open space standard. This includes an audit of existing provision, surveys of existing users, and development of an appropriate formula.</p> <p>Where the needs of a development cannot be met by existing facilities, it should be required to meet the need it creates. This is the approach being developed by the standard.</p>	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8944 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports the recognition of the need for provision of Strategic Open Spaces, not only to meet future needs but also to make up for an historical deficit in provision.	Support for use of strategic open space standards noted.	
11134 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support the provision of open space standards.	Support for use of strategic open space standards noted.	
9884 - Cambridge Preservation Society	Support	Support the further work on creating strategic open spaces. However at this stage we feel the following is essential to be included in this paragraph: With the existing three strategic open spaces (Wandlebury Country Park / the Magog Down, Milton Country Park and the Coton Countryside Reserve) and two planned country parks at Trumpington /Cambridge South and Teversham / Cambridge East there is a clear lack of strategic open space to the north of Cambridge and in particular an appropriate strategic opens space provision should be included between Girton, Milton and north Cambridge's urban extensions and to either side of the A14.	Support noted, however, a change to the DPD is not required. The Strategic Open space Study provides details of existing spaces, and the locations for additional spaces have been addressed through the Area Action Plans.	
<i>SF/14 The River Cam</i>				
11130 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Ignores the fact that public rights of way are often the only way of accessing these important waterways - this should be reflected in 7.25. Suggest change to: "and the need to protect their setting and the associated public rights of access to them"	Agree.	Amend paragraph 7.25:'Due to the sensitive environment, the need to protect their setting, AND THE ASSOCIATED PUBLIC RIGHTS OF ACCESS, the policy strictly limits further development.'
11124 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Noted that this policy strictly limits further development on the River Cam, notwithstanding that Policy P4/4 of the Structure Plan refers to "strategies for the enhancement of the recreation and the tourism potential" of the River Cam and Great Ouse.	Agreed. However, the landscape character and importance of the Cam corridor for all public users of the river and its margins mean that further marina development and boatyards must continue to be limited.	Amend policy SF/14 The River Cam to read: "The District Council will only permit extensions to the curtilage of existing marinas or boat yards, or new marinas and boat yards if development would not have an adverse impact on the landscape and character of the River Cam corridor."
7805 - The camToo Project	Support	The camToo flood relief channel will form such a cut and provide up to an extra mile of bank space for mooring of which one third would be on the existing river. This would represent a doubling of the mooring opportunities in Cambridge	Neither the County Council or District Council have made a commitment to the CamToo project. It would be inappropriate to include proposals in a policy in the LDF.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>7.25</i>				
7806 - The camToo Project	Object	the following should be added "except for the construction of the camToo flood relief channel which will be needed to accommodate the 30% increase in rowing that will result from the planned 30% increase in student numbers at Cambridge University and 30% increase in population if the major housing developments proposed in the LDF take place (currently 15% students row plus 1% of the non academic population)"	Neither the County Council or District Council have made a commitment to the CamToo project. It would be inappropriate to include proposals in a policy in the LDF.	
11132 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Ignores the fact that public rights of way are often the only way of accessing these important waterways - this should be reflected in 7.25. Suggest change to: "and the need to protect their setting and the associated public rights of access to them"	Agree.	Amend paragraph 7.25:Due to the sensitive environment, the need to protect their setting, AND THE ASSOCIATED PUBLIC RIGHTS OF ACCESS, the policy strictly limits further development.'
<i>Objectives</i>				
10959 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	In general would comment that whilst LDF has certainly attempted to pick up on some of the aspects of countryside access covered in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan, there is still little express inclusion of policies to protect and improve public rights of way network corresponding to the Structure Plan policies P8/9 and P4/2.	Policies TR/1 and TR/4 require adequate provision for non-car modes, including walking and cycling, and ensures that the rights of way network is not undermined. The Area Action Plans for the major development sites also require provision as an integral part of the development. The policies in the LDF will be read together, so there is no need to duplicate policies.	
11137 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Strongly welcome inclusion of climate change adaptation and mitigation.	Support noted.	
<i>NE/f</i>				
8227	Support	It is important that new and replacement street lights should be of the full cut-off design, to ensure that all light is directed downwards onto the area required and none is allowed to leak upwards, horizontally, or close to the horizontal. This is to prevent waste of energy and light pollution of the night sky.	Support noted.	
<i>NE/1 Energy Efficiency</i>				
9193 - English Partnerships	Object	English Partnerships encourages the LPA to consider additional BREEAM and NHER standards, particularly with regard to Northstowe.	Policy NE/1 does not preclude the achievement of a higher environmental standard. It is not appropriate to require through planning permission a standard beyond Building Regulations. In recognition of the opportunities at Northstowe, Policy NS/26 in the Northstowe Area Action Plan requires the provision of exemplar projects in sustainable development, including energy efficient measures.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8355 - The Marshall Group	Object	Buildings Regulations, as opposed to planning policy, should be used to secure the desired levels of energy efficiency.	The Building Regulations set out the minimum requirements and Policy NE/1 encourages developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above the minimum. This accords with the approach in the emerging RSS14 and reflects the Council's own commitment to the Nottingham Declaration on climate change.	
9749 - GO-East	Object	We consider that this policy contains matters that are beyond the scope of planning by virtue of not constituting development under the Act and are matters that would be dealt with through Building Regulations. Any matters that are beyond the scope of planning should be deleted from the policy. Where those matters are related to the overall objective of the policy but delivered through an alternative mechanism, those matters and how they will be implemented could be set out in the supporting text.	Draft RSS 14 Policy ENV8 requires "developers to maximize energy efficiencies...and encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards that exceed the minimum standards." This reflects Government commitments to reducing CO2 in accordance with the Kyoto Protocol. The Building Regulations set out the minimum requirements and Policy NE/1 encourages developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above the minimum. This accords with the approach in the emerging RSS14 and reflects the Council's own commitment to the Nottingham Declaration on climate change.	
10017 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	These policies are not yet based on formal government or RSS or other adopted policy guidance and should be adjusted in due course to ensure consistency.	Draft RSS 14 Policy ENV8 requires "developers to maximize energy efficiencies...and encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards that exceed the minimum standards." This reflects Government commitments to reducing CO2 in accordance with the Kyoto Protocol. The Building Regulations set out the minimum requirements and Policy NE/1 encourages developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above the minimum. This accords with the approach in the emerging RSS14 and reflects the Council's own commitment to the Nottingham Declaration on climate change.	
11144 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Why "encouraged"? What is the incentive for a developer to actually fulfil this policy? Should there be a requirement to provide reasons why this has not been achieved?	It is not appropriate to require through planning permission a standard beyond Building Regulations, therefore the policy can only encourage developers to further reduce levels of CO2.	
10077 - House Builders Federation	Object	The HBF strongly objects to the Council's policy which in reality seeks to alter nationally set Building Requirements (by 10%) to different local standards which would be more onerous upon developers. It would clearly be inappropriate for individual Local Authorities to seek to disregard national Regulations and replace them with something that is different which may well be incapable of being met. Furthermore, national guidance in PPS1 and PPS12 is clear that planning should not seek to deal with matters that are instead the responsibility of other legislative regimes.	Draft RSS 14 Policy ENV8 requires "developers to maximize energy efficiencies...and encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards that exceed the minimum standards." This reflects Government commitments to reducing CO2 in accordance with the Kyoto Protocol. The Building Regulations set out the minimum requirements and Policy NE/1 encourages developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above the minimum. This accords with the approach in the emerging RSS14 and reflects the Council's own commitment to the Nottingham Declaration on climate change.	
11060 - Environment Agency	Support	The policy to incorporate energy efficiency measures in new developments is supported.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
9030 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	There is not the evidence base to support the proposed approach or a realistic expectation regarding the implementation of the policy in terms of feasibility. The last paragraph of Policy NE/1 should therefore be deleted.	Draft RSS 14 Policy ENV8 requires "developers to maximize energy efficiencies...and encourage developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards that exceed the minimum standards." This reflects Government commitments to reducing CO2 in accordance with the Kyoto Protocol. The Building Regulations set out the minimum requirements and Policy NE/1 encourages developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above the minimum. This accords with the approach in the emerging RSS14 and reflects the Council's own commitment to the Nottingham Declaration on climate change.	
10132 - Fairview New Homes	Object	It has yet to be demonstrated that the end purchasers pay higher prices for houses as a result of the provision of a number of energy initiatives sought within the document, and as such the cost is currently borne by the developer. Such requirements potentially affect the viability of delivering development in the District and meeting primary objectives such as meeting housing targets, particularly sites which were bought some time ago, in advance of energy policies. As such Fairview object to the following requirements. □ Fairview object to Policy NE/1 paragraph 2 which seeks a reduction in the amount of Carbon Dioxide emitted by 10% compared to the minimum Building Regulation requirement and paragraph 3 of the same Policy which requires the inclusion of technology for renewable energy to provide at least 10% of its predicted energy requirements.	The Building Regulations set out the minimum requirements and Policy NE/1 encourages developers to strive to achieve energy efficiency standards above the minimum. This accords with the approach in the emerging RSS14 and reflects the Council's own commitment to the Nottingham Declaration on climate change.	
<i>NE/2 Renewable Energy</i>				
10174 - East of England Regional Assembly	Object	Support intention of policy but request that the detailed wording of the renewable energy policy is revised, as it requires in all cases a connection to the national grid (this may not always be appropriate). This is not consistent with text in paragraph 8.12 which does allow an exemption.	All energy generation is required to be connected to the national grid to ensure there are no fluctuations in supply and demand, and prevent the developments receiving the electricity to be restricted in being served by one energy supply company. Paragraph 8.12 explains this, but the reference to "the most flexible approach" could be misinterpreted to mean that it does not have to be connected to the national grid. Paragraph 8.12 should be made clearer by deletion of "the most flexible approach".	Amend the first sentence of paragraph 8.12 to read: "Electricity generation from renewable sources will be directed into the national grid where it could help smooth out fluctuations in supply and demand; it would also not require the developments receiving the electricity to be limited to a single energy supply company."
11061 - Environment Agency	Support	We support the policy to enable renewable energy to be generated within the district (subject to the development principles stated).	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
7941 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	The CLA welcomes the recognition for renewable energy projects and hopes to see a diverse range of activities from new crops to PV and other generating sources being used appropriately across the district. However, the Council must be aware that such schemes are relatively new and expensive, and the viability is marginal in many cases; there is little, if any, opportunity for green energy schemes to make any financial contributions as envisaged in policies DP/3 and DP/4.	Policy NE/2 permits the provision of renewable energy schemes provided the proposals accord with other policies in the development plan. Policies DP/3 and DP/4 are concerned with ensuring all development provides the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities to ensure development is acceptable in planning terms. Neither policy requires financial contributions from renewable energy schemes.	
<i>1.</i>				
11164 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	This potentially excludes the use of private wire/district systems, which are the subject of a current South Cambridgeshire Energy Research Trust research study. Suggest point 1 is deleted.	This point is accepted but a revision is proposed to the criterion to address this point. It is important that there is a clear end user for the energy generated if it is to play a role in meeting energy needs.	Add the following to the end of criterion 1 of Policy NE/2:  "...unless it can be demonstrated that energy generation would be used on-site to meet the needs of a specific end user."
9779 - GO-East	Object	Policy NE/2 is overly restrictive in requiring renewable energy generation proposals to be able to be efficiently connected to the existing national grid infrastructure. This requirement also appears to be inconsistent with Policy NE/3. The criterion is applied to all development irrespective of its location and would rule out permission being granted for a proposal to generate electricity on-site for a specific end user and where the on-site generation meets the demand in part and therefore there would be no surplus requiring national grid connection. An example would be where a factory proposes a small-scale turbine on site to meet some of its power demand. The policy should be reworded to ensure that on-site renewable generation is not ruled out because of a lack of connection to the national grid.	Agreed.	Add the following to the end of criterion 1 of Policy NE/2:  "...unless it can be demonstrated that energy generation would be used on-site to meet the needs of a specific end user."
<i>8.8</i>				
8161 - Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee	Object	The choice of words '... large wind farms would BE LIKELY TO compromise the need to maintain the quality of the historic and natural landscape ...' is too woolly and subjective. It provides the opportunity for developers to force through an opposed application on appeal. The words 'be likely to' should be removed.	Policy NE/2 is a criteria-based policy for judging cases objectively on a case-by-case basis and accords with PPS22. The second sentence of Paragraph 8.8 is prejudging whether certain types of schemes are likely to have unacceptable impacts and should be deleted to ensure consistency with PPS22.	Delete second sentence of paragraph 8.8.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9781 - GO-East	Object	Paragraph 8.8 is contrary to PPS22 in prejudging whether certain types of schemes are likely to have unacceptable impacts rather than indicating that that proposals will be judged objectively in the particular circumstances of the case i.e. states 'large wind farms would be likely to compromise the need to maintain the quality of the historic and natural landscapes'. This statement should be deleted from paragraph 8.8 to ensure consistency with PPS22.	Policy NE/2 is a criteria-based policy for judging cases objectively on a case-by-case basis and accords with PPS22. The second sentence of Paragraph 8.8 is prejudging whether certain types of schemes are likely to have unacceptable impacts and should be deleted to ensure consistency with PPS22.	Delete second sentence of paragraph 8.8.
<i>NE/3 Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development</i>				
8357 - The Marshall Group	Object	Whilst sympathetic to the objective underpinning this policy, Marshall is nevertheless concerned by its implications, in particular, the reference to localised wind generators, which are not suitable in high density residential areas. Technologies such as photovoltaic cells are still very much at a developmental stage, where costs of installation require a pay-back period which is so long that an occupier-owner of a house finds the added cost of acquisition disproportionate.	Policy NE/3 does not specify the means of achieving the energy saving and paragraph 8.11 recognises it could take various forms and may be provided off-site as appropriate. The form of renewable energy provision will vary according to the type and scale of development. The threshold applied in NE/3 takes into consideration the viability issue by only requiring larger developments to contribute to the target.	
8926 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Object	Whilst it is agreed that fostering renewable energy is a laudable aim, Wm Morrison is concerned that, as currently drafted, Policy NE/3 does not include any built in flexibility to cater for circumstances where it will neither be practicable to achieve the 10% target, nor possible in viability terms. In respect of the latter point, developers of sites may face abnormal costs to assemble them, and/or there may be conflicting demands in respect of other financial contributions sought by the Local Planning Authority, such as public art for example.	The threshold applied in NE/3 takes into consideration the viability issue by only requiring larger developments to contribute to the target.	
9033 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	The requirement that all new developments greater than 10 dwellings will include renewable energy technologies to provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements is not based upon a sufficiently robust and credible evidence.	PPS22 sets out the Government target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect larger developments to contribute towards this target. The emerging RSS14 includes Policy ENV8, which requires all developments above a certain threshold to demonstrate that 10% of energy requirements can be met by renewables. This approach is therefore consistent. The threshold applied in NE/3 takes into consideration the viability issue by only requiring larger developments to contribute to the target. The threshold is in line with the definition of "major development" in the GPDO and the approach being adopted by Cambridge City Council.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10134 - Fairview New Homes	Object	It has yet to be demonstrated that the end purchasers pay higher prices for houses as a result of the provision of a number of energy initiatives sought within the document, and as such the cost is currently borne by the developer. Such requirements potentially affect the viability of delivering development in the District and meeting primary objectives such as meeting housing targets, particularly sites which were bought some time ago, in advance of energy policies. As such Fairview object to the following requirements. Fairview object to Policy NE/3 which seeks the inclusion of technology for renewable energy to provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements in all development proposals greater than 1000 sq m or 10 dwellings (see also Policy DP/1 paragraph 6).	PPS22 sets out the Government target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect larger developments to contribute towards this target. The emerging RSS14 includes Policy ENV8, which requires all developments above a certain threshold to demonstrate that 10% of energy requirements can be met by renewables. This approach is therefore consistent. The threshold applied in NE/3 takes into consideration the viability issue by only requiring larger developments to contribute to the target.	
9374 - Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Object	It is not clear where the target of 10% is derived from and how developments will be expected to meet this target. The Policy should be reworded to include "where feasible" to ensure that the viability of proposals is not compromised.	PPS22 sets out the Government target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect larger developments to contribute towards this target. The emerging RSS14 includes Policy ENV8, which requires all developments above a certain threshold to demonstrate that 10% of energy requirements can be met by renewables. This approach is therefore consistent. The threshold applied in NE/3 takes into consideration the viability issue by only requiring larger developments to contribute to the target.	
10095 - Bellway Homes	Object	We would query whether this matter is relevant to land use planning and would suggest that it is more properly addressed within building regulation legislation. Policy should encourage rather than require such an approach.	PPS22 sets out the Government target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect larger developments to contribute towards this target. The emerging RSS14 includes Policy ENV8, which requires all developments above a certain threshold to demonstrate that 10% of energy requirements can be met by renewables. This approach is therefore consistent.	
10081 - House Builders Federation	Object	The HBF does not believe that there is any justification for seeking to automatically require that all developments of over 10 dwellings will include technology for renewable energy to provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirement. To do so would be likely to make many potential development sites unviable.	PPS22 sets out the Government target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect larger developments to contribute towards this target. The emerging RSS14 includes Policy ENV8, which requires all developments above a certain threshold to demonstrate that 10% of energy requirements can be met by renewables. This approach is therefore consistent. The threshold applied in NE/3 takes into consideration the viability issue by only requiring larger developments to contribute to the target. The threshold is in line with the definition of "major development" in the GPDO and the approach being adopted by Cambridge City Council.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10018 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Object	These policies are not yet based on formal government or RSS or other adopted policy guidance and should be adjusted in due course to ensure consistency.	PPS22 sets out the Government target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect larger developments to contribute towards this target. The emerging RSS14 includes Policy ENV8, which requires all developments above a certain threshold to demonstrate that 10% of energy requirements can be met by renewables. This approach is therefore consistent.	
10242 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Object	The requirement to provide technology on-site for renewable energy to provide at least 10% of the sites energy requirements may be too onerous on a development when all site costs have been taken into account. This policy should encourage renewable energy where possible, but not require it without regard to other site factors.	PPS22 sets out the Government target for the generation of 10% of UK electricity from renewable energy sources by 2010. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect larger developments to contribute towards this target. The emerging RSS14 includes Policy ENV8, which requires all developments above a certain threshold to demonstrate that 10% of energy requirements can be met by renewables. This approach is therefore consistent. The threshold applied in NE/3 takes into consideration the viability issue by only requiring larger developments to contribute to the target.	
11166 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support for Policy NE/3.	Support noted.	
<i>NE/4 Landscape Character Areas</i>				
10385 - Great Shelford Parish Council	Object	Our main concern is the broad brush of landscape characteristics And the non designation of areas as pvaa.	PVAAs are designated in accordance with Policy CH/6 for those parts of villages which are important for local amenity. These are quite separate from Landscape Character Areas, which refer to the wider countryside outside the built-up areas. The Landscape Character Areas were defined in accordance with Countryside Agency / English Nature framework, as explained at paragraph 8.14. The Design Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance provides even greater detail on the local distinctiveness of these areas, and the special considerations given to the urban fringe.	
8448 - English Heritage	Object	Since the landscape is a product of man's intervention over centuries, this section should include cross references to the historic landscapes policy CH/1 in Section 9, especially in policy NE/4.	Policy CH/1 and paragraphs 9.1 - 9.3 apply specifically to Historic Landscapes. Paragraph 2.29 of PPS12 states that "Local planning authorities should avoid producing a compendium of use-related development control policies which can be repetitive." The LDF contains a suite of policies which are to be read alongside each other, therefore, it would be unnecessary repetition to cross-refer to other parts of the Plan.	
9424 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
9196 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships welcomes and supports policies that respect and enhance local character and distinctiveness.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11174 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support Policy NE/4.	Support noted.	
<i>8.17</i>				
11180 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	The reference to the urban fringe, and the strategies for its maintenance and enhancement set out in the Area Action Plans, is supported.	Support noted.	
<i>NE/5 Countryside Enhancement Areas</i>				
9782 - GO-East	Object	Policy NE/5 is more a statement of intent and aspirational, as it provides no certainty as to how it will be implemented. The policy should either be redrafted to make it clear how the policy will be implemented and by whom, or should be deleted.	Agree, the policy should be redrafted.	Amend Policy NE/5 to read: "Development within, or closely associated with, Countryside Enhancement Areas will contribute towards schemes for quiet recreation, biodiversity and landscape enhancement."  Amend last sentence of paragraph 8.18 to read: "The Biodiversity Strategy, which will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document, identifies a number of Countryside Enhancement Areas. Areas have been identified because of their existing, or potential, biodiversity value for a wide range of species and habitats, or because of their proximity to significant habitat and/or access creation projects."
7887 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	Nothing is quieter than a group of Ramblers using well signed and well-maintained RoW, and we would welcome this emphasis on quiet recreation!	Support noted, although the policy has been amended.	
8948 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust fully supports this policy.	Support noted, although the policy has been amended.	
<i>NE/6 Biodiversity</i>				
9046 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	A minor addition to the first sentence of paragraph 2 is proposed: 'The District Council will resist development that would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the population'. This would be consistent with the wording used in relation to noise in Policy NE/18.	Policy NE/6 has been reworded in response to an another representation and the addition of the word "unacceptable" would be superfluous.	No change.
11063 - Environment Agency	Support	We support the biodiversity policy aims for no net loss of biodiversity in the district.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9731 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds	Support	The RSPB strongly support policy NE/6 which seeks to protect the district's biodiversity and apply a stepwise approach to assessing development schemes which may have a negative impact on biodiversity. The policy also seeks to secure biodiversity enhancements.	Support noted.	
9425 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
8949 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	Thw Wildlife Trust fully supports this policy.	Support noted.	
11182 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support for Policy NE/6.	Support noted.	
<i>NE/7 Sites of Biodiversity Importance</i>				
9760 - Caldecote Parish Council	Object	Caldecote Parish Council was unaware of the designation of the whole SSSI. That is because the LDF Inset Map no 13 does not extend far enough south to detail it all clearly.	Noted. Sites of Special Scientific Interest are also shown on the district-wide Proposals Map.	
10566 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 10605 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough (Madingley Slip Road RSV County Wildlife Site) 10595 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough (London Road, Fowlmere RSV County Wildlife Site) 10587 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough (Shingay Lake Nature Reserve (South Farm Pond) CWS) 10581 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough (Over Railway Cutting CWS)	Object	While supporting the inclusion of County Wildlife Sites on the proposals map, the Wildlife Trust must unfortunately object to the proposals map as it currently stands, as it fails to include the most up to date information on County Wildlife Sites. 4 new sites have been identified since the last Local Plan; Over Railway Cutting, Madingley Slip Road RSV, London Road Fowlmere RSV and South Farm Pond Shingay. The Wildlife Trust requests that the most up to date information is used in the LDF. We can supply the revised County Wildlife Sites information to South Cambridgeshire District Council as a GIS layer.	Noted. The information on the Proposals Map will be updated to include the latest County Wildlife Sites.	Amend the Proposals Map to include the latest County Wildlife Sites.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10087 - House Builders Federation	Object	The policy starts by stating that: 'planning permission will not be given for proposals that may have an adverse impact, either directly, or indirectly, on a Site of Biodiversity Importance'. The HBF does not consider that the above wording complies with national policy guidance, which emphasises the hierarchy of different types of sites requiring protection, and the different levels of protection that can reasonably be afforded them. It is clearly inappropriate that the Council could refuse planning permission for a proposal that may indirectly affect a site designated such status. The Council's blanket approach is clearly inappropriate, as it disregards their individual levels of importance (an Internationally protected site is more important than a non-statutory County Wildlife Site). Consequently, the first paragraph of the policy should be deleted.	Paragraph 6 of PPS9 states that "the most important sites for biodiversity are those identified through international conventions and European Directives. Local planning authorities...may need to cross-refer to the statutory protection given to these sites in the explanatory texts in local development documents. Since they enjoy statutory protection specific polices in respect of these sites should not be included in local development documents". Policy NE/7 is a generic policy, which applies to all Sites of Biodiversity Importance regardless of their position within the hierarchy, as the same principles apply to their protection. The reasoned justification takes into account the importance of a Site of Biodiversity Importance by referring to them in the same order as they appear in hierarchy. The reasoned justification will also be updated to take account of more up to date guidance in PPS9 and Circular 06/2005.	Amend the reasoned justification to refer to, and take account of changes resulting from, PPS9 and Circular 06/2005.
9050 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	A minor addition to the first sentence is proposed: 'Planning permission will not be given for proposals that will have an unacceptable adverse impact, either'. This would be consistent with the wording used in relation to noise in Policy NE/18.	Disagree. These sites include statutorily protected sites and they should be adequately protected. Inserting the word "unacceptable" would weaken the policy.	No change.
9704 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds	Support	The RSPB strongly supports policy NE/7 which seeks to protect nationally and internationally important nature conservation sites. Policy NE/7 adheres to the tiered approach identified in PPG9 giving greater protection to sites designated under international law than those designated under national law. The policy also clearly identifies the steps which will be applied when assessing applications coming forward which affect designated sites. It is important for the LDF to include this policy highlighting the importance with which the district hold its designated sites and helping contribute to sustainable development within the district in accordance with policy DP/2.	Support noted.	
11186 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support for Policy NE/7.	Support noted.	
11064 - Environment Agency	Support	We support the protection of sites of biodiversity importance.	Support noted.	
9426 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
8950 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	Thw Wildlife Trust fully supports this policy.	Support noted.	

