



**South  
Cambridgeshire  
District Council**

# Draft Final Sustainability Appraisal Annex A

## Appendix 3: Responding to Representations on Rejected SHLAA Sites

Settlement Hierarchy	Settlement / Location	Rejected SHLAA Site Number(s)
<b>New Settlement</b>	Six Mile Bottom	135
	Hanley Grange	248
	Barrington Quarry	261
	North of A428, Cambourne	265
	North and NE of Northstowe	274
	Old Goods Yard, Oakington	275
	<b>Rural Centres</b>	Cottenham
Great Shelford & Stapleford		139, 145, 146, 149, 188, 207, 212
Histon & Impington		227, 306
Sawston		076 & 313
<b>Minor Rural Centre</b>	Bassingbourn	059
	Comberton	079, 181
	Fulbourn	108 & 109, 111 & 284, 136, 162, 214
	Gamlingay	174
	Girton	018, 144, 177, 203
	Linton	032, 276, 318
	Milton	094
	Papworth Everard	321
	Swavesey	065, 169, 250
	Waterbeach	142, 202, 270
	Willingham	047, 157
	Great Chesterford	330
<b>Group Villages</b>	Various	(see Table 1)



## Appendix 3: Responding to Representations on Rejected SHLAA Sites

This Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) considers the potential supply of housing land across the whole District. It is a technical assessment of sites to determine whether they may have potential to be suitable for housing.

The Council has assessed over 300 sites which met the Council criteria; a site of at least 0.25 ha, which could provide 10 or more homes, and if not a strategic scale development, be in or adjacent to a reasonably sized settlement (including those classified as a rural centre, minor rural centre or group village). Sites were assessed to be sites with development potential, sites with limited development potential or sites with no development potential.

During the Issues and Options 1 and 2 consultations the Council received a number of comments on sites that the Council had rejected as having no development potential.

This Appendix summarises the site specific representations received to all the rejected SHLAA sites, together with the Council's response and conclusion on each of the sites.

<b>Settlement Hierarchy</b>	<b>Settlement / Location</b>	<b>Rejected SHLAA Site Number(s)</b>	
<b>New Settlement</b>	Six Mile Bottom	135	
	Hanley Grange	248	
	Barrington Quarry	261	
	North of A428, Cambourne	265	
	North and NE of Northstowe	274	
	Old Goods Yard, Oakington	275	
<b>Rural Centres</b>	Cottenham	128, 260, 269, 316	
	Great Shelford & Stapleford	139, 145, 146, 149, 188, 207, 212	
	Histon & Impington	227, 306	
	Sawston	076 & 313	
<b>Minor Rural Centre</b>	Bassingbourn	059	
	Comberton	079, 181	
	Fulbourn	108 & 109, 111 & 284, 136, 162, 214	
	Gamlingay	174	
	Girton	018, 144, 177, 203	
	Linton	032, 276, 318	
	Milton	094	
	Papworth Everard	321	
	Swavesey	065, 169, 250	
	Waterbeach	142, 202, 270	
	Willingham	047, 157	
		Great Chesterford	330
<b>Group Villages</b>	Various	(see Table 1)	

## Sites in New Settlements

<b>Settlement:</b>	New Settlement (Carlton, Little Wilbraham & Weston Colville Parish)		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Six Mile Bottom		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	135		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. Due to the landform and deeply rural character, it will be very difficult to offer any landscape mitigation to development of this scale and character on this site. There may be opportunities for limited, small to medium scale development between the A11 and the A1304. Development of this site will have a direct impact on the A11 and A14. The A14 has capacity problems and the A11 / A14 / A1303 interchange provides no access from the A11 South to A14, both to and from Cambridge. Such access would be required to prevent traffic from using local routes to travel to Cambridge. Potential impact on the A1303, A1304 and local roads. Some utilities will need to be upgraded.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	50766 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Smiths Gore
	<p>The key issues raised (landscape impact, highways considerations, and utilities capacity) can all be addressed and do not detract from the merits of the site in principle as a location for growth. The site should have been identified as a potential location for sustainable growth.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site is within a remote, rural, open and rolling landscape, with many areas of mature woodland, shelter belts and hedges separating a regular pattern of medium to very large sized fields. The horizon is almost entirely treed, but the rolling, rising land allows long views in all directions. The scale and character of the proposed development would be visible over large areas, and would form developed skylines to the north, south and east. Development would be very large in relation to the existing settlements and of such a different character that it would have a very significant adverse effect on them. The landscape would be unable to accommodate the proposed development without total and adverse character change.</p> <p>Development of this site will have a direct impact on the A11 and A14, however, the A14 has capacity problems and the A11 / A14 / A1303 interchange provides no access from the A11 South to A14, both to and from Cambridge. Such access would be required to prevent traffic from using local routes to travel to Cambridge. Potential impact on the A1303, A1304 and local roads. The promoter proposes a new station on the Newmarket to Cambridge railway, potential timetabling and capacity issues on this line would need to be checked.</p> <p>New infrastructure and / or reinforcement of existing infrastructure will be</p>		

	<p>required to provide capacity in utility services. The SHLAA site assessment acknowledged that the promoter had held discussions with Transco, 24 Seven, and Cambridge Water Company and that there were no anticipated problems servicing the new community in terms of gas, electricity and mains water supply.</p> <p>The promoters have not provided any additional information to outline how the harm to the landscape can be mitigated or how the highways issues can be resolved. Housing capacity exists in more sustainable locations, closer to Cambridge, with better transport links, with less landscape impacts and with a greater use of brownfield land. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	--

<b>Settlement:</b>	New Settlement		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Hanley Grange, east of A1301 and west of A11		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	248		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. Grade II Listed Hinxtton Grange and associated Grade II Listed stable and coach house are located in the middle of the site. Close proximity are three Conservation Areas. Close to Scheduled Monument. Site contains evidence for significant archaeology. Close to County Wildlife Site and SSSI, and possible presence of protected species. High Grade agricultural land – Grade 2. The site lies over the Granta Chalk Aquifer. Potential for significant increases in traffic emissions and static emissions that could affect local air quality. Noise issues from road &amp; rail transport surrounding the site. Significant landscape and townscape impacts on the setting of nearby villages and Cambridge. Full Transport Assessment required and traffic impacts would need mitigating. Significant utility upgrades required.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	<p>8 representations (including Little Abington and Ickleton Parish Councils) supporting the rejection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would do nothing to address the needs of Cambridgeshire / South Cambridgeshire residents but would draw in a large number of people who would simply commute south.</li> <li>• Pampisford Parish Council - land should NOT be reconsidered.</li> </ul>		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	42586 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Hinxtton Land Ltd
	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal has significant deficiencies and cannot be relied upon as a basis for selecting new settlement options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SA does not conform to SA guidance published by the Government</li> <li>- Level of information provided by each site promoter varies widely in detail and depth.</li> <li>- The red / amber / green scoring appears subjective and is difficult to reconcile with the evidence.</li> </ul> <p>It is difficult to reconcile the Government's SA which found no 'showstoppers' for Hanley Grange, but concerns relating to Waterbeach, with the SA now undertaken by SCDC. Wardell Armstrong have undertaken a rescoring of the red / amber / green assessment for the new settlement candidates and conclude that there is nothing in the evidence which would lead to Hanley Grange being rejected at this stage. Unless the Council rectifies the deficiencies in the SA process, the promoters of Hanley Grange will urge the Local Plan Inspector to reject the plan as being unsound due to the deficiencies of the SA.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The SHLAA assessment and Sustainability Appraisal have been revised in light of comments received from the objector, but this does not change the overall conclusion that this is a site with no development potential.</p> <p>Several historic environment constraints and significant sites and settings</p>		

potentially compromised. The need to preserve the setting of numerous historic features and areas imposes constraints on the development. However, with an appropriate scale of development and careful design it should be possible to mitigate these impacts. Significant archaeological interest is likely and will need early assessment.

There are records of protected species in the area and the bird survey indicates the presence of BAP species and one Schedule 1 species. Several natural environment constraints which would require further survey and investigation. However, with an appropriate scale of development and careful design it should be possible to mitigate these impacts. The loss of agricultural land cannot be mitigated.

Significant townscape and landscape impacts. Through careful planning, phasing and design mitigation measures can be incorporated into the site's design to reduce the visual impact of the development. However, mitigation of a large-scale development would be very difficult. The form, scale and character of the proposal is likely to be at odds with the local landscape and settlement pattern, overwhelming the local village character and small-scale river valley landscape. The scale and extent of the development will ensure that it becomes the dominant feature in the landscape. This will result in a very substantial negative effect on the adjacent villages and local landscape character and on views from the countryside beyond the site. The additional infrastructure required to connect the proposed development would add further damage.

Although a new settlement is one of the most sustainable means to provide for new housing, this is outweighed by the harm to the historic and natural environment, landscape and townscape. Housing capacity exists in more sustainable locations, closer to Cambridge, with better transport links, with less landscape impacts and with a greater use of brownfield land. The site has no development potential.

<b>Settlement:</b>	New Settlement (Barrington & Haslingfield Parish)		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Barrington Quarry		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	261		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. The eastern part of the site is a former quarry. Barrington Chalk Pit extends over this area and is a designated SSSI for geological purposes. Approximately half the site is within a safeguarding area for chalk identified in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Councils Minerals and Waste LDF.</p> <p>The presence of the SSSI and safeguarding area for chalk together result in the site having no development potential.</p> <p>The form and scale of the proposed development are completely at odds with the local Landscape Character and settlement patterns.</p> <p>Additionally there would be major adverse impact on the setting of the Conservation Areas in the villages of Barrington, Orwell, Haslingfield and Harlton as well as the setting of a number of listed buildings.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	Harlton and Haslingfield Parish Councils support rejection of site.		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	40899 (I&O1) 52144 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Cemex Mr David Blake
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEMEX considers the Council has been inconsistent in assessing sites. The Council called for "large" sites as possible locations for new settlements. CEMEX's landholding including the cement works and quarries is a large site, hence it was put forward.</li> <li>• In rejecting the site at Barrington for a new settlement, the Council should have considered a smaller development parcel on the cement works (as previously developed land of low environmental value on the edge of Barrington). This approach was taken to Waterbeach.</li> <li>• CEMEX considers that based on sound planning principles, Barrington cement works should be considered as a suitable housing site.</li> <li>• Support for development of Barrington Quarry included in questionnaire response.</li> <li>• Barrington cement works is unused and would provide an opportunity for redevelopment. It has a railway line connection which can be re-established and would enable easy access to Cambridge.</li> </ul>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	The scale of the development proposed would have a significant impact on the landscape character and settlement pattern of the area. Development of this new settlement would have a major adverse impact on a number of Conservation Areas of villages nearby particularly that of Barrington. It would impact on the setting of a number of listed buildings and bring unacceptable development into the landscape.		

	<p>Part of the site is designated as an SSSI and is within a chalk safeguarding area identified in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Councils' Minerals and Waste LDF. Such protections would prevent development of these parts of the site.</p> <p>The Council has not considered a smaller development allocation because if this were to be adjoining the village of Barrington the SSSI and chalk safeguarding would seriously impact the land available and this is a Group Village. The Council has not proposed allocating sites within such villages. Group Villages are smaller villages which provide a lower level of services and facilities than larger villages classified as Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres. Development in Group Villages is less sustainable than development in locations higher in the sustainable development sequence which runs from locations in and on the edge of Cambridge, through New Settlements, to Rural Centre and Minor Rural Centre villages and finally to Group Villages. Sufficient sites have been identified for allocation in locations higher in the sustainable development sequence and therefore no development allocations are justified in Group Villages.</p>
--	--

<b>Settlement:</b>	New Settlement (Elsworth & Knapwell Parishes)			
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land to the north of the A428, Cambourne			
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	265			
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. It should be possible to partly mitigate the noise and air quality issues, and impacts on the listed buildings, SSSI, County Wildlife Site, protected trees and biodiversity. However, it would not be possible to mitigate the landscape impacts as the scale of the development and types of buildings proposed would be very difficult to integrate into the local landscape. The development would have a direct impact on A428 with potential capacity issues.			
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A			
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	39859 (I&O1) 55265 & 55261 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b>	Martin Grant Homes Limited, Harcourt Developments Limited
	<p>The development could deliver circa 2,500 dwellings (with opportunities to increase this to 4,000 dwellings over the longer term) as well as new jobs, education facilities (including primary and secondary provision), a park &amp; ride site, improved public transport services, new leisure and recreation facilities and footway and cycle links to the existing villages to the south. The land is not subject to any landscape designations, and provides opportunities for landscape and habitat creation linking woodland, copses and hedges that will also contribute to the overall enhanced sustainability of the expanded community at Cambourne. Traversing the A428 and connecting the existing and proposed new communities at Cambourne will be a key aspect to delivering an integrated settlement. Connections can be achieved through highway, cycleway, footpath and public transport. The location sits logically within the wider village grouping in the countryside, and would not therefore read merely as an extension of the existing three villages.</p> <p>The initial SHLAA assessment did not assess the site on a comparable basis with other sites such as Bourn Airfield or extensions of Cambourne to the west and therefore a reassessment should be carried out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways: potential impacts on the A428 would be significantly less than a similar quantum of development on Bourn Airfield as that site would form a linear extension along the A428 which is less sustainable because journeys are extended over greater distances.</li> <li>• Access to facilities: would create better opportunities for walking and cycling to existing facilities because closer to key services including new secondary school, and most direct link via pedestrian or cycle bridges over A428 would be inaccessible for motor users.</li> <li>• Landscape: this development is a garden suburb with a high proportion of</li> </ul>			

	<p>the site for landscaping and open space. Existing landscape of hedgerows, trees and woodland provides considerable visual enclosure which prevents many long views. A comprehensive range of mitigation measures has been incorporated including extensive tree planting to screen key viewpoints. Not within a protected landscape.</p>
<p><b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b></p>	<p>The Highways Agency advised that development on this site is likely to be largely Cambridge focussed but that there is also likely to be a significant number of trips to St Neots. The A428 corridor between the A1 and the A1198 is severely limited in capacity. There is some scope for larger sites to enhance the overall transport sustainability this area through better integration with the potential to offset some of the new demand. The capacity to accommodate new development on this corridor is directly related to this scope, which will need to be demonstrated by the promoters. Although the promoters have indicated that the development would include a park and ride site and improved public transport services, the development will still generate a significant number of car journeys.</p> <p>The centre point of the proposed site is more than 1km from the existing services and facilities provided in Cambourne, although the proposed development would provide some new facilities. Even with pedestrian and cycle bridges across the A428, it would be difficult to view this development as an extension of Cambourne given the separation from the existing settlement by the A428, other roads and structural landscaping. If the site were to be developed, it would be best seen as a new village.</p> <p>The site is part of a layered landscape that consists of fairly open and rolling land that falls away to the north towards Knapwell and contains areas of mature woodlands often in the valley bottoms of small streams which cut through the site. This layered landscape means that long views are not so frequent as adjacent areas. Although the proposal includes open space and landscaping, and other mitigation measures to reduce the impact on the landscape, the existing detailed and layered landscape would become obscured by the development. The scale of the development proposed would also make integration of the development into this landscape very difficult and the new built skyline would be viewable from local roads and villages changing the rural character of the area. This development alongside the existing Cambourne development would create a significant built up area that is at odds with the local landscape.</p> <p>Housing capacity exists in more sustainable locations, closer to Cambridge, with better transport links, with a closer relationship to Cambourne, with less environmental and landscape impact and with a greater use of brownfield land. The site has no development potential.</p>

<b>Settlement:</b>	Northstowe			
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land generally to the north and north east of Northstowe adjoining the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway			
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	274			
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. A small part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. 1/3 of the site is within a Sand and Gravel Minerals Safeguarding Area. High grade agricultural land – Grades 1 and 2. Possible land contamination, odour, air quality and noise issues. Significant townscape and landscape impacts. Full Transport Assessment required and traffic impacts would need mitigating. No spare capacity in the drainage system. Significant utility upgrades required.			
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A			
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	46333 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b>	The Fairfield Partnership
	Fairfield Partnership propose that land to north of CGB should be allocated for a mixed use development, to provide employment and housing within easy reach of Cambridge, and overcome an identified deficit in employment in current proposals for Northstowe. New employment, including high value manufacturing, will complement the needs of the Cambridge high technology cluster and create greater self-containment and sustainability within town, with 1 job to every home. Further development at Northstowe can ease pressure on Cambridge Green Belt in providing homes and jobs which the area needs.			
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The promoter has modified the original residential-led submission to include a higher proportion of employment uses within a mixed-use proposal. A new SHLAA assessment and Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken, but this did not change the overall conclusion.</p> <p>Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts. The development is at odds with the local landscape character. It would be extremely difficult to integrate an extended development of this scale with existing proposals and the local landscape. If this site is to form an extension to Northstowe then the form of the combined developments, their structural landscape, connections to the wider landscape and their transport infrastructure and connections will have to be re-addressed. The proposed layout of Northstowe and the existing transport infrastructure will make satisfactory connections between the two sites very difficult. Given its likely form and scale the development will form an extensive urban edge clearly visible from Willingham and Rampton to the north. Development would be very large in relation to the existing and proposed settlements and would adversely affect the landscape setting of Longstanton Oakington, Willingham and Rampton.</p>			

	<p>Although a new settlement is one of the most sustainable means to provide for new housing, this is outweighed by the identified impacts to the landscape and townscape. Housing capacity exists in more sustainable locations, with less environmental and landscape impact and with a greater use of brownfield land. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	--

<b>Settlement:</b>	Northstowe		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Old East Goods Yard, Station Road, Oakington		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	275		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. The site includes areas in flood zones 2 and 3. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Westwick as despite the opportunity for the proposal to improve an unoccupied commercial site, the planning history demonstrates the unsuitability of this site for backland development given the historically sensitive nature of the area. The site forms an important part of the setting of several listed buildings and the conservation area. There are likely to be noise and vibration impacts from the close proximity to the guided busway and the physical constraints of the site are likely to influence the design and layout of the site.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	29732, 55250 & 34590 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Simon Collis
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Factual correction: the plot width is 26m at entrance, narrowing to 16m and then 11m for the final 40m of its length.</li> <li>• The site is close to Oakington Station and directly adjoining the guided busway and cycle way. Factual correction: the nearest guided busway stop is around 80m from the site not 872m. The site is linked to Cambridge without using roads, therefore minimising car use and encouraging cycling and walking for both work and leisure. SA Criteria 51 (shorter journeys, modal choice and integration of transport modes) should be +++, not +.</li> <li>• A high quality scheme is achievable and would be much more in keeping with the surrounding land use than the existing commercial use.</li> <li>• Flood risk issues have already been addressed in the Flood Risk Assessment and the proposed layout reduces the hard-surfaced areas further alleviating the risk. The land proposed for development is between 8.3 and 8.5 metres AOD and is therefore within Flood Zone 1 or 2 and certainly not Flood Zone 3.</li> <li>• The assessment lists noise and vibration from guided buses as a potential impact, although the frequency and proximity of buses is less intrusive than a minor road. A noise and vibration study would be carried out if required.</li> <li>• Objections to development on the grounds of townscape impact and the pattern of development in relation to the existing settlement of Westwick seem to be inconsistent with the approval of S/0352/12/FL.</li> <li>• The proposal would match closely the extent of development on the opposite side of the busway and development of the goods yard would in no way be alien and out of keeping with the historic pattern of development.</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site would reuse brownfield land.</li> <li>• SA Criteria 37 &amp; 38 (accessibility to key local services and facilities, and distance to centre) should be 0 or -, not ---. All local schools and recreational facilities are within 800m ACF. Post office and shop is only just beyond this range. Doctor's surgery would form part of the development proposal.</li> <li>• Land Contamination: study submitted with soil analysis data showing limited risk especially on proposed location for construction.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b></p>	<p>The SHLAA assessment has been updated to include revised information regarding the dimensions of the site and the sustainability appraisal has been updated to include the correct information on the location of the nearest bus stop.</p> <p>The SHLAA assessment has been updated to include revised information regarding flood risk. The whole of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 with the site entrance being within Flood Zone 3, and the NPPF states that new development should be located in areas with the lowest probability of flooding and that development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. The Council has identified other sites in the district that are not at risk of flooding that could meet the identified housing need.</p> <p>It may be possible to mitigate the noise and vibration impacts from the guided buses, however these impacts would need to be thoroughly investigated in accordance with national planning policy and a full noise assessment would be needed.</p> <p>S/0352/12/FL allows the construction of an office building with associated landscaping and car parking on the former railway sidings site on the opposite side of the guided busway. The planning application was considered as a departure to adopted planning policies and having taken all relevant considerations into account, it was considered that planning permission should be approved in this instance. This proposal is for a commercial building within an existing commercial site and therefore is different to a proposal for residential uses.</p> <p>Westwick is a very linear settlement with the majority of houses directly facing the road often with no front gardens. Only Westwick Hall which is surrounded by parkland and the model farm are set back from the road. The site adjoins a row of railway workers houses and the station masters house. Development of this site would be contrary to this linear settlement pattern. The site also forms an important part of the setting of listed buildings and the conservation area. Careful design of a smaller scale of development that does not extend so far back from the road frontage may allow some of the impacts on the historic environment to be mitigated.</p> <p>Any physical measures to mitigate the impacts identified will leave a reduced site area that is unsuitable to create a well-designed development compatible with its surroundings.</p>