---

*Representations*

*Nature Representation Summary*

*Councils' Assessment*

*Change to Draft DPD*

---

8.34

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11190 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Should recognise that Rights of Way are often also green corridors in their own right - can be up to 60 feet wide strips through the countryside - and should be protected for the biodiversity opportunities they provide. These corridors often co-exist with SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites, and Scheduled Ancient Monuments and need to be very carefully managed to balance the complex rights and various statutory protections. Suggest add in new para after 8.34 to this effect.	Agree rights of way should be protected for the biodiversity opportunities they provide.	Amend paragraph 8.34 to read: "PPS9 recognises that Regional or Local Sites have a fundamental role to play in meeting overall national biodiversity targets; contributing to the quality of life and the well-being of the community; and in supporting research and education. In South Cambridgeshire these "County Wildlife Sites" (CWS) are identified by the Wildlife Trust in accordance with published criteria and are marked on the Proposals Map. As the SSSI network is only a representative sample, many CWSs are equivalent ecological value to SSSIs and a majority of CWSs support priority BAP habitats and species. They will be treated as material to the consideration of development proposals. The knowledge of such sites and their condition is always changing and sites may be added and removed from the list. PPS9 also recognises the value provided by networks of natural habitats. They may link sites of biodiversity importance and provide routes or stepping stones for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange of species in the wider environment. In South Cambridgeshire such networks may include public rights of way, important roadside verges which need to be protected from road improvements or new access points, ponds, moats, marshes and ditches that can be adversely affected by changes in local hydrology, woodlands, copses, pollarded willow and hedgerows, semi-natural grasslands and disused gravel, chalk or clunch pits. The management of such features is crucial to maintaining the existing biodiversity interest and to assisting further colonisation of habitats by various species."

---

*Representations**Nature Representation Summary**Councils' Assessment**Change to Draft DPD*

---

Add new paragraph after 8.34:  
"Public rights of way can often be green corridors in their own right, especially when in open arable countryside. which can be up to Some rights of way can be up to ten metres wide 60 feet wide strips through the countryside, and should consequently be protected for the biodiversity opportunities that they provide. These corridors often co-exist with SSSIs, County Wildlife Sites, and Scheduled Ancient Monuments, and need to be very carefully managed to balance the complex rights and various statutory protections."