	<p>The site is in the countryside (as it is not within a village framework) and was only considered for assessment through the SHLAA as an extension to Northstowe. The nearest existing settlement is Westwick. The distance to local services and facilities is measured as the crow flies to a specific central point in the village centre identified considering the location of facilities. Therefore although some facilities may be closer than 1000m, the specific central point in Oakington is over 1,000m from the centre point of the site. The scoring of these two criteria should remain unchanged.</p> <p>Due to the previous uses of the site, there is potential for land contamination and therefore the Environmental Health Officer has stated that a Contaminated Land Assessment would be required.</p> <p>Although the site is located adjacent to the guided busway and would involve the reuse of brownfield land, this does not outweigh the harm to the townscape and landscape and the settings of the listed buildings and conservation area. Housing capacity exists in more sustainable locations. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	--

## Sites in Rural Centres

<b>Settlement:</b>	Cottenham		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Rampton Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	128		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Archaeological potential in the area. High grade agricultural land of Grades 1, 2 and 3. Minor to moderate noise / odour risk. There have been reports of flooding near the site. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. The Highway Authority has access concerns on part of the site. Significant utility upgrades required. No spare capacity in the drainage system.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	45163 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Cambridgeshire County Council
	<p>Site currently forms part of an agricultural holding. Opportunity for a residential led mixed use development. Development could provide a new vehicular and pedestrian access to primary school, to future new school if required, and the parish council's recreation ground.</p> <p>Site not in Green Belt, low flood risk. No heritage or ecology impacts. Access should be achievable.</p> <p>Cottenham is sustainable, well served village, which may be upgraded. Site easy walking distance of most services. Sustainable growth would assist in maintaining vitality and viability of the rural community, supporting existing facilities and potentially making viable new ones.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. The site is in an elevated position and slopes down to the west from relatively high land at the edge of the village. It is largely open with few trees and there are long views to and from the site over the flat fen landscape to the north and west. Although a smaller scale of development could be considered, the site is remote and rural, and does not relate well to the built up part of the village.</p> <p>There are flooding and drainage issues in the area and the local drainage board states there is no capacity to accept any direct discharge flow from the village into its main drain system.</p> <p>Although Cottenham is one of the more sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the landscape and townscape. The site has no development potential.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Cottenham		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Oakington Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	260 (Part of Site Option 22 I&O 2012)		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with development potential. Archaeological potential in the area. High grade agricultural land of Grade 1. Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. No spare capacity in the drainage system.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	46075 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Mr Derek Brown and Mr Peter Savidge
	<p>Propose smaller site suitable for development. In ownership of two landowners (remainder of site owned by 4 landowners).</p> <p>Plot of 4.5 acres, regular shape, with road frontage. Unused for a number of years. Access outside 30mph limit. No constraints. Easily accessible to all facilities in village - 10 minutes walk to all schools, 3 minutes to nearest bus stop, 10 minutes to High Street. Safer cycle path to Histon and Guided Busway. Accessible to surrounding villages, A14 and M11.</p> <p>Cottenham appropriate settlement for development - lively, vibrant, good employment, facilities, services, shops and schools to meet everyday needs. Village status may be upgraded to Rural Centre.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p><b>Council's response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not provide homes close to the jobs in and around Cambridge.</li> <li>• Does not provide homes close to the jobs south of Cambridge in view of the predominance of new housing in villages to the north over many years and substantial jobs growth in the south.</li> <li>• Does not make best use of brownfield land.</li> <li>• Does not have parish council or local support.</li> </ul> <p>Site with development potential – part of a site consulted on in I&amp;O1 (Site Option 22). Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. Development of this site, with its long plot depth would result in a cul-de-sac that is out of character with the rest of Cottenham and thus have a detrimental impact on the character of this linear approach to the village. No spare capacity into the main drain system.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Do not allocate for development in the draft Local Plan.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Cottenham		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land adjacent to The Woodyard		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	269		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Site lies adjacent to the Cottenham Conservation Area and several Listed Buildings nearby. High grade agricultural land of Grade 2. Flooding and noise issues. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. No spare capacity in the drainage system.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	Supporting rejection, against development due to costly constraints and requirements on adjoining property and provision of drainage.		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	55157 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Stewart Cole & Paul Cole
	Site provides an opportunity for Cottenham to grow in a unique way with a development form that reflects traditional growth and is well related to settlements core, rather than sterile formulaic expansion associated with other options. A scheme in this location would create an exemplar development, incorporating a mixture of tenures, house sizes and densities. Open space and landscaping would be key elements and relationship to conservation carefully planned. Access through demolition of 33 High Street, Cottenham which is a 1970's house in an otherwise traditional street scene.		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. The land forms an important part of the setting of this part of historically sensitive part of Cottenham. Previous planning applications have been refused, as development in this location would constitute a sporadic form of development, detached from the village, and would represent an intrusion into open countryside. Detrimental impact on the setting of Grade I Listed church and Conservation Area, which it would not be possible to mitigate.</p> <p>Although Cottenham is one of the more sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the landscape and townscape. The site has no development potential.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Cottenham		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land to rear of High Street		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	316		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Part within and part adjoining the Cottenham Conservation Area and several Listed Buildings nearby. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. No spare capacity in the drainage system.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	Cottenham Parish Council: while the Parish Council can appreciate exclusion from the Local Plan, this site would appear to be included in the Neighbourhood Development Plan Option 2 and to that extent, the Parish Council's acceptance / rejection of this site is subject to the consultation response.		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	55132 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Mr Unwin and Mr Smith
	We believe that the site merits consideration as an independent site but would also be prepared to bring it forward as part of a larger scheme as envisaged by the Parish Council. Do not agree with the site assessment which highlights that potential townscape and landscape impacts would be difficult to mitigate against. A well designed scheme will enhance the surrounding area and there is the opportunity to create a truly unique development that will complement and enhance the traditional architecture of the adjacent village centre. Cottenham is a sustainable location benefiting from good service provision and excellent public transport.		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Cottenham. The site is part within and adjacent to the Conservation Area, adjacent to and close to several Listed Buildings. Development of this site would result in backland development contrary to single depth development on this part of village, harming the historic linear settlement pattern, and would result in the loss of significant green backdrop.</p> <p>Although Cottenham is one of the more sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the landscape and townscape. The site has no development potential.</p>		

## **Cottenham Sites with no objections**

The Woodyard, Cottenham (SHLAA Site 241): 1 representation supported the continued rejection of the site as against the development due to costly constraints and requirements on adjoining property and provision of drainage.

<b>Settlement:</b>	Great Shelford & Stapleford		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land east of Bar Lane and South of Gog Magog Way, Stapleford		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	139		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. The site falls within an area where development would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. If the site were to be developed there would be a significant adverse impact on landscape due to loss of a significant open green space which reflects the rural character of this part of the village.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	<p>This site was referenced in 204 of the 254 representations that supported the continued rejection of one or more of the Great Shelford and Stapleford sites. The following reasons were cited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impact on infrastructure and services;</li> <li>• congestion and traffic (queues for railway crossing);</li> <li>• Green Belt / open space is valuable;</li> <li>• Surrounding fields are an attractive part of village;</li> <li>• Protect the allotments;</li> <li>• Impact on rural character of settlements;</li> <li>• Impact on historic character and landscape;</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land; and</li> <li>• Stapleford Parish Plan states no development on Green Belt.</li> </ul>		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	39244 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Endurance Estates Limited
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land does not provide a Green Belt function, the land to the east of Haverhill Road does.</li> <li>• The site can be developed at a lower density in a manner to be respectful to its setting.</li> <li>• The proposal also includes the formation of a recreation area to the north part of the site, adjacent to the existing recreation ground.</li> </ul>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site comprises two paddocks which are within the Green Belt. They are divided by a well-established hedgerow with mature trees some of which are protected. These bring a distinctive rural character into this part of Stapleford bringing a finger of green into the urban form of the village therefore fulfilling a Green Belt function.</p> <p>There are a number of listed buildings near to the site whose setting would be adversely affected by the loss of openness and rural character if the site were to be developed.</p> <p>The area being proposed as a recreational area is one that is allocated within the LDF for this purpose and would benefit the local community but implementation of this open space should not be as a result of the development of the rural land within the Green Belt to the south.</p>		

	<p>Development in this location would result in the loss of land with a rural character and would harm the Green Belt. If this site were to be developed it would impact on the setting of a number of listed buildings. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	---

<b>Settlement:</b>	Great Shelford & Stapleford		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Granhams Farm, Great Shelford		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	145		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on the Green Belt purposes and functions. Development of this site would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape and townscape of this area as it would result in the encroachment of development into the open farmland that provides a countryside setting to the village and it would also harm the earthworks, moat and spring at Granhams Farm that are listed in the Village Design Statement as features to protect. It is not possible to mitigate the impacts on the settings of the listed buildings, the archaeological remains, and the townscape and landscape.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	<p>This site was referenced in 198 of the 254 representations that supported the continued rejection of one or more of the Great Shelford and Stapleford sites. The following reasons were cited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impact on infrastructure and services;</li> <li>• congestion and traffic (queues for railway crossing);</li> <li>• Green Belt / open space is valuable;</li> <li>• Surrounding fields are an attractive part of village;</li> <li>• Protect the allotments;</li> <li>• Impact on rural character of settlements;</li> <li>• Impact on historic character and landscape;</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land; and</li> <li>• Stapleford Parish Plan states no development on Green Belt.</li> </ul>		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	37043 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> College of Saint John the Evangelist, University of Cambridge
	<p>The site lies close to the Cambridge - Kings Cross main line railway line at Great Shelford. The site includes both open land as well as a large collection of buildings and structures associated with the farmyard. Whilst there may be historic assets in and around the site it is considered that the built up nature of much of the land, its proximity to the built up area and the sustainable nature of the land at Great Shelford is such that the land should be considered for residential development requiring a review of the Green Belt.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Only a small proportion of this site (around 10%) includes buildings used for residential and commercial purposes. The residential properties include a row of listed cottages and a listed former dovecote that is now a dwelling. A cluster of former agricultural buildings have been converted to commercial use.</p> <p>The remainder of the site is open fields divided by hedges and trees. The site includes earthwork remains of a medieval moat and previous archaeological investigations in this area demonstrate the significance of the site. The site is</p>		

within the Green Belt and is part of the rural landscape that plays a critical role in preserving the separate identity of Great Shelford and in providing a countryside setting for the City of Cambridge. It is also within an area identified for improved landscaping to mitigate the impact of the Trumpington Meadows development. The site is part of the settings of the listed buildings within and adjacent to the site.

Development in this location would result in the encroachment of the built up areas into this rural landscape, and is likely to have a major adverse impact on the settings of the listed buildings due to the loss of openness and loss of views to the countryside in the context of the former manor and farmstead. Cambridgeshire County Council would object to development of the site due to the archaeological remains it includes.

Although Great Shelford is one of the most sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the Green Belt, the landscape and townscape, and the setting of the listed buildings, and the adverse impacts on the archaeological remains. The site has no development potential.

<b>Settlement:</b>	Great Shelford & Stapleford		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Hinton Way, Great Shelford		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	146		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on the Green Belt purposes and functions. Development of this site would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape and townscape of this area, as it would result in considerable encroachment of built development into the strongly rolling chalk hills rising from the village edge and would change the agricultural character of this approach to the village.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	<p>This site was referenced in 198 of the 254 representations that supported the continued rejection of one or more of the Great Shelford and Stapleford sites. The following reasons were cited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impact on infrastructure and services;</li> <li>• congestion and traffic (queues for railway crossing);</li> <li>• Green Belt / open space is valuable;</li> <li>• Surrounding fields are an attractive part of village;</li> <li>• Protect the allotments;</li> <li>• Impact on rural character of settlements;</li> <li>• Impact on historic character and landscape;</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land; and</li> <li>• Stapleford Parish Plan states no development on Green Belt.</li> </ul>		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	37045 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> College of Saint John the Evangelist, University of Cambridge
	This land lies adjacent to existing residential development and is thus well related to the settlement of Great Shelford and Stapleford which in our view has been appropriately identified for new growth. The extent of the site means that it is capable of accommodating approximately 150 dwellings and it can bring forward much needed affordable housing. Given the history of land immediately to the east which had planning permission for a new hotel development, it is considered that this site should be excluded from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development.		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site is within the Green Belt and is part of the rural landscape that plays a critical role in preserving the separate identity of Great Shelford and in providing a countryside setting for the City of Cambridge. It is also within an area identified for improved landscaping to mitigate the impact of the Trumpington Meadows development.</p> <p>Development in this location would result in the encroachment of the built up area into the strongly rolling chalk hills rising from the village edge to a ridge and would change the agricultural character of this approach to the village.</p>		

	<p>The planning application for a hotel with associated car parking and landscaping (S/1229/00) was considered as a departure as the use was considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances were provided to justify the development.</p> <p>Although Great Shelford is one of the most sustainable villages in the district, the harm to the Green Belt and the significant adverse impact of development of this site on the landscape and townscape outweighs this. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	--

<b>Settlement:</b>	Great Shelford & Stapleford		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Marfleet Close, Great Shelford		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	149		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. The majority of the site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on the Green Belt purposes and functions. Development of this site would have a significant adverse impact on the townscape and landscape of this area, as it would create development contrary to the ribbon development character of this area of village and result in further encroachment of development into the transitional area of enclosed fields that provide a softer edge to the village. It should be possible to partly mitigate the noise impacts from Scotsdales Garden Centre through careful design.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	<p>This site was referenced in 190 of the 254 representations that supported the continued rejection of one or more of the Great Shelford and Stapleford sites. The following reasons were cited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impact on infrastructure and services;</li> <li>• congestion and traffic (queues for railway crossing);</li> <li>• Green Belt / open space is valuable;</li> <li>• Surrounding fields are an attractive part of village;</li> <li>• Protect the allotments;</li> <li>• Impact on rural character of settlements;</li> <li>• Impact on historic character and landscape;</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land; and</li> <li>• Stapleford Parish Plan states no development on Green Belt.</li> </ul>		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	37038 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> College of Saint John the Evangelist, University of Cambridge
	<p>The land is paddock land located close to a major commercial enterprise at Scotsdales garden centre and it is considered that the impact of that major development in the Green Belt is a factor in reconsidering our clients land. It is considered that the design and layout of the site is capable of addressing any concerns about impact on neighbouring properties and the wider landscape. Great Shelford as a Rural Centre should continue to be a focus for new growth and therefore we consider that the Green Belt should be amended and this land allocated for housing development.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Scotsdales Garden Centre is within the Green Belt and development on the site has grown incrementally over the last 40 years as the services and facilities it provides have been increased. Recent changes on site have been justified by special circumstances. This is not justification for land at Marfleet Close being released from the Green Belt for housing development.</p> <p>The site is also within the Green Belt and is part of the rural landscape that separates the inner necklace villages from Cambridge. It is also within an</p>		

	<p>area identified for improved landscaping to mitigate the impact of the Trumpington Meadows development.</p> <p>Development in this location would result in the encroachment of the built up area into the transitional area of enclosed fields that provide a softer edge to the village and would create development contrary to the ribbon development character of this area of village.</p> <p>Although Great Shelford is one of the most sustainable villages in the district, the harm to the Green Belt and the significant adverse impact of development of this site on the landscape and townscape outweighs this. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	---

<b>Settlement:</b>	Great Shelford & Stapleford		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land south of Great Shelford Caravan and Camping Club, Cambridge Road, Great Shelford		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	188		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on the Green Belt purposes and functions. Development of this site would have some adverse impact on the townscape and landscape of this area, as it would create development contrary to the ribbon development character of this part of the village and result in further encroachment of development into the transitional area of enclosed fields that provide a softer edge to the village. It should be possible to partly mitigate noise issues from the adjacent commercial / industrial uses through careful design. Suitable access would need to be agreed with the Highways Authority.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	<p>This site was referenced in 190 of the 254 representations that supported the continued rejection of one or more of the Great Shelford and Stapleford sites. The following reasons were cited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impact on infrastructure and services;</li> <li>• congestion and traffic (queues for railway crossing);</li> <li>• Green Belt / open space is valuable;</li> <li>• Surrounding fields are an attractive part of village;</li> <li>• Protect the allotments;</li> <li>• Impact on rural character of settlements;</li> <li>• Impact on historic character and landscape;</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land; and</li> <li>• Stapleford Parish Plan states no development on Green Belt.</li> </ul>		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	39151 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Mr Colin Astin
	<p>There are too few development options identified for Great Shelford. This site is accessible to the services and facilities provided by the village, but it is possibly better related to those that exist to the north in Trumpington. The Green Belt boundary around the village should be reviewed and this site should be allocated for residential development. The development of backland sites is the typical form of development for Great Shelford. It is within an area identified for landscape improvements and these could be undertaken in conjunction with this development. The site is not part of the wider landscape but is related to the urban area. It has an existing access to the highway network, which will need to be upgraded to accommodate residential development on the site.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Only a small proportion of the site (around 20%) includes a dwelling and garden, land used for the storage of caravans and agricultural buildings. The remainder of the site is an open grassed field within the transitional area of enclosed fields that provide a softer edge to the village and which form part of the rural landscape separating the inner necklace villages from Cambridge.</p>		

	<p>The site is within the Green Belt and is also within an area identified for improved landscaping to mitigate the impact of the Trumpington Meadows development.</p> <p>This part of the village has a linear character and as this site is to the rear of the existing residential properties along Cambridge Road, its development would change this linear character and would increase the depth of the coalescence between Trumpington and Great Shelford.</p> <p>Suitable access would need to be agreed with the Highways Authority. Even if a suitable access to the site could be provided, the site would still have no development potential due as there are other issues that cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>Although Great Shelford is one of the most sustainable villages in the district, the harm to the Green Belt and the adverse impact of development of this site on the landscape and townscape outweighs this. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	---