---

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8956 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Object	The Wildlife Trust would like to suggest some additional wording to provide clarification and further strengthening of the justification behind the policy and supporting text. 2nd sentence, add "in accordance with published criteria" after "the Wildlife Trust". Between 2nd and 3rd sentences, add a new sentence: "As the SSSI network is only a representative sample, many County Wildlife Sites are of equivalent ecological value to SSSIs and a majority of County Wildlife Sites support priority BAP habitats and species."	Agree the additional wording would clarify and strengthen the text.	Amend paragraph 8.34 to read: "PPS9 recognises that Regional or Local Sites have a fundamental role to play in meeting overall national biodiversity targets; contributing to the quality of life and the well-being of the community; and in supporting research and education. In South Cambridgeshire these "County Wildlife Sites" (CWS) are identified by the Wildlife Trust in accordance with published criteria and are marked on the Proposals Map. As the SSSI network is only a representative sample, many CWSs are equivalent ecological value to SSSIs and a majority of CWSs support priority BAP habitats and species. They will be treated as material to the consideration of development proposals. The knowledge of such sites and their condition is always changing and sites may be added and removed from the list. PPS9 also recognises the value provided by networks of natural habitats. They may link sites of biodiversity importance and provide routes or stepping stones for the migration, dispersal and genetic exchange of species in the wider environment. In South Cambridgeshire such networks may include public rights of way, important roadside verges which need to be protected from road improvements or new access points, ponds, moats, marshes and ditches that can be adversely affected by changes in local hydrology, woodlands, copses, pollarded willow and hedgerows, semi-natural grasslands and disused gravel, chalk or clunch pits. The management of such features is crucial to maintaining the existing biodiversity interest and to assisting further colonisation of habitats by various species."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NE/8 Natural Areas</i>				
9701 - GO-East	Object	May need to be included in a different chapter such as Natural Environment and consideration should be given as to whether it could be included within another Policy, for example NE/8 which relates to Natural Areas throughout the district that have been defined by, amongst other attributes, landscape and biodiversity.	This is an important issue for the Green Belt chapter. Other policies, such as DP/2 apply district-wide. It is proposed to delete Policy GB/7 and expand Policy GB/3 into a new policy on "Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt".	
9053 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	A minor addition to the first sentence is proposed: 'Planning permission will not be granted for development which would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the biodiversity, unless there are demonstrable reasons for the proposal which outweigh the negative impacts'. This would be consistent with the wording used in relation to noise in Policy NE/18.	Disagree with the inserting the word "unacceptable" as this would weaken the policy.	No change.
9784 - GO-East	Object	The policy is very general and relates to development not impacting on the biodiversity of the Natural Area. We would suggest that consideration is given to whether Policy NE/8 could be incorporated within another policy such as Policy NE/6.	Agree Policy NE/8 should be merged with Policy NE/6.	Add the text of Policy NE/8 to the end of Policy NE/6.  Move paragraphs 8.35 and 8.36 to follow paragraph 8.26.
10088 - House Builders Federation	Object	The HBF does not consider that the policy complies with national policy guidance, which emphasises the hierarchy of different types of sites requiring protection, and the different levels of protection that can reasonably be afforded them. It is clearly inappropriate that the Council could refuse planning permission for a proposal that may have an adverse impact upon a site designated such status. The blanket approach across vast areas of the district is clearly inappropriate, as it disregards the individual levels of importance of sites (an Internationally protected site is more important than a non-statutory County Wildlife Site). Consequently, in the absence of any apparent reasonable justification the policy should be deleted.	Paragraph 6 of PPS9 states that "the most important sites for biodiversity are those identified through international conventions and European Directives. Local planning authorities...may need to cross-refer to the statutory protection given to these sites in the explanatory texts in local development documents. Since they enjoy statutory protection specific policies in respect of these sites should not be included in local development documents". Policy NE/7 is a generic policy, which applies to all Sites of Biodiversity Importance regardless of their position within the hierarchy, as the same principles apply to their protection. The reasoned justification takes into account the importance of a Site of Biodiversity Importance by referring to them in the same order as they appear in hierarchy. The reasoned justification will also be updated to take account of more up to date guidance in PPS9 and Circular 06/2005.	Amend the reasoned justification to refer to, and take account of changes resulting from, PPS9 and Circular 06/2005.
11202 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Support but again this would need to be covered in any Landscape Supplementary Planning Documents. I suggest that it may be better to produce a Joint Landscape and Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document.	Noted. The District Council has already undertaken a considerable amount of work on a Biodiversity Strategy whilst the Landscape SPD is not so far advanced. Therefore, it is not considered appropriate to merge the two.	
9427 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8957 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust fully supports this policy.	Support noted.	
<i>NE/9 Regionally Important Geological / Geomorphological Sites</i>				
9785 - GO-East	Object	The supporting text at paragraph 8.38 indicates that there are no regionally important geological / geomorphological sites within South Cambridgeshire. The policy is therefore unnecessary and should be deleted. If a site is designated at some time in the future, then PPS9 should be relied on pending inclusion of any necessary policy in the DPD in the future.	Agree, as there are no Regionally Important Geological sites within the district, Policy NE/9 should be deleted. However, there is a geological SSSI and it is proposed to amend Policy NE/7 to refer to Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance. This accords with the approach in PPS9.	<p>Delete Policy NE/9 and paragraph 8.37.</p> <p>Amend title of Policy NE/7 to read: "Policy NE/7 Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance"</p> <p>Amend first sentence of first paragraph to read: "Planning permission will not be given for proposals that may have an adverse impact, either directly or indirectly, on a Site of Biodiversity or Geological Importance."</p> <p>Amend first sentence of paragraph 8.27 to read: "Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance are identified on the Proposals Map."</p> <p>Move paragraph 8.38 to follow paragraph 8.31.</p> <p>Add new paragraph to follow 8.31A: "In considering any development proposal, the District Council will have regard to the need to allow suitable opportunities to study and record exposures and features, and the opportunity to incorporate within the development the preservation of geological features of interest."</p>
8960 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust fully supports this policy.	Support noted.	
11209 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support for NE/9.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NE/10 Groundwater</i>				
9752 - GO-East	Object	The policy is very general in nature and restates policy considerations contained in PPG23. PPG12 indicates that development control policies should not duplicate national policy but rather should explain how national policy applies at the local level. We question whether the policy could be made more specific relative to the zones in the Ground Water Protection Maps prepared by the Environment Agency to make it a more local application of national policy. In its current form the policy is unnecessary as it duplicates national policy contrary to PPS12 and should be deleted if cannot be amended to apply criteria that respond to local circumstances rather than repeating national policy.	This policy has the support of the Environment Agency, producers of the ground water protection maps. It should therefore remain in the plan.	
11065 - Environment Agency 8961 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The policy is supported as the protection of groundwater sources is necessary to ensure existing and future requirements can be met.	Support noted.	
<i>NE/11 Water and Drainage Infrastructure</i>				
9429 - Anglian Water Services Ltd	Object	Anglian Water Services Limited objects to this policy. The policy should include reference to the possibility of Milton Wastewater Treatment Works being relocated to a new site as part of the development of the Cambridge Northern Fringe (East) area. The District Council should engage with the County Council, as the waste planning authority, regarding the potential need for a new site.	New sites for waste infrastructure will be allocated through the Cambridgeshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework. A specific reference is not required in this policy. The issue of the sewage works is addressed by paragraph 11.8 of the Site Specific Policies DPD. The future development of Chesterton Sidings is not dependant on the relocation, if design measures can be used to provide an acceptable scheme.	
9056 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	The purpose of the LDF is to provide the basis for the statutory bodies to provide the necessary infrastructure to meet development needs. It should not be the role of the LDF to phase development according to the infrastructure programme.	Development should not be permitted where infrastructure is inadequate, therefore the policy correctly requires provision, or the use of planning conditions and agreements to ensure it is in place before the development takes place.	
11067 - Environment Agency	Support	We support the requirement of new developments to have appropriate water supply, sewerage and land drainage systems.	Support noted.	
8965 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust supports this policy, as lack of water is potentially a major constraint to development and a major threat to the local environment and biodiversity.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7942 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Support	The proposed levels of development will create serious problems for water supplies and other existing services and supplies. It is imperative that the Council ensures that the supplies and facilities are adequate before approving any additional development. Water is a key resource for agriculture which, with including food processing and packaging, makes a huge contribution to the GDP of the east of England.	Support noted.	
9705 - Foxton Parish Council 9428 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy NE/11.	Support noted.	
9105 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards	Support	The Boards support the policy relating to water and drainage infrastructure, foul drainage, flood risk and sustainable drainage systems (p112-p114). These policies should be used to assess all planning applications. The Boards should be consulted on all planning applications that may affect their districts.	Support noted.	
<i>NE/12 Foul Drainage - Alternative Drainage Systems</i>				
11069 - Environment Agency	Object	Whilst supporting the principle of the policy the following alteration should be made: The second paragraph is not required. The pollution prevention measures can be undertaken/required as in conjunction with NE/10.	Not accepted. The additional detail is required in this policy, to ensure appropriate measures for pollution control are taken.	
9106 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards	Support	The Boards support the policy relating to water and drainage infrastructure, foul drainage, flood risk and sustainable drainage systems (p112-p114). These policies should be used to assess all planning applications. The Boards should be consulted on all planning applications that may affect their districts.	Support noted, although policy has been amended.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
11068 - Environment Agency	Object	Whilst supporting the principle of the policy the following alteration should be made: "...if proposed alternative facilities are considered ADEQUATE..."	Agree that the first paragraph of policy NE12 requires clarification.	Amend first paragraph of policy NE/12 as follows:[Drainage to a public sewer should be provided wherever possible] The development of sites where drainage to a public sewer is not feasible will only be permitted if proposed alternative facilities are considered [in]adequate and would NOT pose an unacceptable risk to the quality or quantity of ground or surface water, pollution of local ditches, watercourses or sites of biodiversity importance. DRAINAGE TO A PUBLIC SEWER SHOULD BE PROVIDED WHEREVER POSSIBLE. A package treatment plant [will therefore need to] should be provided WHERE THIS IS NOT POSSIBLE. Only where it is clearly demonstrated that neither of these options is feasible will a system incorporating septic tank(s) be acceptable.'
<i>NE/13 Flood Risk</i>				
10327 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Object	The wording of the policy needs clarification that mitigation relates to sites that are liable to flooding.	Disagree. Mitigation may also be required on sites not liable to flooding, but that could increase risk of flood risk elsewhere, such as by creating additional run-off. This is made clear in policy NE/13.	
7861 - Elsworth Parish Council	Object	Elsworth Parish Council requests that inset map 28 Draft June 2005 be revised to show correct flood risk areas.	The proposals map displays the Environment Agency (EA) Flood Zone maps, produced by the EA in 2005. They enable a risk based approach to planning and flooding. Although the maps show areas of possible flooding from rivers, streams, and watercourses, they do not take account of flood defences, and always take a conservative approach where detailed information is available. These maps are regularly updated by the EA. The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment examines areas of potential growth in greater detail. The information collected in the study may be used in the future to improve the EA mapping.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9201 - Papworth Saint Agnes Parish Meeting	Object	The boundary of the High Risk Flood Zone is misleadingly shown on the Proposals Map Inset No 85 for Papworth St Agnes. Houses that are on higher ground at the southern end of the area included within the village framework are shown as being at high risk. This is inaccurate and the high (and medium) risk designation should be removed.	The proposals map displays the Environment Agency (EA) Flood Zone maps, produced by the EA in 2005. They enable a risk based approach to planning and flooding. Although the maps show areas of possible flooding from rivers, streams, and watercourses, they do not take account of flood defences, and always take a conservative approach where detailed information is available. These maps are regularly updated by the EA. These maps are not produced by the District Council, and therefore cannot be amended by the Council. The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment examines areas of potential growth in greater detail. The information collected in the study may be used in the future to improve the EA mapping.	
9823	Object	Policy NE/13 - please see my representation that I made under policy NS/2 and the attached Environment Agency Map. Policy NE/21 has also been covered by my previous representations.	The requirement in the policy not to increase flood risk to surrounding areas also applies to Northstowe. Specific issues around flooding and Northstowe are dealt with in the Northstowe Area Action Plan. A change to policy NE/13 is not required.	
11214 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Should include mention of taking into account projected impacts of climate change.	Paragraph 8.47 makes clear that where appropriate a Flood Risk Assessment in association with a development will be required to take account of the impact of climate change. The potential impact of climate change has also been explored through the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.	
9753 - GO-East	Object	We note however that the policy is framed in a way that means that permission will not be granted where the site is liable to flooding OR where development is likely to result in the detrimental circumstances as set out in the criteria. This seems to imply that the location of a development on a site that is liable to flooding will be reason enough to refuse permission irrespective of what the impacts are, which seems inconsistent with paragraph 8.46 and the application of a more detailed sequential approach to assessment of flood risk and the degree to which different types of development might be acceptable, as set out in PPG25. The policy should be reworded to ensure that it is consistent with PPG25.	Disagree. The policy clearly states that development will not be permitted where it is at risk, or will increase flood risk. It also makes clear that it may be permitted if those impacts can be mitigated. The policy is consistent with PPG25.	
11076 - Environment Agency	Object	We suggest that the proposals map key should include wording to refer the reader to the most up to date flood zone maps. These could either be the agency's updated flood map (on the internet) or the approved strategic flood risk assessment.	Agree.	Amend proposals map key to refer to EA website, and the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, for further information.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11070 - Environment Agency 9707 - Foxton Parish Council 9108 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards 9710 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds 8967 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough 9430 - Croxton Parish Council 9335 - Caxton Parish Council	Support	Support for policy NE/13.	Support noted.	
<i>3.</i>				
8233	Support	Concreting over 250 hectares to build Cambridge East will significantly increase the flood risk for Teversham.	The requirement of development not increasing flood risk in surrounding areas applies to Cambridge East. Specific measures are addressed in the Cambridge East Area Action Plan.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
7811 - The camToo Project	Support	The camToo Project has been specifically designed to enable the first section of stage 2 of the guided bus (crossing the Cam flood plain downstream of Cambridge) to be built without an increase in flood risk due to widening the railway embankment - indeed the project will reduce the risk of flooding in central cambridge.	A change to this policy relating to this proposed protect is not required.	
<i>8.45</i>				
9002 - The Fairfield Partnership	Object	The Flood Zone Maps are generated using a generalised technique and should not therefore be used in isolation to suggest that specific areas are at risk of flooding and that planning permission should be refused. Proposed Amendment -Reference should be made in either paragraph 8.45 or paragraph 8.46 to indicate that significant additional flood modelling may be required to determine the risk of flooding in a specific area.	Paragraph 8.47 states the need for flood risk assessments in relation to proposals of an appropriate scale and nature. Even where a flood risk exists the policy makes clear that where this can be overcome by appropriate alleviation and mitigation measures planning permission may be granted subject to planning conditions or agreements.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NE/14 Sustainable Drainage Systems</i>				
9754 - GO-East	Object	The policy lacks certainty as to how the requirement will be implemented and by whom and what the criteria are for determining whether implementing SUDs is practicable. Further clarification should be provided as to how the requirement will be implemented e.g. as a requirement of a planning permission or through alternative means that might be implemented by the Environment Agency, and clarifying what practicable might mean in practice i.e. larger schemes etc.	Implementation of SUDS will depend on the nature of development and the site. Specific rules of the practicality of implementation would be too detailed to include in the Development Control Policies DPD. Advice on the practicality of implementing SUDS will be obtained from the Environment Agency on a case by case basis. The changes proposed would result in a level of detail that would be more appropriate in a Supplementary Planning Document. If it becomes apparent that further clarification on the policy is necessary, the Council will review its Local Development Scheme in the future, and schedule preparation of such a document.	
11216 - Cambridgeshire County Council 11215 - Cambridgeshire County Council 11071 - Environment Agency 9124 - Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards 9199 - English Partnerships 8968 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	Support for policy NE/14.	Support noted.	
<i>NE/15 Water Conservation</i>				
10136 - Fairview New Homes	Object	It has yet to be demonstrated that the end purchasers pay higher prices for houses as a result of the provision of a number of energy initiatives sought within the document, and as such the cost is currently borne by the developer. Such requirements potentially affect the viability of delivering development in the District and meeting primary objectives such as meeting housing targets, particularly sites which were bought some time ago, in advance of energy policies. As such Fairview object to the following requirements. □ Fairview object to the requirement in Policy DP/1 and Policy NE/15 that development should incorporate water recycling measures.	PPS1 paragraph 21 states: 'Development plan policies should seek to minimise the need to consume new resources over the lifetime of the development by making more efficient use or reuse of existing resources... Planning Authorities should promote the sustainable use of water resources.'The policy provides a mechanism for achieving that goal. It also provides sufficient flexibility to take account of the constraints of a site, and issues of viability.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9066 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	A general policy relating is supported. However, the requirements within Policy NE/15 begin to prejudge the outcome of a water conservation strategy. In order to provide the necessary flexibility, there is no need for the policy to outline specific water conservation measures, in particular grey water recycling which may well not provide a viable or useful part of each strategy. The deletion of the first sentence following 'measures' would be prudent in order to meet the flexibility test of soundness.	Agreed. Examples of the types of measures that could be used should be part of the reasoned justification, not the policy itself.	Amend 1st sentence of policy NE/15: Development must incorporate water conservation measures [such as water saving devices, rainwater harvesting, and greywater recycling].  Amend paragraph 8.51: 'There are a number of ways water conservation can be achieved, SUCH AS WATER SAVING DEVICES, RAINWATER HARVESTING, AND GREYWATER RECYCLING, and the policy offers a degree of flexibility on the exact methods used.'
9338 - Caxton Parish Council	Object	Whilst Caxton parish council supports generally water conservation measures it objects that the policy does not clearly identify where the water will be obtained from to support all the new development in the District.	Support for water conservation noted. Policy NE/11 requires adequate water supply to be in place or required by planning agreement / condition before planning permission is granted.	
8317 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	Objection is lodged in respect of Policy NE/15 - the Policy states 'major developments will be required to submit a water conservation strategy' However the document fails to define what is a 'major development' where the policy will be applied. This should be clarified.	Major development is defined by the General Development Order as greater than 1000m2 of floorspace or 10 dwellings. It is agreed this should be defined in the policy.	Amend policy NE15:  Development must incorporate water conservation measures, [such as water saving devices, rainwater harvesting, and greywater recycling]. Any measures must avoid adverse impact on the water environment and biodiversity. [Major Developments] ALL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS GREATER THAN 1,000 M2 OR 10 DWELLINGS will be required to submit a Water Conservation Strategy, to demonstrate how this is to be achieved.
9758 - GO-East	Object	Whilst supportive of measures that conserve water, the measures are beyond the scope of planning by virtue of not constituting development under the Act and are matters that would be dealt with through Building Regulations. The planning system should not duplicate, cut across, or detrimentally affect matters within the scope of other legislative requirements, such as those set out in the Building Regulations (paragraph 30 in PPS1). Therefore the approach should be reconsidered and reference to these matters and their implementation through alternative mechanisms might be retained in the text.	PPS1 paragraph 21 states that development plan policies should seek to minimise the need to consume new resources over the lifetime of the development by making more efficient use or reuse of existing resources. Planning Authorities should promote the sustainable use of water resources. The policy provides a means of achieving this goal.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
11217 - Cambridgeshire County Council 11072 - Environment Agency 9713 - Royal Society for Protection of Birds 8969 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	Support for water conservation policy.	Support noted.	
<i>NE/17 Lighting Proposals</i>				
9634 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils	Object	Support, but require a further constraint to minimise light spillage outside of the curtilage of the development.	General support for the policy noted. Controlling light spillage outside the curtilage of a development is adequately covered by the third point of the policy that seeks to ensure there is no adverse impact on nearby properties or the countryside.	
8972 - The Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire & Peterborough	Support	The Wildlife Trust fully supports this policy.	Support noted.	
<i>2.</i>				
8234	Support	I agree. There should be no light spillage even close to the horizontal, it's unnecessary and risky (because any slight misalignment of light fitting will cause spillage above the horizontal). This applies mainly to street lights and lights illuminating buildings.	Support noted.	
<i>3.</i>				
9076 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	A minor addition to the first sentence is proposed: 'There is no unacceptable adverse impact on neighbouring'. This would be consistent with the wording used in relation to noise in Policy NE/18.	Whilst it may be true that impact is unavoidable, the policy should retain the requirement to avoid adverse impact. As part of new external lighting schemes, appropriate measures should be taken to avoid adverse impact. For example these measures could include planning conditions limiting time of use of flood lighting.	
11218 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Support but suggest additional wording for 3 to read "there is no adverse impact on neighbouring or nearby properties OR WILDLIFE or on the surrounding countryside".	Disagree. Specific reference to wildlife is unnecessary given the other criteria of the policy.	
<i>5.</i>				
10253 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company	Object	TMLC would welcome an addition to this policy stating: 'If to be adopted, road and footway lighting meets the District and County Council's adopted standards.'	Disagree. The standard for road and footway lighting involve a consideration of safety. It would be inappropriate to require those standards to be met only where the road was to be adopted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NE/18 Noise Pollution</i>				