<b>Settlement:</b>	Great Shelford & Stapleford			
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land east of Hinton Way, north of Mingle Lane, Great Shelford			
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	207			
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on the Green Belt purposes and functions. Development of this site would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape and townscape of this area, as it would result in considerable encroachment of built development into the strongly rolling chalk hills rising from the village edge and would create development contrary to the ribbon development character of this part of the village. It should be possible to partly mitigate the impact on the setting of the Conservation Area through careful design. Suitable access to the site would need to be agreed with the Highways Authority.</p>			
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	<p>This site was referenced in 230 of the 254 representations that supported the continued rejection of one or more of the Great Shelford and Stapleford sites. The following reasons were cited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impact on infrastructure and services;</li> <li>• congestion and traffic (queues for railway crossing);</li> <li>• Green Belt / open space is valuable;</li> <li>• Surrounding fields are an attractive part of village;</li> <li>• Protect the allotments;</li> <li>• Impact on rural character of settlements;</li> <li>• Impact on historic character and landscape;</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land; and</li> <li>• Stapleford Parish Plan states no development on Green Belt.</li> </ul>			
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	40783 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b>	Landowners of land off Mingle Lane in Great Shelford
	<p>The site represents a suitable location for 200+ dwellings and associated open space, outdoor recreation, and strategic landscaping, and therefore should be allocated for development with associated amendments to the development framework boundary. A Concept Masterplan and a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment have been submitted to illustrate how the proposed development would relate to its surroundings including the wider landscape. The development of backland sites is a not untypical form of development for Great Shelford. The main access to the site would be from Mingle Lane and access can be achieved via a simple priority junction that accommodates visibility splays consistent with current standards and guidance.</p>			
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site is an agricultural field within the transitional area of enclosed fields that provide a softer edge to the village.</p> <p>The site is within the Green Belt and is also within an area identified for improved landscaping to mitigate the impact of the Trumpington Meadows</p>			

	<p>development.</p> <p>This part of the village has a linear character and as this site is to the rear of the existing residential properties along Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, its development would create extensive backland development and result in considerable encroachment of the built up area into the strongly rolling chalk hills rising from the village edge.</p> <p>Suitable access would need to be agreed with the Highways Authority and would need to take account of the adjoining Conservation Area as an intensification to create a vehicular entrance is likely to have an adverse effect on this. Even if a suitable access to the site could be provided, the site would still have no development potential due as there are other issues that cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>Although Great Shelford is one of the most sustainable villages in the district, the harm to the Green Belt and the significant adverse impact of development of this site on the landscape and townscape outweighs this. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	---

<b>Settlement:</b>	Great Shelford & Stapleford			
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land east of Hinton Way, north of Mingle Lane, Great Shelford			
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	212			
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on the Green Belt purposes and functions. Development of this site would have some adverse impact on the landscape and townscape of this area, as it would result in the encroachment of built development into the strongly rolling chalk hills rising from the village edge and would create development contrary to the ribbon development character of this part of the village. There is no access to the site.			
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	<p>This site was referenced in 226 of the 254 representations that supported the continued rejection of one or more of the Great Shelford and Stapleford sites. The following reasons were cited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impact on infrastructure and services;</li> <li>• congestion and traffic (queues for railway crossing);</li> <li>• Green Belt / open space is valuable;</li> <li>• Surrounding fields are an attractive part of village;</li> <li>• Protect the allotments;</li> <li>• Impact on rural character of settlements;</li> <li>• Impact on historic character and landscape;</li> <li>• Loss of agricultural land; and</li> <li>• Stapleford Parish Plan states no development on Green Belt.</li> </ul>			
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	40783 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b>	Landowners of land off Mingle Lane in Great Shelford
	The site represents a suitable location for 200+ dwellings and associated open space, outdoor recreation, and strategic landscaping, and therefore should be allocated for development with associated amendments to the development framework boundary. A Concept Masterplan and a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment have been submitted to illustrate how the proposed development would relate to its surroundings including the wider landscape. The development of backland sites is a not untypical form of development for Great Shelford. The main access to the site would be from Mingle Lane and access can be achieved via a simple priority junction that accommodates visibility splays consistent with current standards and guidance.			
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site is an agricultural field within the transitional area of enclosed fields that provide a softer edge to the village.</p> <p>The site is within the Green Belt and is also within an area identified for improved landscaping to mitigate the impact of the Trumpington Meadows development.</p> <p>This part of the village has a linear character and as this site is to the rear of</p>			

	<p>the existing residential properties along Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, its development would create extensive backland development and result in considerable encroachment of the built up area into the strongly rolling chalk hills rising from the village edge. The adverse impact would be greater than originally assessed for this site as the landowners have proposed that this site is considered in association with the adjoining site (SHLAA Site 207).</p> <p>The site adjoining site (SHLAA Site 207) would provide the access to this site and suitable access to that site would need to be agreed with the Highways Authority and would need to take account of the adjoining Conservation Area as an intensification to create a vehicular entrance is likely to have an adverse effect on this. Even if a suitable access to the site could be provided, the site would still have no development potential due as there are other issues that cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>Although Great Shelford is one of the most sustainable villages in the district, the harm to the Green Belt and the adverse impact of development of this site on the landscape and townscape outweighs this. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	---

## **Great Shelford and Stapleford Sites with no objections**

In total 254 representations supported the continued rejection of one or more of the Great Shelford and Stapleford sites. The following reasons were cited:

- impact on infrastructure and services;
- congestion and traffic (queues for railway crossing);
- Green Belt / open space is valuable;
- Surrounding fields are an attractive part of village;
- Protect the allotments;
- Impact on rural character of settlements;
- Impact on historic character and landscape;
- Loss of agricultural land; and
- Stapleford Parish Plan states no development on Green Belt.

Land east of Bar Lane, Stapleford (SHLAA Site 033) was referenced in 199 of the 254 representations.

Land Between Hinton Way and Mingle Lane, Stapleford (SHLAA Site 041) was referenced in 226 of the 254 representations.

Land east of Bar Lane and Gog Magog Way, Stapleford (SHLAA Site 140) was referenced in 204 of the 254 representations.

Land east of Bar Lane and Gog Magog Way, Stapleford (SHLAA Site 141) was referenced in 205 of the 254 representations.

Land north west of 11 Cambridge Road, Great Shelford (SHLAA Site 205) was referenced in 190 of the 254 representations.

Land north of Gog Magog Way, Stapleford (SHLAA Site 208) was referenced in 194 of the 254 representations.

Land at Gog Magog Way / Haverhill Road, Stapleford (SHLAA Site 253) was referenced in 194 of the 254 representations.

Land at Land at Hinton Way, Stapleford (SHLAA Site 262) was referenced in 193 of the 254 representations.

<b>Settlement:</b>	Histon and Impington		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Villa Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	227		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have a significant adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. Whole site is within the Mineral Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. A large proportion of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The site contains an area of filled land. Noise issues from the A14. Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Histon. The site does not appear to have a direct link to the adopted public highway.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	43517 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Kingsgate Management Company Ltd
	<p>Site was considered by Council in the SHLAA report as being suitable for residential development in planning policy terms and conclusions stated that the site has limited development potential.</p> <p>The majority of the other sites being consulted also were categorised as being of limited development potential. Unclear why our client's site has not been included as a site of limited development potential, as it has similar, and better, characteristics to provide for a range of housing needs. Our client's site is not in any worse category for providing for development than the other sites around Histon / Impington that are being consulted upon.</p> <p>It is unclear if an error has been made regarding the site options but we would request that our client's site on land off Villa Road in Histon is considered as a residential allocation in the Local Plan process.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site is within the Green Belt, within an area of land considered to be most critical in separating settlements within the immediate setting of Cambridge, and which should be afforded the greatest protection.</p> <p>Approximately 4/5ths of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3, which will reduce the developable area to a small area unsuitable for development.</p> <p>Further investigation and possible mitigation will be required to address the physical considerations, including possible land contamination and noise. The site does not appear to have a direct link to the adopted public highway.</p> <p>Although Histon and Impington is one of the most sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the Green Belt, the landscape and townscape. The site has no development potential.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Histon and Impington		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land west of 113 Cottenham Road, Histon		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	306		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on GB purposes and functions. Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Histon. Whilst the site is screened from adjoining residential properties, and the Unwins industrial estate, it is open to views across to the north west, where the landscape becomes more exposed. The landscape is clearly rural in character and the northern edge of Histon is characterised by linear development. Development of this site would be backland, much deeper than the adjoining properties and would be detached from the current northern edge of the village. Further investigation and possible mitigation will be required to address the potential for noise and malodour. It is not established that safe access can be provided. The access track is unlikely to be suitable for such a large area of land. Access could be taken through 113 Cottenham Road if the house were to be demolished and replaced by an access road.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	50850 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Mr Chris Meadows
	I do not understand how on one hand this proposal (31128) is rejected, but then representation 47253, adjacent to representation 31128, is also a proposal for public open space. Also, 31128 was rejected on the basis of 'unsuitable access'. There is direct access from Cottenham Road.		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Land at ByPass Farm, Histon was suggested through representation 47253 as a site for public open space by Histon &amp; Impington Parish Council, and was not suggested for housing development. Land west of 113 Cottenham Road, Histon was suggested through representation 31128 as a site for housing development. The two representations cannot be compared.</p> <p>Suitable access to the site would need to be agreed with the Highways Authority. Even if a suitable access to the site could be provided, the site would still have no development potential due to its adverse impact on the landscape and townscape. The site has no development potential.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Sawston		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land north of Babraham Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	076 in July 2012 initial SHLAA / 313 in December 2012 SHLAA update		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Development of the site would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions, including reducing the separation of Sawston and Babraham, and increasing Sawston's footprint into the open countryside. In addition, the site's proximity to Dales Manor Business Park / Industrial Estate would require noise mitigation / abatement measures on the Business Park as well as on-site to reduce the significant negative impact potential in terms of health and well being and a poor quality living environment.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	42281, 29771 & 33140 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Dr David Bard, KWA Architects, Sawston Parish Council
	<p>Objections to the rejection of site 076 include the following arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noisy activities on the Business Park / Industrial Estate have greatly reduced in recent years; the boundary of the Business Park / Industrial Estate is mainly comprised of offices, and it is already bordered by residential properties. Any minor nuisance effects could be mitigated.</li> <li>The site is adjacent the highway.</li> <li>Sawston Parish Council would support this site going forward for the next stage of the assessment process based on the information it has at present. However the Parish Council do have concerns about the infrastructure and traffic.</li> </ul>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>In response to the objections to the rejection of site 076, the Council reassessed the site as site no. 313 in the SHLAA update of December 2012.</p> <p>This SHLAA update concluded its site assessment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of the site would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. However, this site has the potential to have a positive impact upon the landscape setting of Sawston, provided the design makes a generous provision of land to ensure a soft green edge to the east.</li> <li>While noise mitigation measures on-site and reduction/abatement measures off-site could be required, overall the impact of noise on this site from the Business Park is not of such concern as to prevent residential development on this site.</li> </ul> <p>The site was included as site option H6 in the Issues &amp; Options 2 consultation, and is now being taken forward as a site option within the draft Local Plan.</p>		

## **Sawston Sites with no objections**

Land to south of Mill Lane, Sawston (SHLAA Site 044): 2 representations supported the continued rejection of the site. The following reasons were cited:

- Site has history of flooding.
- Would impact on infrastructure.

## Sites in Minor Rural Centres

<b>Settlement:</b>	Bassingbourn			
<b>Site Address:</b>	North End & Elbourn Way, Bassingbourn			
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	059			
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Development of this site would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape and townscape of this area that provides a setting for the listed buildings, conservation area and historic core of the village, and it would also change the rural character of this wooded and enclosed area of the village. The proposed development would be contrary to the pattern of single depth development in the historic core of this part of village. Suitable access to the site would need to be agreed with the Highways Authority.			
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A			
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	32473, 32474, 32476 & 32477 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b>	Mrs Carol Mailer and D&M Sharp Farming Limited
	<p>The site is divided into two distinct areas but it has only been considered as one development.</p> <p>The western part of the site (1.7 ha) adjoins existing residential development. The site is bounded by trees along its northern boundary and is screened by a wooded area to the west. All existing trees and hedgerows will be retained. These will screen the proposed site from the Listed Buildings. No direct access to the site – access via The Limes would have to be by an agreement with Council (believed to be the landowners of the space at the end of The Limes). Bungalows for aged persons (as found in The Limes) could be extended onto the proposed site together with limited affordable housing. Significant “green area” to be retained for use by the public. Very limited and specific development of this site would have no significant affect on the adjoining conservation area and listed buildings, and no adverse impact on the landscape and townscape. Other constraints including minor flooding issues and archaeology would have to be investigated but the land should be considered as suitable for inclusion as a site option.</p> <p>The eastern part of the site (1.1 ha) adjoins existing residential development. All existing trees and hedgerows will be retained and northern and western boundaries can be landscaped. Proposed site is screened from listed buildings by wooded area on adjoining land – these trees form a natural division between the site and listed buildings and therefore the use of this site for housing would have no adverse impact on any listed building or the area as a whole. Agreed contract to permit access over ransom strip from</p>			

	<p>Elbourn Way and to remove the balancing tank to the adjoining land. No major flood risk issues. Sewers, surface water drainage and highways infrastructure capable of accommodating this development. Development of this site would have no significant affect on the adjoining conservation area and listed buildings, and it would not be a major intrusion into the open countryside or have any adverse impact on the landscape and townscape. The land would be a natural extension of the existing development.</p>
<p><b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b></p>	<p>In assessing the sites submitted, officers considered whether the site as a whole had development potential, and if not, whether a smaller proportion of the site had development potential. None of this site was considered to have development potential.</p> <p>Two accesses to the site have been proposed one of which is already subject to a legal agreement and the other would need to be agreed with the landowner. Suitable access would need to be agreed with the Highways Authority. Even if a suitable access to the site could be provided, the site would still have no development potential due as there are other issues that cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>Development of any of this site would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape and townscape of this area as it would result in the encroachment of the built up area into the wooded area and enclosed fields that form a soft rural edge to the village and provide a rural and green setting for the listed buildings, conservation area and historic core of the village. Development would also be contrary to the pattern of single depth development in the historic core of this part of village.</p> <p>Although the landowners have indicated that all existing trees and hedgerows will be retained and a significant area of green space would be provided within the development, this does not outweigh the harm to the landscape and townscape, the conservation area and its setting, and the settings of the listed buildings. The site has no development potential.</p>

<b>Settlement:</b>	Comberton			
<b>Site Address:</b>	40 - 48 West Street, Comberton			
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	079			
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. The majority of the site is within the Green Belt, and development here therefore would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. In addition, the proposal would have major adverse effects, which could only be mitigated in part, on settings of several nearby Grade II Listed buildings.			
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A			
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	41365 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b>	Mr Barry Barker
	This site should be reconsidered as an excellent central site that would help combine the village rather than extend it in a fragmented way. The village needs to grow even larger to accommodate the younger generations, and to create a better balance of the population. The site is close to the bus route, and is near other amenities.			
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The majority of the site is within the Green Belt, and would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions through the loss of enclosed farmland close to the village so causing a loss of rural character. In addition, the proposal would have major adverse effects on settings of Grade II Listed buildings at 38, 40 and 54 West Street Manor House on Green End, due to possible loss of mature hedge and trees prominent in the streetscape and the loss of openness and rural character of backdrops and skylines. These adverse effects could only be mitigated in part by retention of trees and hedges.</p> <p>While Comberton does have some village services and is on a bus route, these factors do not outweigh the adverse impacts on Green Belt and heritage assets noted above, which cannot be fully mitigated. The site therefore has no development potential.</p>			

<b>Settlement:</b>	Comberton		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land to the West of Green End, Comberton		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	181		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Development at this site would have an adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. Development here would have a major adverse impact on backdrop and open rural functional settings of nearby Grade II Listed buildings, and would have an adverse impact upon a non-statutory archaeological site. It would also adversely impact the current soft edge of the village, and would introduce back-land development behind the linear single depth of properties fronting Green End.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	32164 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Mrs A E Scott
	Site should be carried forward for further consideration, together with road access to West Street.		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>This site lies within the Green Belt. Development would therefore have an adverse impact on upon the setting, scale and character of Comberton by increasing the footprint of the village out into the countryside, and by the loss of farmland causing a loss of rural character. It would also adversely impact on the backdrop and setting of two Grade II Listed buildings within 10 metres of the site. Development of this site would develop part of the enclosed fields and paddocks forming a soft edge to the village in this location, and would bring additional traffic to Green End. Overall, development would have an adverse effect on the landscape setting and townscape of Comberton.</p> <p>The representation supporting development at this site has not addressed any of the initial reasons for rejection. The site therefore has no development potential.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Fulbourn		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land south of Hinton Road & Land to the South of Fulbourn Old Drift & Hinton Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	108 & 109		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Sites with no development potential. Sites fall within an area where development would have a significant adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. Sites lie approximately 360m south of nationally important Caudle Corner Iron Age settlement (SAM 95). The sites form an important part of the setting of the two Conservation Areas and a Grade II Listed windmill. Development of these sites would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Fulbourn.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	41086 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Endurance Estates Limited
	Objection is made that this land is not a site option. The SHLAA assessment appears to have been made on the presumption that the land would be intensively developed. It would be more appropriate for the land to be developed in a manner that respects its settlement edge location. Development can appear less intense and more low-key than the SHLAA assessment suggests with the design being focussed on landscape, village edge and village entrance enhancements. The site benefits from long sections of road frontage to attain access. There are no evident reasons why a residential-led development of the site could not be deliverable. As commercial promoters of land we are confident that the site is economically viable, with allowance for affordable homes and planning obligation agreements.		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site lies within the Green Belt. Development of this site would reduce the extent of Green Belt between the edge of Cherry Hinton (Fulbourn Hospital) and Fulbourn from 665m to 530m (site 108) or 310m (site 109). This area has been identified in various Green Belt studies as being particularly important:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "key elevated panoramic views to Cambridge. Cambridge Road is an important approach to the city"</li> <li>• "an area of landscape close to the city to be safeguarded"</li> <li>• "an area with no or very limited potential development capacity"</li> <li>• [development] "would create physical and visual coalescence between city and Fulbourn"</li> <li>• "Fine views over Cambridge, and over the surrounding countryside, are available from this area. The area is widely visible and prominent in many local views and therefore highly sensitive to change, be it development or misplaced tree planting."</li> </ul>		

	<p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Fulbourn. To the south and west of the village the land rises to the prominent 'dome' of Lime Pit Hill, which forms part of the Gog Magog hill group. It would be very difficult to mitigate against the adverse impacts of even a small amount of development in this very prominent location, as any landscaping may itself be incongruous in the largely open and highly prominent landscape.</p> <p>Although Fulbourn is one of the most sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the Green Belt, the landscape and townscape. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	--

<b>Settlement:</b>	Fulbourn		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Broad Location 7: Land between Babraham Road & Fulbourn Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	111 & 284		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. The site falls within an area where development would have a very significant adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions being landscape essential to the special character of Cambridge. Adjoins the Gog-Magog SSSI to the south, and the Cherry Hinton Pit &amp; East Pit Site SSSI to the north. Two Scheduled Monuments located south of the golf course at Wandlebury and Magog Down. Roadside verges of Limekiln Road &amp; Worts Causeway are a County Wildlife Site as is Netherhall Farm. Adjoins Beechwoods Local Nature Reserve to south. Permissive Access Path alongside Worts Causeway and down Cherry Hinton Road. Netherhall school playing fields are designated protected open space in Green Infrastructure Study 2011. Development of the site would have very significant adverse effects on landscape and townscape. High pressure gas main crosses the location. Significant infrastructure and utility upgrades required.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	45073 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Commercial Estates Group
	<p>The site represents the most sustainable release of Green Belt land for necessary mixed use development being the most sustainable location and having the greatest physical capacity to help meet the unmet need for dwellings and job growth. It can provide 3,000 dwellings in Cambridge City and 1,000 dwellings in SCDC. It is also the most appropriate and sustainable in connectivity terms for all modes of transport away from the A14/M11 and close to Babraham Park and Ride and Addenbrooke's Hospital. It is able to deliver sustainable development by making economic, social and environmental gains through the mixed development proposal, providing a balance of jobs, homes and supporting these elements by exemplar movement, community, educational servicing, infrastructure and recreation planning (forming the social function); whilst respecting and enhancing the Green Belt and countryside element by improving public access and increasing biodiversity in the area (public open space, creating chalk grassland and wildlife corridors).</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site falls within an area where development would have a very significant adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions being landscape essential to the special character of Cambridge. This area has been identified in various Green Belt studies as being particularly important:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• location are categorised as medium to very high in terms of importance to the setting of the City and to Green Belt purposes.</li> <li>• majority of the land in this area is elevated with important views, accords it more importance to both the setting of the City and to Green</li> </ul>		