9585	Object	The section on Natural Environment contains some very helpful policies. I feel that it would be helpful if policy NE/18 recognised that at present residents in Little Shelford and Hauxton suffer from noise pollution now and that steps need to be taken to reduce the noise from the M11.	Such a statement would not be suitable in this suite of development control policies.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
9764 - GO-East	Object	It is not clear that the numbered criteria differ from matters set out in PPG24. PPS12 indicates that development control policies should not repeat national policy. Criteria 1 to 3 should therefore either be expanded on to apply national policy to local circumstances or should be deleted.	The policy provides a clear statement of the criteria the Council will take into account in relation to noise in considering planning applications as recommended in PPG24. The criteria do not duplicate PPG24.	
<i>3</i>				
9766 - GO-East	Object	It is noted that Criteria 3 makes reference to unacceptable 'ambient' noise levels. This relates to background noise levels and does not take into account the nature of specific noises including impulses, whether it is irregular and the tone. Consideration should be given to rewording any criteria relating to noise impacts to recognise these characteristics of noise and the impact they will have on whether noise is a nuisance or not.	Agreed.	Revise Policy NE/18 criterion 3 to read:  "3. Would be subject to unacceptable noise levels from existing noise sources, both ambient levels and having regard to noise impulses whether irregular or tone."
<i>Policy Paragraph 3</i>				
9769 - GO-East	Object	It is not clear why in sensitive locations why business use is restricted to office use only (Use Class B1(a)) where all B1 Uses i.e. including B1(b) and (c) are compatible with residential amenity by definition. Accordingly, the policy appears overly restrictive and should be amended to indicate that all B1 uses may be appropriate in sensitive locations.	Whilst the three categories of B1 uses are by definition suitable in residential areas, this relates to the use within the building and it is also relevant to have regard to the nature of associated uses serving the building. The nature of B1(b) and (c) uses is such that there can be HGV traffic visiting the premises and this is a material factor in determining applications, particularly in sensitive locations.	
<i>NE/19 Emissions</i>				
11219 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Support for Policy NE/19.	Support noted.	
<i>NE/20 Land Contamination</i>				
11073 - Environment Agency	Support	We support the policy ensuring that land contamination is investigated and remediated as soon as possible.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>NE/21 Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land</i>				
10256 - Trumpington Meadows Land Company 8974 - The Fairfield Partnership 9079 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd. 9129 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	Policy NE/21 is inconsistent with advice contained within PPS7. Guidance in PPS7 advises that in some instances the use of higher grade quality agricultural may be acceptable when taking into account other sustainability considerations.	It is acknowledged that some higher-grade agricultural land has been allocated in the Local Development Framework, due to the need for development and the relative sustainability of the locations, and this should be acknowledged in the policy. An amendment to better reflect PPS7 on the considerations where high grade agricultural land may be developed is also proposed.	Amend 1st paragraph of policy NE/21:'The District Council will not grant planning permission which would lead to the irreversible loss of grades 1,2, or 3a agricultural land UNLESS:- <input type="checkbox"/> LAND IS ALLOCATED FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK;- <input type="checkbox"/> SUSTAINABILITY CONSIDERATIONS AND THE NEED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT ARE SUFFICIENT TO OVERRIDE THE NEED TO PROTECT THE AGRICULTURAL VALUE OF THE LAND.  Add to end of paragraph 8.62:'DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE VILLAGE FRAMEWORKS IS RESISTED TO THAT REQUIRED FOR AGRICULTURE, HORSICULTURE, FORESTRY, OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OTHER USES WHICH NEED TO BE LOCATED IN THE COUNTRYSIDE, BY POLICY DP/8.
9708 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy NE/21.	Support noted, although the policy has been modified to better reflect PPS7.	
<i>Objectives</i>				
10021 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	Generally Support.	Support noted.	
<i>CH/a</i>				
11226 - Cambridgeshire County Council 11220 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Welcome inclusion of rights of way in objective but would request that 'public' be inserted before rights of way.	Agree.	Amend objective CH/a:'To protect historic landscapes and PUBLIC rights of way'
9023 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Support	Support - these areas should be protected and managed sensitively but at the same time permitting public access.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7888 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	We welcome this objective, and would merely ask that the sense of a past discovered should not be diminished by over-enthusiastic use of signs and interpretative boards. Most already provided in the county are excellent, but the feeling of being somewhere different, perhaps less tamed, should not be lost.	Support noted, but the concerns raised are not relevant to the Development Control Policies DPD.	
<i>CH/1 Historic Landscapes</i>				
9135 - Ashwell (Barton Road) Limited	Object	The policy does not accord with Government Guidance.	Disagree. Paragraph 2.8 of PPG15 states,' Local plans should set out clearly the planning authority's policies for the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment in their area.'	
9090 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	In the absence of further detail on the nature and extent of such historic landscapes, the plan is unable to provide a clear guide. The text refers to a Historic Landscape Database and the intent appears to be to protect those landscapes recorded on that database. Rather than preclude all development the plan should seek an assessment of the impact of development on such features before consideration of proposals. The policy at present appears over prescriptive.	Disagree. The policy is intended to protect the historic landscape. When a site is identified as including historic landscape features, measures will be required to be taken to avoid adverse impact or loss. If such measures cannot be taken the policy requires the application should be refused.The Historic Landscape Database is intended to draw together sources of information, for further consideration as part of relevant planning applications. It does not in itself designate areas of land.	
11228 - Cambridgeshire County Council 9431 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Support for protection of historic environment assets.	Support noted.	
<i>9.1</i>				
11005 - Cambridge Antiquarian Society	Object	The second sentence in 9.1 should include settlements.	Disagree. The focus of the policy is on landscapes, while other policies focus on the built environment.	
11004 - Cambridge Antiquarian Society	Object	In 9.1, ', particularly relevant ... long period' is superfluous and misleading. If this remark is not deleted, it will put all that follows into a poor light. It suggests that the policy has been drafted without understanding the historic environment.	Agree that the second half of the sentence is superfluous.	Delete 2nd half of 1st sentence of paragraph 9.1.The landscape is the product of human action on the natural landscape over many thousands of years[, particularly relevant in South Cambridgeshire which has been significantly settled for a long period].
11229 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Allows for adequate protection of historic environment assets (landscape and archaeology).	Support noted, although the paragraph has been modified.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<b>9.2</b>				
11007 - Cambridge Antiquarian Society	Object	For 9.2, it is not valid to cite the Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Database or to propose dependence on it. The Database is not yet available for consultation. The draft of it has not even been released for expert consultation. We strongly advise the District Council to avoid reference to the Database until expert landscape assessment of it is feasible. We suspect that the draft will be revised before any use can be made of the Database. It is not at all clear how long this process will take.	Whilst it is acknowledged the database is still under preparation, due to the timescale of the plan preparation process it is likely it will be in operation before the Development control Policies DPD is adopted. It should therefore remain in the plan.	
11006 - Cambridge Antiquarian Society	Object	In 9.2, it is quite correct to state that many significant features are officially unrecognised. We welcome this statement warmly. However, the details of this paragraph are heavily laced with loop-holes. In its details, this paragraph is uninformed, very weak, quite inadequate.	The paragraph is necessarily open, as it is difficult to define every historic landscape feature, and its importance, through the development control policy.	
11234 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Change "connected by local streets and rights of way..." to reflect the importance of this part of the public highway network in connecting up local communities.	A change regarding access to historic landscapes is not required in this paragraph.	
8344 - CPRE	Object	Historic Landscapes. '...The Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Database, developed by the County Council, provides a valuable tool in defining the evolution of landscape and in identifying historic landscapes.' We understand that this Database has not been completed. Suggest the amending the wording to '...the Cambridgeshire Historic Landscape Database, currently being developed by the County Council, will provide a valuable tool...'	Whilst it is acknowledged the database is still under preparation, due to the timescale of the plan preparation process it is likely it will be in operation before the Development control Policies DPD is adopted. It should therefore remain in the plan.	
11230 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Allows for adequate protection of historic environment assets (landscape and archaeology).	Support noted.	
<b>9.3</b>				
11008 - Cambridge Antiquarian Society	Object	In 9.3, it is appropriate to mention historic parkland. However, that feature has to be appraised in context. 9.3 is unbalanced and would soon prove a liability. Revise this paragraph carefully by broadening it.	It is unclear why this paragraph is unbalanced and would prove a liability. It adequately describes the process of considering historic parks and gardens.	
11231 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Support	Allows for adequate protection of historic environment assets (landscape and archaeology).	Support noted.	
<b>CH/2 Archaeological Sites</b>				
11009 - Cambridge Antiquarian Society	Object	Open CH/2 with a statement on how archaeology relates to historic landscape. As soon as that is done, the exclusive emphasis on sites will be exposed as a weakness. In the preamble, much more attention is needed to "settings".	Repeating the text of CH/1 in CH/2 is not required. It is unclear what further clarity is required on 'settings'.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9683 - Foxton Parish Council 9432 - Croxton Parish Council 11010 - Cambridge Antiquarian Society	Support	Support for policy CH/2.	Support noted.	
<hr/>				
<i>9.4</i>				
11011 - Cambridge Antiquarian Society	Object	We approve of the proposal to favour preservation in situ. 9.4: clarify the distinction between 'value in their own right' and education etc.. Specify the government policies that favour preservation.	The first part of paragraph 9.4 does not require clarification, however a change is agreed with regard to the second point.	Replace 4th sentence of paragraph 9.4 with:[Government policy favours the retention of important remains in situ.] PARAGRAPH 13 OF PPG16 MAKES CLEAR THAT PRESERVATION IN SITU OF IMPORTANT ARCHAEOLOGICAL REMAINS IS NEARLY ALWAYS THE PREFERRED APPROACH.
<hr/>				
<i>9.6</i>				
11012 - Cambridge Antiquarian Society	Support	9.6: we strongly support the proposal to attend to sites of more local value. Clearer thought on CH/1 would make this part of the policy much easier to draft.	Support for paragraph 9.6 noted.	
<hr/>				
<i>9.7</i>				
11013 - Cambridge Antiquarian Society	Object	9.7: clarification of the sentence, "Prospective developers", could make it firmer. That is vitally important. Our Society anticipates that, in the years to come, appraisal will have to cover more than just archaeology. That is implicit in CH/1.	This sentence highlights the point that it could speed up the development process if developers are aware from an early stage of the constraints on a site. It does not need to be made firmer.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CH/3 Listed Buildings</i>				
9548 - GO-East	Object	The Policy repeats national policy contained in PPG15. PPS12 indicates that development control policies should not repeat national policy but should explain how national policy is to be applied at the local level. The policy should either be amended to remove repetition of national policy and include criteria that apply national policy specific to the local level or should be deleted.	Agree Policy CH/3 repeats PPG15 and should be amended.	Amend Policy CH/3 to read: "Applications for planning permission and listed building consent (including applications for alterations, extensions, change of use or demolition of Listed Buildings) will be determined in accordance with legislative provisions and national policy (currently in PPG15), together with the local policies set out in Supplementary Planning Documents. In assessing such applications the District Council will adopt a presumption in favour of the retention and preservation of local materials and details on Listed Buildings in the district."  Add the following text to the end of paragraph 9.11: "In particular the District Council will resist applications that result in the loss of traditional longstraw roofs and their ridge, barge and dormer details, or the loss of traditional gault clay pegtiles and pantile roofs, their ridge, valley, verge and abutment details."
9433 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
9684 - Foxton Parish Council	Support	Support policy CH/3.	Support noted.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
7943 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	While it is important to conserve special and older properties, the policy must recognise the need to permit the use of such buildings in a way which generates an income and covers the maintenance costs; while the special qualities of each building need to be respected, suitable and viable uses for many such grade II buildings need to be recognised even if some compromises have to be made.	Noted. Policy CH/3 has been amended as it duplicates PPG15, an approach which is contrary to PPS12. However, the amended policy requires that applications be determined in accordance with policy in PPG15, and this issue is covered by PPG15.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>CH/4 Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building</i>				
9434 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
<i>CH/5 Conservation Areas</i>				
10800 - Comberton Parish Council	Object	Comberton Parish Council is dissatisfied that the Southern Comberton Conservation Area is not shown in its entirety on the Comberton Inset map.	It is acknowledged that this conservation area south of the village does not entirely appear on the proposals map, it is continued on the district wide map, so its full extent can be ascertained. This approach has been taken with many such conservation areas in the countryside across the district.	
10663 - Bourn Parish Council (Bourn, Land at and around Kingfisher Close)	Object	Bourn Parish Council object to the Conservation Areas as shown on the Inset map for Bourn. These areas should be joined in the middle to include all of the central area.	Conservation Areas are not designated by the Local Development Framework, however the Council does have a duty from time to time to review the areas included. Details of this representation will be passed on to the Conservation section of the Council.	
10871 (Over, Land South of Willingham Road)	Object	Land south of Willingham Road Over should be designated as a Conservation Area to provide a wooded and wildflower meadow to be used by villagers.	Conservation Areas are not designated by the Local Development Framework, however the Council does have a duty from time to time to review the areas included. Details of this representation will be passed on to the Conservation section of the Council.	
9465 - Croxton Parish Council	Object	Croxton PC also notes the extent of the existing Conservation Area but it requests that SCDC looks towards reviewing and expanding that boundary so that it includes the surrounding landscape that more readily defines the character of the conservation area and forms the setting for the conservation area.	Conservation Areas are not designated by the Local Development Framework, however the Council does have a duty from time to time to review the areas included. Details of this representation will be passed on to the Conservation section of the Council.	
8110 - Comberton Parish Council (Comberton, Land along Green End)	Object	Comberton Parish Council oppose the Conservation Area in Comberton as detailed on inset map ref 20. The Parish Council ask that this is extended up Green End, to include the many fine old buildings there which should be afforded protection.	Conservation Areas are not designated by the Local Development Framework, however the Council does have a duty from time to time to review the areas included. Details of this representation will be passed on to the Conservation section of the Council.	
8449 - English Heritage	Object	This section generally provides good coverage of the historic environment. We consider policy CH/5 requires strengthening to address demolition. It should refer to the presumption in favour of the retention of buildings in conservation areas which contribute to their character or appearance [para 4.27 PPG15], and state that demolition of such buildings will only be granted exceptionally.	Noted. Policy CH/5 has been amended as it duplicates PPG15, an approach which is contrary to PPS12. However, the amended policy requires that applications be determined in accordance with policy in PPG15, and this issue is covered by PPG15.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9549 - GO-East	Object	The policy either repeats matters set out in PPG15 and legislation i.e. relating to development preserving or enhancing the conservation area, or sets out design criteria that are effectively covered by policy DP/2 or any generic design policy. PPS12 indicates that the development control policies should not be a compendium of use related policies that can be repetitive and should not repeat national policy but rather should indicate how national policy is to be applied at the local level. We therefore think that this policy in its current form is unnecessary and contrary to PPS12 and should be deleted.	Agree Policy CH/5 repeats PPG15 and should be amended.	Amend Policy CH/5 to read: "Planning applications for development proposals (including applications for Conservation Area Consent for demolitions) in or affecting Conservation Areas will be determined in accordance with legislative provisions and national policy (currently in PPG15), together with the local policies set out in Supplementary Planning Documents and guidance contained in specific Conservation Area Appraisals (where they exists) and the District Design Guide."  Add the following text to the end of paragraph 9.18: "Where appropriate they will be adopted as Supplementary Planning Documents."
9685 - Foxton Parish Council 9736 - Guilden Morden Parish Council 9408 - Eltisley Parish Council 9435 - Croxton Parish Council 9290 - Papworth Saint Agnes Parish Meeting 9751 - Caldecote Parish Council 9572 9586	Support	Support for conservation areas and conservation area policy.	support noted.	
<i>CH/6 Protected Village Amenity Areas</i>				
9596 - GO-East	Object	PPS12 indicates that development control policies should take the form of a limited suite of generic policies and should not be a compendium of policies that can be repetitive. The policy is very general and appears to in part repeat criterion 2 in Policy DP/8. We therefore question whether this needs to be a separate policy or whether the criteria could be effectively incorporated within Policy DP/8 in order to reduce the overall number of policies and avoid proponents of schemes having to refer to, and comply with a number of policies that are similar but all slightly varied.	Disagree. The policy focuses on particular areas that contribute to the character, amenity and functioning of the village. The village framework policy determines the division between the countryside and a village. It would cause confusion to assign two very different special elements to one policy.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9072 (Comberton , Land West of 64 Barton Road)	Object	<p>1) object to the inclusion of a specific parcel of land within the Comberton PVAA.</p> <p>2)The land is extremely well screened by mature trees and hedging on both the road frontage and the whole of the west boundary and is thereby physically and visually separated from the remainder of the the PVAA.</p> <p>3)The land could be satisfactorily developed for a single dwelling without adverse impact on the PVAA as or the village. Any development can be subject to appropriate tree preservation orders and the requirements of Conservation policies.</p>	The Protected Village Amenity Area in the centre of Comberton contributes significantly to the character of the village. Although this particular site has become overgrown, it continues contribute to the open character of that area of the village. Its removal could diminish the role of the remaining area, in particular by reducing the openness of Barton Road. Paragraph 9.21 of the Development Control Policies DPD states that PVAAs may be enclosed or semi enclosed, but still perform the roles they are designated to protect.	
10870 (Over, Land North of Primary School)	Object	Land north of Primary School, Over This land should be designated a PVAA as it provides an open area in the middle of the village as well as providing a site for wildlife.	The southern part of this site is allocated for an extension to the school playing field. When this is completed, it should be examined for its suitability as a PVAA as part of a future review of the Development Control Policies DPD. With regard to the remaining area, its contribution is limited due to lack of access, views, and the nature of the site, and does not warrant designation.	
7824 (Over, Land East of Station Road)	Object	We are asking for the removal of the PVAA status from our land in Over, East of Station Road. The site in question has been derelict for many years. Amenity areas within the village of Over have greatly improved over the last 5 years, with further land set aside for more areas for recreational use. Given that our site serves no amenity purpose and never has, we would respectfully request that the PVAA be removed from this site.	The Protected Village Amenity Area East of Station Road in Over contributes to the character of this part of the village. Although this particular site has become overgrown, it continues contribute to the open character of that area of the village. Its removal could diminish the role of the remaining area, in particular by reducing the openness. Paragraph 9.21 of the Development Control Policies DPD states that PVAAs may be enclosed or semi enclosed, but still perform the roles they are designated to protect.	
9650 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Histon, Chivers Barrell Field (Manor Park))	Object	The area of woodland between Histon & Girtton adjacent to the railway line (disused) should be retained and, if possible, expanded, linking to the area adjacent to No.4 Footpath to the north.	This site is outside the village framework. Its designation as a Protected Village Amenity Area is not required.	
9636 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Impington, Land between Clay Close Lane and Burgoynes Road)	Object	An important PVAA has been omitted at Impington. The parcel of land adjoining the junction of Clay Close Lane and Burgoynes Road currently used as open space should be designated as a Protected Village Amenity Area.	This land is outside the village framework as it does not form part of the built up area of the village, and the importance of its openness acknowledged by designation of Important Countryside Frontage.	
9576	Support	Policies CH/5, CH/6 and CH/7 are important in order to retain the particular character of individual villages. I fully support the designation of Protected Village Amenity Areas as set out on the Proposals Map for Great and Little Abington. In particular, the designation of the central area within Magna Close is important for recreation and amenity reasons. Several years ago I requested protection for this area within Magna Close as part of my comments submitted in relation to consultations on a previous Local Plan.	Support for PVAA at Magna Close, Great Abington noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9587	Support	Policies CH/5, CH/6 and Ch/7 are important to retain the particular character of individual villages. I support all the designations of Protected Village Amenity Areas as set out in the Proposals Maps for Great Shelford and Stapleford, Harston, Little Shelford, Newton and Sawston. I am particularly pleased that Spicers Sports Ground in Sawston has such protection.	Support noted.	
<i>CH/7 Important Countryside Frontages</i>				
10564 (Fulbourn, Land at Home End)	Object	Land at Home End Fulbourn. The designation of Important Countryside Frontage is considered inappropriate bearing in mind that the existing hedge, which could be preserved in any residential scheme, restricts views into the site. In the event that one could see into and beyond the site, it does not back on to open countryside but onto the car parking areas associated with the Village recreation ground, the pavilions, bowling greens and the lighting associated with these facilities.	Disagree. This frontage does perform the role required to justify designation of an Important Countryside Frontage. It allows the countryside to sweep into the built up area of the village.	
8532 - Steeple Morden Parish Council (Steeple Morden, Views North of Cheyney Street)	Object	North of Cheyney Street, Steeple Morden. The village descriptions that accompanied the Inset Maps in the Local Plan 2004 have been removed. These helped provide a reference point for describing village character in the absence of a village design and character assessment. Therefore a new Important Countryside Frontage is proposed. This proposed frontage is important to the character and setting of the village and in particular embraces where the countryside enters the village setting. This designation will help fill the policy vacuum before SPG on village character is produced.	This frontage is in the countryside, open on both sides. It does not warrant specific designation, as it does not bring rural character into the built up area, or provide a break between two significantly built up areas.	
11017 - Trustees of the Estate of the Late D L January (Great Shelford, Land NW of 11 Cambridge Road)	Object	An objection is raised to the continued inclusion of land to the northwest of 11 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford within the Cambridge Green Belt and the designation of Important Countryside Frontage to the Cambridge Road. Owing to the mature tree and hedge belt to the road frontage, there are no significant connections between the street scene and the surrounding rural area as all views are blocked. There is other open land adjoining, which is not screened to such an extent, that would still provide an important rural break between two nearby detached paths of the Village Framework. The mature trees to the frontage could be retained in any development scheme as vehicular access already exists.	Disagree. The Inspector's report of the Local Plan 2004 Inquiry confirmed that it emphasises the role of the green belt in this location in protecting the countryside from further encroachment. The frontage does form an important break between built up areas of the village, and should be retained as an important countryside frontage.	
10872 (Over, Frontage East of Hill Road)	Object	East of Hill Road, Over. This frontage should be designated an Important Countryside Frontage as it complies with the wording of the policy.	Agree.	Designate Important Countryside Frontage east of Hill Road.