	<p>Belt purposes in general.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• urban edge of the City is clearly defined in this area resulting in a very direct relationship between the city and its surroundings</li></ul> <p>The site covers the entire area between the edge of the city and Cherry Hinton to the lower slopes of the Gog Magog hills to the south. The dramatic approaches to the city and beyond from the south will be lost with development forming a new skyline to the north. It would be very difficult to mitigate against the adverse effects of a large-scale development in this location as many qualities of the site are related to the landform and open character of the landscape.</p> <p>Although the edge of Cambridge is one of the most sustainable locations, this is outweighed by the harm to the Green Belt, the landscape and townscape. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	--

<b>Settlement:</b>	Fulbourn		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Balsham Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	136		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have an adverse impact on the GB purposes and functions. The entire site is within a minerals safeguarding area for sand and gravel. Adverse effect on setting of Conservation Area and listed buildings. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Fulbourn		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	46865 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Christopher Barnes and Joyce Burling
	<p>Tier 1 - although Green Belt, would not cause coalescence, impact on physical separation, setting, scale and character of village; or affect general landscape.</p> <p>Tier 2 appears based on assumption 'whole site' would be developed - limited development up to 35 dwellings on front of site, with back land landscaped.</p> <p>Discussions with Accent Nene for provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>Potential to provide a range of benefits for local population and wildlife, without detriment to Conservation Area, Green Belt, Listed Buildings (in Stonebridge Lane) or general biodiversity of surrounding area.</p> <p>No Physical Considerations or Highways Issues and landscape, utility, school and health considerations, could be dealt with through Section 106 Agreement.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site lies within the Green Belt. Fulbourn is identified as an inner necklace village within an area of townscape/ landscape that is an integral part of the city and its environs but lacks individual distinction.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Fulbourn because it would extend the built form of the eastern edge of the village. The listed buildings in Stonebridge Lane look directly southward over the site and the setting of all these properties would be adversely affected if the site were to be developed – their rural location would be lost. The views of rolling countryside from within the village looking outwards would also be impacted by an extension to the built form of the village.</p>		

	<p>Although Fulbourn is one of the most sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the Green Belt, the landscape and townscape. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	---

<b>Settlement:</b>	Fulbourn			
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land between Teversham Road and Cow Lane			
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	162			
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. The site is white land adjacent to the Green Belt. Adverse effect on setting of Conservation Area as loss of significant green space as backdrop and approach to Conservation Area. Land contamination, noise, odour, and vibration issues. Drainage issues resulting from high water table. Development of this site would have a neutral effect on the landscape setting of Fulbourn. Significant utility upgrades required.			
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	<p>3 representations supporting rejection of this site due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsuitable access to local roads and the fact that the water table is very close to the surface in this area making construction of dwellings costly and difficult.</li> <li>• Loss of a local open space amenity.</li> </ul>			
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	45023 (I&O1) 51903 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b>	Castlefield International Limited
	<p>The site east of Teversham Road is well related to the built-up framework of the village and existing community facilities. The potential impact of development will be minimal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is the only one of the 10 sites at Fulbourn being assessed for development which is not within the Green Belt and which meets the aspirations of South Cambridgeshire. The site will therefore enable the Council to avoid setting a precedent of allocating village sites in the Green Belt for development elsewhere.</li> <li>• The site is in single ownership, facilitating early delivery.</li> <li>• The site owner has the required finance to secure the development of the site which will equally facilitate early delivery. They are a credible, well funded international developer who will be able to provide certainty in its ability to bring the development of the site to fruition.</li> <li>• The site is easily accessible, both from outside of the village and from areas within the village, making it a highly sustainable option.</li> <li>• All the technical work undertaken has been professionally evaluated by independent consultants who conclude that the site raises no issues for development and therefore is an unconstrained site; noise, odour, transportation, sustainability, landscape and townscape setting; drainage; outside of the Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p>It is noted that some six criteria are advanced for the purpose of selecting additional housing site options for consultation. In relation to SHLAA site 162, Land between Teversham Road and Cow Lane, Fulbourn, these criteria are entirely met and therefore the site should appear in the Local Plan document for consultation purposes:</p>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The site exceeds 10 dwellings;</li> <li>* The site is in a sustainable location given Fulbourn's position in the settlement hierarchy;</li> <li>* Development of the site would not affect any townscape, biodiversity, heritage assets;</li> <li>* Development of the site is viable;</li> <li>* The site could deliver housing development over the Plan period; and</li> <li>* Development of the site involves no loss of employment.</li> </ul> <p>On behalf of Castlefield International Ltd, a planning assessment report together with technical reports was submitted to the initial Issues and Options Consultation in September 2012, to support an allocation for residential purposes of land east of Teversham Road, Fulbourn.</p> <p>The Issues and Options 2 document for consultation is incomplete in that it does not make any reference whatsoever to SHLAA Site 162 in terms either of a policy option for allocation or a comprehensive sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Appendix 3 contains a list of certain sites rejected by the Council for inclusion in this current consultation document. This is a partial list of rejected sites and does not include a significant number of sites which were initially rejected as part of the SHLAA process. It is not acceptable for this appendix to cross-reference the SHLAA which is an entirely separate process, with the resulting SHLAA being a document to support the Local Plan. All sites, whether or not assessed through the SHLAA, should be listed in Appendix 3. The SHLAA cannot be used as a document to support or not support the inclusion of sites within the Local Plan.</p>
<p><b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b></p>	<p>There are drainage issues on the site, which it has not been demonstrated can be adequately addressed. The Environment Agency recommends that the site not be allocated unless it can be demonstrated that this risk can be mitigated to their satisfaction.</p> <p>The site adjoins industrial type units with the potential to generate solvent type smells / odours and potential to cause noise nuisance. It is unlikely that mitigation measures on the proposed development site alone can provide an acceptable ambient noise environment and it is very difficult to abate off site odour sources effectively.</p> <p>Development of the site would have an adverse effect on the setting of the Conservation Area as it would result in the loss of significant green space which provides a backdrop and approach to the Conservation Area. The site includes trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders. The South Cambridgeshire Village Capacity Study (1998) describes the edge of the village to the south of the site as soft and well defined with mature woodland and low density development adjoining the open fields that form the site. Development of this site would therefore be harmful to the character of the village.</p> <p>Although Fulbourn is one of the most sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the village character and by the environmental issues on this site, which it has not been demonstrated can be adequately</p>

	addressed to provide acceptable living conditions. The site has no development potential.
--	---

<b>Settlement:</b>	Fulbourn		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Home End		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	214		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have an adverse impact on the Green Belt purposes and functions. Major adverse effect on Conservation Area due to loss of prominent and important open green space, playing fields and countryside views. Adverse effect on settings of listed buildings in Home End. There is an Important Countryside Frontage along the western edge looking across the site. Moderate to major significant noise related issues. Reports of flooding in the vicinity. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Fulbourn. The proposed site does not appear to have a direct link to the adopted public highway.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	46079 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Trustees of the Late K G Moss
	The land off Home End, Fulbourn provides a clear example of where circumstances have changed at the site and its immediate surroundings which means that it no longer performs the function or purpose of land within the Green Belt. The site is now surrounded by buildings and a car park. We request that a review of the Green Belt boundary is required, and land off Home Farm should be released from the Green Belt for development. The site is an undeveloped parcel of land, adjacent to the Development Framework boundary of Fulbourn. Fulbourn is a Rural Centre and one of the preferred locations for development.		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site lies within the Green Belt. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Fulbourn. It would have a major adverse effect on Conservation Area due to loss of prominent and important open green space, playing fields and countryside views, and the setting of listed buildings nearby would be adversely affected. The land has been an Important Countryside Frontage to protect the views towards the recreation ground and the rural area beyond.</p> <p>Moderate to major significant noise related issues from the adjoining recreational and social uses. Such short distance separation between a skateboard park and residential is unlikely to be in accordance with SCDCs Open Space SPD.</p> <p>Although Fulbourn is one of the most sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the Green Belt, the landscape and townscape and environmental issues. The site has no development potential.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Gamlingay			
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Heath Road / Green End			
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	174			
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential.</p> <p>Development here would have adverse impacts on the landscape setting of Gamlingay by reducing the transitional area of small fields, hedgerows and trees, and by the creation of a promontory of built development into the countryside. The development would also cause the loss of rural context and green backdrop for nearby Listed Buildings. Neither of the above two factors could be effectively mitigated.</p> <p>The local planning authority also has concerns about the landowner's ability to deliver a financially viable development; this site may not be sufficiently attractive for developers to be interested in acquiring it in the current market.</p>			
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	The site was not specifically referred to in any representations supporting its continued rejection for development. One representor expressed support for the rejection of all sites in Gamlingay, on the grounds of traffic impact and visual impact.			
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	40797 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b>	Wyboston Lakes Limited
	<p>The site has scope to provide a logical and sustainable expansion of the village that relates well to the existing built framework, with good access links to village facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is enclosed by established boundary planting, and there is ample scope for reinforcing existing boundary trees and hedges to maintain a 'soft' green edge to this part of the village. There is also the opportunity to safeguard/enhance the setting of the Listed Cottage at 1 Dennis Green by reintroducing a Village Green (Dennis Green) between the existing cottage and any new development.</li> <li>• The development of the land would have no adverse impact on the conservation area.</li> <li>• Although the site has been the subject of landfill in the past, the Council's Environmental Protection officer was satisfied this did not pose a risk to development on adjacent land.</li> <li>• Contrary to the statement in the SHLAA there are no viability issues. In the absence of any significant on or off-site abnormal development costs, the current poor grazing use and the extremely low current use (and book) value, a residential development will provide sufficient return to enable a viable development scheme and meet the development/infrastructure costs.</li> </ul>			
<b>Council's Response and</b>	While the objector responds to several of the original reasons for rejection, the Council considers that the adverse effects on the landscape, rural			