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10874 (Over, Frontage bounded by New Road, Station Road & The Doles)	Object	Frontage bounded by New Road, Station Road & The Doles, Over This frontage should be designated an Important Countryside Frontage as it complies with the wording of the policy.	Disagree. The majority of the proposed ICF does not consist of open frontages, but land to the rear of properties. The areas that does consist of frontages is obscured by trees and hedges, not bringing the countryside into the built up area.	
10880 (Over, Frontage North of High Street)	Object	North of High Street, Over This frontage should be designated an Important Countryside Frontage as it complies with the wording of the policy.	Disagree, the proposed ICF runs to the rear of properties along the high street. It does not consist of a frontage, or provide a significant connection between the street scene and the countryside beyond.	
10878 (Over, Frontage between 69 & 71 Station Road)	Object	Station Road, Over This frontage should be designated an Important Countryside Frontage as it complies with the wording of the policy.	Disagree. The site lies some distance from the built up area of the village indicated by the village framework. Given the location, the small gap in the frontage does not warrant specific designation for significantly connecting the street scene to the surrounding rural area.	
10875 (Over, Frontage between 96 & 110 Station Road)	Object	Station Road, Over. This frontage should be designated an Important Countryside Frontage as it complies with the wording of the policy.	Disagree. The site lies some distance from the built up area of the village indicated by the village framework. Given the location, the small gap in the frontage does not warrant specific designation for significantly connecting the street scene to the surrounding rural area.	
10876 (Over, Frontage South of 110 Station Road)	Object	Station Road, Over This frontage should be designated an Important Countryside Frontage as it complies with the wording of the policy.	Disagree. The site lies some distance from the built up area of the village indicated by the village framework. Given the location, the small gap in the frontage does not warrant specific designation for significantly connecting the street scene to the surrounding rural area.	
10873 (Over, Frontage bounded by New Road, Station Road & The Doles)	Object	Frontage bounded by New Road, Station Road & The Doles, Over. This frontage should be designated an Important Countryside Frontage as it complies with the wording of the policy.	Disagree. The majority of the proposed ICF does not consist of open frontages, but land to the rear of properties. The areas that does consist of frontages is obscured by trees and hedges, not bringing the countryside into the built up area.	
8534 - Steeple Morden Parish Council (Steeple Morden, Views opposite 19-33 Station Road)	Object	Station Road, Steeple Morden. The village descriptions that accompanied the Inset Maps in the Local Plan 2004 have been removed. These helped provide a reference point for describing village character in the absence of a village design and character assessment. Therefore a new Important Countryside Frontage is proposed. This proposed frontage is important to the character and setting of the village and in particular emprises where the countryside enters the village setting. This designation will help fill the policy vacuum before SPG on village character is produced.	Disagree. Due to the enclosed nature of the frontage, with planting limiting views, it does not sufficiently link the built up area of the village with the countryside beyond to warrant specific designation.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8533 - Steeple Morden Parish Council (Steeple Morden, Views West of Brook End)	Object	West of Brook End, Steeple Morden. The village descriptions that accompanied the Inset Maps in the Local Plan 2004 have been removed. These helped provide a reference point for describing village character in the absence of a village design and character assessment. Therefore a new Important Countryside Frontage is proposed. This proposed frontage is important to the character and setting of the village and in particular emphasises where the countryside enters the village setting. This designation will help fill the policy vacuum before SPG on village character is produced.	This frontage is in the countryside, open on both sides. It does not warrant specific designation, as it does not bring rural character into the built up area, or provide a break between two significantly built up areas.	
8536 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Object	The retention of open spaces between distinct parts of Steeple Morden should be given greater weight than the Countryside Policies in PPS/7 and the Policies contained in the emerging Draft LDF currently provides.	Some frontages have been designated as important countryside frontages where appropriate. Specific proposals have been considered through responses to separate representations.	
9639 - Histon & Impington Parish Councils (Histon, Proposed frontage N of Park Lane)	Object	An important Countryside Frontage designation has been omitted at Park Lane, Histon	It is agreed that this frontage warrants designation as an Important Countryside Frontage, as it provides a significant connection between the street scene and the countryside.	Designate Important Countryside Frontage along Park Lane Histon.
10773 (Fen Ditton, Land off Horningsea Road)	Object	Land between no. 28 and 12 Horningsea Road, Fen Ditton, objection is raised to its designation an important Countryside Frontage. At the present time, the frontage presents an unattractive appearance comprising a broken down concrete post and wire fence with little or no vegetation alongside. In addition, views to the open countryside beyond are restricted by some tree planting along the rear boundary. Given the open character of the land towards the west, together with the surrounding agricultural land, it is considered that the development of this frontage would not significantly detract from the character or setting of Fen Ditton.	This site is not proposed to be designated as Important Countryside Frontage in the Pre Submission Public Participation DPD.	
10825 - Cambs County Council Property & Procurement Department (Litlington, ICF along South Street)	Object	It is considered difficult to justify the Important Countryside Frontage (ICF) designation linked to the recreation ground at Litlington. This is particularly relevant to the western section in front of the recreation centre, which is surrounded by, and is integral to the built environment of the village.	Disagree. This frontage does perform the role required to justify designation of an Important Countryside Frontage. It allows the countryside to sweep into the built up area of the village.	
9852 (Longstanton, Built Area South of Woodside) 9850 (Longstanton, Built Area South of Woodside)	Object	South of Woodside, Longstanton. The protected countryside frontage policy should be removed from this land. The hedge in question is predominately leylandii and has been planted by us as owners nearly 30 years ago. There are agricultural barns situated behind the hedge all along the frontage.	Disagree. This frontage performs a rural break between two nearby but separate areas of the village framework. Its designation as Important Countryside Frontage should be retained.	
10881 (Over, Frontage West of Longstanton Road)	Object	Longstanton Road, Over This frontage should be designated an Important Countryside Frontage as it complies with the wording of the policy.	Disagree. This frontage does not perform the role required to justify designation of an Important Countryside Frontage. Views out into the countryside are limited.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10882 (Over, Frontage East of Longstanton Road)	Object	Longstanton Road, Over This frontage should be designated an Important Countryside Frontage as it complies with the wording of the policy.	Disagree. This frontage does not perform the role required to justify designation of an Important Countryside Frontage.	
8535 - Steeple Morden Parish Council (Steeple Morden, Views opposite 93-105 Hay Street)	Object	Hay Street, Steeple Morden The village descriptions that accompanied the Inset Maps in the Local Plan 2004 have been removed. These helped provide a reference point for describing village character in the absence of a village design and character assessment. Therefore a new Important Countryside Frontage is proposed. This proposed frontage is important to the character and setting of the village and in particular embraces where the countryside enters the village setting. This designation will help fill the policy vacuum before SPG on village character is produced.	Disagree. Due to the enclosed nature of the frontage, with planting limiting views, it does not sufficiently link the built up area of the village with the countryside beyond to warrant specific designation.	
8530 - Steeple Morden Parish Council	Support	Steeple Morden Parish Council believes that the criteria under PPS 7/24 and 25 for Local Landscape Designation have been met in regard to Policy CH/7 Important Countryside Frontages.	Support noted.	
9739 - Guilden Morden Parish Council	Support	Guilden Morden Parish Council support the Importance Village Frontage as detailed on Proposals Map Inset no. 47.	Support noted.	
9579	Support	This policy, together with policies CH/5 and CH/6, is important in order to retain the particular character of individual villages. I support Countryside Frontages set out on the Proposals Map of Great and Little Abington and of Pampisford.	Support noted.	
9589	Support	This policy, together with policies CH/5 and CH/6, is important in order to retain the particular character of individual villages. I support the Important Countryside Frontages set out in the Proposals Map for the villages of Great Shelford and Stapleford, Harston, Hauxton, Little Shelford, Newton and Sawston.	Support noted.	
10803 - Comberton Parish Council	Support	Comberton Parish Council wish to give strong support and endorsement of the village protection frontage.	Support noted.	
<i>Objectives</i>				
10316 - Highways Agency	Support	The Highways Agency fully supports criteria 2 of Policy DP/1 and the objectives set out in Chapter 10, that seeks to ensure that development is located in areas highly accessible by public transport, cycling and walking thereby reducing the need to travel by car. This is of course fully in line with Government policy that seeks to reduce car use.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
8360 - The Marshall Group	Support	In supporting these objectives, Marshall asks the Council to be mindful of the benefits of sustainability achieved at a high level by promoting and accepting the concentration of new development in urban extensions as opposed to a more dispersed distribution to selected villages.	Support noted.	
<i>TR/c</i>				
11236 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	Change the wording to reflect the objective to increase travel by sustainable modes. "To increase travel by sustainable modes through the encouragement of modal shift away from the private motorcar."	Agree, amend the wording of Objective TR/c.	Amend the wording of Objective TR/c to read: "To increase travel by sustainable modes through the encouragement of modal shift away from the private car."
<i>TR/e</i>				
10292 - Huntsman Advanced Materials	Support	We support Policy TR/e which acknowledges the potential for sustainable travel and good accessibility to be achieved through new development.	Support noted.	
<i>TR/g</i>				
7889 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	We would emphasise the multiple benefits of walking, whether to work, to school, to shops, or for recreation: walking contributes to a healthier life style, and is cheap!	Support noted.	
<i>TR/1 Planning for More Sustainable Travel</i>				
10284 - Stannifer	Object	Planning for more sustainable travel, needs to recognise that improvements may be necessary along the existing transport corridors between Cambridge and the surrounding market towns if High Quality Public Transport (HQPT) provision is to be made. Policy TR/1 should be expanded to make clear the policy advantages of improving existing roads within the main transport corridors of the district.	Policy criteria 1 already recognises and makes provision for "securing appropriate improvements to public transport (including infrastructure improvements) in accordance with the aims of the Local Transport Plan" (LTP). The LTP adopts a corridor approach and this policy would support such.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
10096 - Bellway Homes	Object	We object to this policy on the basis that almost all new development will give rise to an increase in travel demands, and in some cases it will not be possible for contributions to be made to alternative transport solutions, if there are other costs associated with developing the land, such as contamination.	<p>This policy allows for flexibility, securing "appropriate" improvements. The measures listed are indicative of the sorts of things which may be sought to improve provision for non-car modes. Measures and contributions will be sought of a kind and level in scale with the development and could also include a financial contribution into a "pot" for the implementation of larger schemes.</p> <p>Add reasoned justification in a new paragraph before paragraph 10.5.</p>	<p>Add a new paragraph before paragraph 10.5:            "All development should strive to offer travel choice by non-car modes appropriate in scale and kind to the development. An indicative list of measures which may assist in achieving suitable modal choice are listed. The measures applicable to each development proposal will vary on case by case basis, according the type and scale of development proposed, its location, and the level of existing transport infrastructure and services in the immediate area. This could also include a financial contribution into a "pot" for the implementation of schemes beyond the scope of an individual development to deliver."</p>
11140 - Fairview New Homes	Object	Fairview are concerned with the statement in Policy TR/1 (see also DP/3 paragraph 2) that the council will seek to ensure that every opportunity is taken to secure appropriate improvements to public and community transport in accordance with the aims of the Local Transport Plan. Improvements should only be sought where such improvements are necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms.	<p>This policy seeks to ensure development is acceptable in transport terms and allows for flexibility, securing "appropriate" improvements. The measures listed are indicative of the sorts of things which may be sought to improve provision for non-car modes. Any contributions will be sought of a kind and level in scale with the development. This could also include a financial contribution into a "pot" for the implementation of larger schemes.</p> <p>Add reasoned justification in a new paragraph before paragraph 10.5.</p>	<p>Add a new paragraph before paragraph 10.5: "All development should strive to offer travel choice by non-car modes appropriate in scale and kind to the development. An indicative list of measures which may assist in achieving suitable modal choice are listed. The measures applicable to each development proposal will vary on case by case basis, according the type and scale of development proposed, its location, and the level of existing transport infrastructure and services in the immediate area. This could also include a financial contribution into a "pot" for the implementation of schemes beyond the scope of an individual development to deliver."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9203 - English Partnerships	Object	This policy could usefully make reference to the use of travel plans in Policy TR/3 and set out requirements for development to be within walking distance of a public transport corridor, whether it is 'high quality' or 'good quality'.	<p>There is no need to include reference to Travel Plans, which are addressed in Policy TR/3. It would be unnecessary duplication.</p> <p>The development strategy steers development to the larger, more sustainable, settlements which are better served by public transport. It would not be feasible, to require development to be within walking distance of a public transport corridor, given that the accepted walking distance to a bus stop is 400m and a large proportion of the district is removed from the corridors (as identified in the Local Transport Plan). However, bullet point 4 of the policy could be amended to require new development to be located close to public transport interchanges.</p> <p>As a consequence, bullet 3 of Policy TR/4 should also be amended.</p>	<p>Amend bullet 4 to read: "Ensuring that new developments are located and designed at the outset with permeable layouts to facilitate and encourage short distance trips by cycle and walking, including to public transport interchanges, in accordance with Policy TR/4."</p> <p>Amend bullet 3 of Policy TR/4 to read: "That detailed designs and layouts are permeable and encourage cycle use and walking for all or part of a journey, e.g. by including safe, direct links to schools, nearby centres of attraction and public transport interchanges, contributing..."</p>
9436 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
10261 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University welcomes the policy promoting more sustainable travel (TR/1).	Support noted.	
10022 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	BayerCropScience supports the policies as general criteria for assessing planning applications but reserves the right to make representations at the deposit stage of the local development framework, if experience from preparing a planning brief for the Hauxton site suggests that improvements can be made.	Support noted.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 1</i>				
8318 - D H Barford + Co Limited	Object	The policy requires further clarification in terms of the reference to 'material increase'.	Agree this could be clarified. Add a new paragraph after paragraph 10.4 in the reasoned justification, explaining how this will be measured.	<p>Add a new paragraph after paragraph 10.4: "In assessing whether the development proposal is likely to give rise to a material increase in travel demand, the Council will consider the existing use of the building(s) / site, existing transport conditions in the immediate and wider area, and likely transport generation resulting from the development proposal(s)."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
7944 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	Too often the assessment of sustainability comes down against development in rural areas because most people will have a reliance on the private motor car; there is limited public transport across much of the district preventing easy access for rural residents to work, services and recreation. Sustainability requires a balance to be struck between the social, economic and environmental considerations and such a balance is vital to many rural communities.	A balance is already being struck with the rural development strategy. The greater part of development in the rural area is permitted in the larger, more sustainable, settlements - Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres. These settlements have a wider range of facilities and services, reducing the need to travel, and are more capable of providing travel choice. It would not be appropriate to allow for greater levels of residential or employment development at smaller villages or in the open countryside which would encourage unsustainable travel. Focusing new development on more sustainable locations helps to support rural areas, promote a more inclusive society and may lessen the impact on existing levels of congestion, with it's associated social, economic, environmental impacts on rural communities.	
<b>3.</b>				
9783 - Haslingfield Parish Council 7945 - Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Object	There is a clear need to balance parking provision with what is needed and expected by people. While policies to restrict parking spaces may feel that a step has been taken to limit car use, it is clear that this leads to more on street parking and friction between neighbours.	The Council is sympathetic to the view expressed that levels of car ownership are not necessarily directly related to car use. However, the policy is consistent with PPGs 3 & 13, the Local Transport Plan and Structure Plan, which seek to minimise car parking provision. Residential car parking provision must be made in accordance with PPG3, paragraph 62, which states that policies which would result in higher than an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling should not be adopted. This is an average across the whole district. In rural areas more lenient standards are applied to reflect the poorer accessibility by alternative modes, whilst in more accessible areas with better travel choice, such as the major development areas, more stringent standards are applied. This is approach is necessary to retain the average across the district and it would be contrary to policy to amend the policy approach. Appendix 1 should be amended to clarify that residential parking standard refers to an average of 1.5 spaces applied across the district.	Amend Appendix 1, Use Class C3: Dwelling Homes, to read: "Average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling across the district..."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>TR/2 Car and Cycle Parking Standards</i>				
11242 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	The County Council will expect to see parking provided at levels that are consistent with the fact that as new developments with no preset travel patterns, there is ample opportunity to achieve sustainable travel patterns from the outset and avoid the need for overly large and wasteful parking areas. The document implies that parking for commercial / retail uses (and indeed residential use) will be provided at maximum standard levels. Disabled parking provision is to be included within the maximum provision and not to be considered as an additional provision.	<p>Policies already encourage shared parking and apply a more stringent approach to sites with good facilities and services and HQPT (e.g. the major development sites). Parking standards are fairly stringent for a rural area and should not result in large and wasteful parking areas - the design of parking areas should be controlled by DP/2 etc.</p> <p>However, Policy TR/2 could also refer to car pooling, to ensure consistency with the approach in the AAPs.</p> <p>Appendix 1 clearly states the car parking standards are maximum standards and provision will be up to the maximum level.</p> <p>The approach requiring the addition of, rather than inclusion of, disabled parking is in accordance with PPG13, Annex D, Note 3.</p>	Amend 2nd sentence of 2nd paragraph to read: "Where opportunities arise, for example, on mixed-use sites, shared use parking and car pooling will be encouraged to minimise provision."
10099 - Bellway Homes	Object	We consider that the restrictions to two spaces for three-bedroom or larger dwellings in poorly accessible areas is too restrictive. Given that South Cambridgeshire is a predominantly rural district with poor public transport, there should be flexibility within the parking standards.	<p>New development is restricted in poorly accessible areas because it is not sustainable in travel terms. However, where limited development may be acceptable in planning terms, e.g. infill development in smaller villages, car parking provision must be made in accordance with PPG3, paragraph 62, which states that policies which would result in higher than an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling should not be adopted. This is an average across the whole district. In rural areas more lenient standards are applied to reflect the poorer accessibility by alternative modes, whilst in more accessible areas with better travel choice, such as the major development areas, more stringent standards are applied. This is approach is necessary to retain the average across the district and it would be contrary to policy to amend the policy approach. Appendix 1 should be amended to clarify that the average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling is across the district.</p>	Amend Appendix 1, Use Class C3: Dwelling Homes to read: "Average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling across the district..."

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9096 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	Reference to the particular circumstances of Northstowe and the sustainable communities should be made in the text. Further restrictions on car parking over and above those set out in the standards that the District Council intends to adopt, may impact on the success of centres and as such detract from the wider objectives of the LDF. They must not undermine the establishment of the robust centres and mixes of uses which are necessary in building communities.	Such an approach is consistent with PPG3 paragraph 61 which states that "local authorities should revise their car parking standards to allow for significantly lower levels of off-street parking provision, particularly for developments: in locations, such as town centres, where facilities and services are readily accessible by walking, cycling or public transport". The concerns of the representor are unproven. Car parking standards will be applied on a case by case basis, in accordance with the above guidance. In the case of Northstowe, it is appropriate that the aim in respect of car parking provision in the town centre should be to reduce provision by methods such as shared use parking and other opportunities. The town centre will be located on the dedicated busway through the town and there will be high levels of accessibility to the route for local residents.	
10023 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	BayerCropScience supports the policies as general criteria for assessing planning applications but reserves the right to make representations at the deposit stage of the local development framework, if experience from preparing a planning brief for the Hauxton site suggests that improvements can be made.	Support noted.	
<i>Policy Paragraph 3</i>				
10262 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University welcomes the introduction of cycle parking standards (TR/2).	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>TR/3 Mitigating Travel Impact</i>				
11246 - Cambridgeshire County Council	Object	<p>The third paragraph should make mention to residential developments also requiring Transport Assessments and Travel Plans as Para. 89 of PPG13 only refers to commercial development proposals.</p> <p>In addition, smaller developments may require Transport Statements to outline the transportation implications of the development proposal and how they are to be mitigated and comply with sustainable transport policies.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council agrees that a Transport Assessment should be required for residential development proposals which may have 'significant transport implications', it would not be appropriate to require a Travel Plan, given that the end user and their trip pattern is unknown and there will be a wide variation in destinations.</p> <p>Amend the 3rd paragraph to require a Transport Assessment for major residential developments, with a new footnote defining what constitutes 'major development'.</p> <p>Agree, there should be a requirement for a Transport Statement for smaller schemes, and this would be consistent with the approach in DP/2 for Design and Access Statements. Add this requirement in a new sentence after bullet 2.</p> <p>Add reasoned justification in a new paragraph before 10.9 to explain the policy requirements for a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan.</p>	<p>Amend 3rd paragraph to read: "Proposals for 'major development'* or where a proposal is likely to have 'significant transport implications' the Council will require developers to submit the following alongside planning applications:..."</p> <p>Add new footnote to read: "Major development' will be interpreted as set out in paragraph 3.5 on page 32."</p> <p>Add the following text after bullet 2: "All other planning applications should be accompanied by a Transport Statement to demonstrate that the development will achieve adequate mitigation of its transport impacts."</p> <p>Add new paragraph before 10.9, as follows: "It is important that all development mitigates its transport impact. 'Major development' proposals or development proposals with a 'significant transport implications' will be required to produce a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan (for non-residential proposals). A Transport Statement should be submitted alongside all other development proposals to enable the applicant to demonstrate to the Council that they have properly considered the transport impact of the proposal and taken into account how to mitigate them. The level of detail of the Transport Statement will vary according to the scale and complexity of the application."</p>

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9102 - Gallagher Longstanton Ltd.	Object	The policy draws no distinction between the outline and more detailed stages of the application process. With no knowledge of end users it is not possible to submit a travel plan alongside an outline planning application. The policy should include a caveat at its end as follows: 'In relation to outline planning applications, a Framework for the preparation of Travel Plans will be submitted with the application proposals'.	Agree, add caveat to the end of Policy TR/3.	Add the following caveat to the end of Policy TR/3: "In relation to outline planning applications, a Framework for the preparation of Travel Plans will be submitted with the application proposals."
10024 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	BayerCropScience supports the policies as general criteria for assessing planning applications but reserves the right to make representations at the deposit stage of the local development framework, if experience from preparing a planning brief for the Hauxton site suggests that improvements can be made.	Support noted.	
<i>TR/4 Cycling and Walking Provision</i>				
9037 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Object	OBJECT: this policy would be better titled "Non motorised Provision". In its current form it discriminates against other vulnerable road users, and any leisure users.	Agree, the title does not fully reflect the range of users the policy refers to and should be amended.  The policy should also better reflect this and the 1st and 2nd paragraphs should be amended to refer to non-car modes.  The policy includes provision for leisure use.	Amend policy title to: "Non-car modes".  Amend 1st paragraph to read: "The District Council will use its planning powers to support increased use of non-car modes by all sectors of society, including cycle use and walking by ensuring that..."  Amend 2nd paragraph to read: "In assessing such future provision for non-car modes, the District Council will use the following priorities:..."
10264 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Object	Specific reference should be made in Policy TR/4 to the need to provide facilities to encourage cycling and walking in the new urban extensions (including North West Cambridge).	Criteria 3 already seeks linkages within the development, to centres of attraction and the wider network. In addition, the Area Action Plans for the major development sites provide more detail on cycle infrastructure, including internal and external cycle links to the main centres of attraction, and to the wider countryside. An area Action Plan for North West Cambridge is proposed.	
10025 - Bayer CropScience Ltd	Support	BayerCropScience supports the policies as general criteria for assessing planning applications but reserves the right to make representations at the deposit stage of the local development framework, if experience from preparing a planning brief for the Hauxton site suggests that improvements can be made.	Support noted.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
9208 - English Partnerships	Support	English Partnerships supports the proposed hierarchy of cycle provision and requests that the policy states that large-scale development should offer an appropriate level of cycle facilities and infrastructure. The Local Authority should seek to achieve a balanced provision of external links between large-scale developments and good quality intra settlement links.	Support noted, although it is proposed to widen the hierarchy to include all non-car modes. All development, regardless of scale, is required to make provision for cycle parking under policy TR/2, which sets out the minimum standards in Appendix 2. The Area Action Plans for the major development sites provide more detail on cycle infrastructure, including internal and external cycle links.	
10263 - Chancellor, Masters & Scholars of the University of Cambridge	Support	The University welcomes promotion of cycling and walking provision (TR/4).	Support noted.	
9437 - Croxton Parish Council	Support	Croxton PC supports the following draft policies because it is considered that they will all support the delivery of the strategic vision.	Support noted.	
<b>3.</b>				
9045 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Object	OBJECT to the exclusion of equestrians; safe crossing places (i.e Pegasus lights, bridges or underpasses) are needed just as much by horse riders as by cyclists and pedestrians. A crossing that caters for all users offers a 'best value' option.	Whilst there is no explicit mention of equestrians within the policy text, provision is made for all non-car modes, including equestrians. Agree that crossing facilities are an important aspect of effective routes and should be added to list of things improving the attractiveness of the network in the last paragraph.	Amend 1st sentence of the last paragraph to read: "...or improve the attractiveness of the network, including through improved maintenance, crossings, signposting and waymarking of cycleways, footpaths and other rights of way."
<i>Policy Paragraph 2</i>				
9051 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Object	Object: non motorised safety is equally important to all vulnerable road users, whether the journey is made for leisure or other use.	The policy requires any new routes to be safe. This applies to all users and for both leisure or other use.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>c.</i>				
9058 - British Horse Society (Cambridgeshire)	Object	OBJECT: The 3 tier objective means that needs of equestrians will be omitted, as emphasis is likely to fall on the first two objectives.	<p>The three tiers are weighted to reflect value for money in terms of the likely / potential usage levels. However, that is not to say that the third tier will be omitted. For example, recreation and leisure routes are an integral part of the proposals in the major development areas and are provided for in the Area Action Plans.</p> <p>Add some reasoned justification, before paragraph 10.11, to explain the reasoning behind the tiers.</p>	<p>Add new paragraph, before paragraph 10.11, as follows:          "The hierarchy sets out the priority for the delivery of infrastructure provision for non-car modes through the planning process, for example through Section 46 contributions. Although listed in priority order, no one priority should be promoted to the exclusion of others. The first priority is to connect to larger centres of attraction, both within or adjacent to the district, including Cambridge and the market towns. These centres have a range of services and facilities, including schools and employment areas. This offers greater value for money in terms of the range of the population who could potentially use the routes. In addition, Safer Routes to School, whilst contributing to the overall aims of improving infrastructure, is already delivered from a separate pot of money. Leisure and recreation routes are also an important resource, particularly to improve access to the surrounding countryside as part of a healthy lifestyle."</p>
<i>Policy Paragraph 4</i>				
7911 - Ramblers Association [Cambridge Group]	Support	We would strongly support the sentiments in this statement: it is the continuous care and maintenance of RoW that matters, and making their presence known to a wider public, that really matters. The mere establishment of such routes is not sufficient. We welcome too the concern to establish circular routes, though in order to achieve this, with walks of varying lengths, it will be necessary to consider connectivity to other District Councils, whether in Cambridgeshire or not.	Support noted. The hierarchy of provision promotes linkages to centres with facilities and services, which may include settlements outside of the district, including Cambridge City and the market towns. The Area Action Plans for the major development sites also provide more detail on infrastructure provision, including internal and external links.	

<i>Representations</i>	<i>Nature</i>	<i>Representation Summary</i>	<i>Councils' Assessment</i>	<i>Change to Draft DPD</i>
<i>TR/6 Eastern Rapid Transit</i>				
9525 - GO-East	Object	It is not clear whether the route and other facilities associated with the Eastern Rapid Transit link is wholly contained within the defined area of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan (CEAAP) or not. If the link and the associated facilities are wholly contained within the Area Action Plan area, then this policy is unnecessary and should be deleted, as the matters could be dealt with through policies in the CEAAP. However, if the link and/or associated facilities are to be provided outside the defined area of the CEAAP, then it would be appropriate to retain the policy. Further consideration should be given to this matter and any necessary changes made prior to submission of the DPD.	The policy relates to the rapid transit link which will serve the urban expansion of Cambridge East. It is contained within the Cambridge East Area Action Plan and this policy is to be deleted as it is unnecessary duplication of the Area Action Plan, and it would not be reasonable to retain the policy and expect development in the wider area to contribute to a scheme serving the urban expansion.	Delete Policy TR/6.
8361 - The Marshall Group	Support	The Structure Plan has a requirement for a link to a rapid transit system, but at present a decision is awaited from the Secretary of State on the Transport and Works Act application. Guided bus, which is the chosen rapid transit system, will bring benefits to many sites and individuals. It will be of sub-regional significance. Thought needs to be given to a system of contribution from many sources.	Support noted. However, this policy is to be deleted, as it is unnecessary duplication of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan, and it would not be reasonable to retain the policy and expect development in the wider area to contribute to a scheme serving the new urban quarter.	
<i>TR/7 Aviation-Related Development Proposals</i>				
8362 - The Marshall Group	Object	The text supporting this policy indicates a wide range of flying activities and runway provision throughout South Cambridgeshire. Cambridge City Airport is the most important operational airport in the sub region. It fulfils a number of roles. Whilst Marshall is planning to relocate, nevertheless in the interim period it may bring forward proposals to enhance its business at Cambridge City Airport and Marshall requests that such a policy provision should be written in.	The policy already allows flexibility for further expansion of Cambridge Airport with Criteria 1, which allows the consideration of the economic / employment advantages of development.	
<i>USE CLASSES ORDER A1</i>				
8936 - Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	Object	Wm Morrison is concerned that the proposed cycle parking standard for superstores is 1 space/25 sq.m of gross floorspace. In our client's experience as a superstore operator there is a limited requirement for cycle parking facilities in food retail facilities, since the bulky food shopping trip (which is predominantly undertaken by car) has become the norm. In our client's view a cycle parking standard of 1 space/400 sq.m should be sufficient to cater for cycle parking demands at most superstore developments.	Supermarkets perform a number of functions in addition to the bulky shopping trip, including, "top-up" shopping, and many supermarkets have cafe / restaurant facilities. It is possible for all the above to be accessed by cycle, especially as cycles have range of panniers / trailers to allow carriage of a range of goods. This approach is consistent with PPG 13 and It would therefore be contrary to policy to amend the policy approach.	