<b>Conclusion:</b>	character of the area, and major adverse impacts via the loss of rural context and green backdrop to the Grade II Listed 1 Dennis Green, cannot be sufficiently mitigated. In particular, this development would create a promontory of development into the countryside, and as noted in the original reasons for rejection, the upper floors of houses would be visible above retained hedgerows. The site therefore has no development potential.
--------------------	--

<b>Settlement:</b>	Girton		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Town End, Duck End		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	018		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have a significant adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. It would not be possible to mitigate impacts on heritage considerations as the only vehicular access to the site is via a narrow driveway, situated between two Listed Buildings, which would need upgrading to provide safe access. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Girton. The Highway Authority has concerns relating to the provision of suitable safe access for this site.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	46790 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> J Gordon
	<p>Our client's site on land off Duck End, Girton, should be considered for a residential allocation to include for both affordable and market housing. The site is located immediately adjacent the existing settlement framework and would provide a logical extension to the village.</p> <p>The site on land off Duck End in Girton (as shown on the attached plan) should therefore be considered for development by the Council.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site is within the Green Belt, within an area of land considered to be most critical in separating settlements within the immediate setting of Cambridge, and which should be afforded the greatest protection.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Girton as even a small scale of development will be harmful to the small scale and intimate character of Duck End.</p> <p>It is not possible to provide suitable vehicular access to the site without detrimental impact to adjoining Listed Buildings, as access can only be achieved via a narrow driveway between the properties. The Highways Authority does not consider it possible to achieve appropriate visibility splays necessary for safe access to the site. The site has no development potential.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Girton		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at Dodford Lane, High Street		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	144		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>The site has no development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on GB purposes and functions. Approximately 1/3 of the site is within the Flood Zones 2 and 3. Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts. Development would have a detrimental impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings and Important Countryside Frontage, which it would be very difficult to mitigate unless a much smaller scale of development were proposed, which would be difficult to integrate into the built form of the village. Further investigation and possible mitigation will be required to address the physical considerations, including potential for noise from the adjacent public house and A14 and nuisance from artificial lighting from the Golf Club.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	37035 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> College of Saint John the Evangelist, University of Cambridge
	<p>This site lies to the south of existing residential properties, south of Dodford Lane and housing frontage to the High Street. The site lies within the Green Belt and is some 3 hectares in extent. The site could accommodate approximately 50 dwellings having regard to the character of this site and will provide an important contribution to the Council's Housing Land Supply in the village with a good level of services and facilities.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the frontage of the site is identified as an important countryside frontage, the design and layout of any residential scheme on site is capable of mitigating the impacts of the street scene and protecting the character of this part of the village.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. The site forms an important part of the setting for the High Street, where it forms a particularly attractive incursion of countryside into the village. Development would have significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts, including a detrimental impact on the setting of two Grade II Listed Buildings and the Important Countryside Frontage. It would be very difficult to mitigate these impacts unless a much smaller scale of development were proposed, which would be difficult to integrate into the built form of the village. A view shared by an independent planning inspector - "The site can be prominently seen from High Street, where it forms a particularly attractive incursion of countryside into the northern part of the village." (Local Plan 1993 Inspector)</p>		

	<p>In addition, potential for noise from the adjacent public house and possibly from the A14, together with potential impact from floodlighting at the golf club, could influence the design and layout of any development, making it even more difficult to achieve a suitable development in a very sensitive location.</p> <p>Although Girton is one of the more sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the Green Belt, the landscape and townscape, and the setting of the listed buildings, and the adverse impacts on the Important Countryside Frontage. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	---

<b>Settlement:</b>	Girton			
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Oakington Road			
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	177			
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	The site has no development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. Approximately half of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Possible noise and malodour from Dapple and Manor Farm and A14. A high voltage overhead electricity line runs through the middle of the site so possible Electromagnetic fields concerns (EMFs). Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Girton.			
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A			
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	37458 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b>	Girton Golf Club (Cambridge) Limited
	<p>Object to the rejection of this site as I support development at site 177:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- With more landscaping, the impact of any development will be minimal.</li> <li>- The area at risk of flooding is not necessary to the development of the site.</li> <li>- The impact on school capacity will not be large.</li> <li>- The pylons which pass over the site are not in the way of the housing.</li> <li>- Given the agricultural nature of East Anglia nearly every development would be near noise and malodour from farms.</li> <li>- The need to look at utilities upgrades is common to all new developments.</li> </ul>			
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions.</p> <p>The western half of the site falls within Flood Zone 3 and national planning guidance confirms that houses are not appropriate in this zone. Half of the remaining site is within Flood Zone 2, which the Sequential Test considers should only be considered where there are no reasonable available sites in Flood Zone 1. There are sufficient suitable alternative sites available.</p> <p>Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Girton as the site currently forms an area of rural separation between the edge of the village and a complex of farm and commercial uses to the north, and creates a soft edge and visually interesting entrance to the village from the north.</p> <p>There are also other environmental and health concerns with locating residential uses close to high voltage overhead electricity lines and possible noise and malodour from nearby uses which would need further consideration before the site could be allocated for housing.</p>			

	Although Girton is one of the more sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the Green Belt and the flood risk, as well as the harm to landscape and townscape. The site has no development potential.
--	--

<b>Settlement:</b>	Girton		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Duck End		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	203		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Site falls within an area where development would have a significant adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. A very small part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Girton. The Highway Authority has concerns with regards to the intensification of Wash Pit Road.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	41007 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Trustees of T W Green
	We request that the merits our client's site is reconsidered on the basis of a reduced amount of the development and in the context of other representations regarding the re appraisal of the green belt. The site merits reconsideration on a reduced scale, which would provide the opportunity to round off the village and provide for a suitable transition between the edge of the village and the A14. This could include some form of ribbon development along the perimeter of the site. Such development would offer opportunities for landscape and ecological improvements, and provision of affordable housing in a location that is located close to employment and benefits from good links into Cambridge. The main constraint to redevelopment of the site seems to relate to the site's location in the Green Belt.		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The site is within the Green Belt, within an area of land considered to be most critical in separating settlements within the immediate setting of Cambridge, and which should be afforded the greatest protection.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Girton as even a small scale of development will be harmful to the small scale and intimate character of Duck End. A smaller ribbon development along the perimeter of the site, consistent with the existing properties in Duck End would not be of sufficient scale to allocate.</p> <p>Although Girton is one of the more sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the Green Belt, as well as the harm to landscape and townscape. The site has no development potential.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Linton		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land to south of Horseheath Road, Linton (land south of Wheatsheaf, Horseheath Road, Linton)		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	032		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape setting of Linton because the site is part of the open undulating farmland that extends eastward from the village. Highway Authority has severe concerns with regards to the accident record of the A1307 and how scheme would access this road.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	43165 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Ely Diocesan Board of Finance
	Site is available, suitable, and achievable and can be brought forward at early stage in the period of emerging Local Plan. A number of technical studies have been commissioned including a Transport Statement, Flood Risk Statement, Phase 1 Habitat Assessment and Landscape and Visual Assessment which further confirm the site's suitability. An Indicative Concept Plan has also demonstrates an appropriate scheme can be achieved which conforms to necessary adopted policy requirements.		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Whilst recognising that longer views towards the site could be mitigated by careful design and layout taking account of the height of any new buildings and the associated landscaping the Council consider that there would be an adverse impact on the landscape setting of Linton if this site were to be developed.</p> <p>The Highway Authority has accepted that in principle access to the site could be via a junction located on Horseheath Road but traffic generated from development is highly likely to need to access the A1307 and this road continues to have a poor accident record.</p> <p>Due to the impact on the landscape setting of Linton and the concerns regarding the A1307 by the Highway Authority the site has no development potential.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Linton		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land adjacent to Paynes Meadow		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	276		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape setting of Linton because the site is within the open countryside that is an important part of the setting of Linton. It would impact on views from the historic centre and ones across the village.</p> <p>The Highway Authority has severe concerns with regards to the accident record of the A1307 and how scheme would access this road.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	39213 (I&O1) 51227 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> The Fairey Family
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment of the site contains some inaccuracies. The site is not part of a large arable field. It is enclosed by mature hedge boundaries on three sides, which makes it separate from the neighbouring open land.</li> <li>• The site is well-related to existing housing to the south. The site sits in a valley/dip, which means that the site would be screened from the village by the existing housing and the hedge/tree boundaries.</li> <li>• The highways concerns about the impact on the A1307 would apply to all the sites around Linton.</li> <li>• Linton is a suitable village for additional development, and sites should be identified within and adjacent to the development framework boundary.</li> </ul>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>This site is adjoining an exception site for housing and separate from the village framework. An adjoining site promoted during the SHLAA Call for Sites (Sites 101 and 120) was found not to have development potential when it was assessed and therefore was rejected as being considered suitable for housing. Site 276 is not adjoining the village framework and there are no proposals to alter the Linton framework as part of the review of the local plan. Since sites 101 and 120 are not being proposed as having development potential this site 276 could not be considered for housing allocation in the local plan as it is not adjoining the village framework.</p> <p>The concerns that the Highway Authority has about the A1307 and its accident record have been stated for all the site assessments in Linton as it is equally valid for any additional larger scale development within the village.</p> <p>The site has no development potential since it neither adjoins the village framework nor is adjacent to a housing site to be allocated in the local plan. Also the concern about the A1307 on any development in Linton is likely to make any larger scale development unacceptable.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Linton		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land to the east of Linton		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	318		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. Major adverse effect on the conservation area as a very prominent countryside site in views across valley and village and on approach. Major adverse effect on settings of Barham Hall and Water Tower on Rivey Hill, vista along High Street and as backdrop to other listed buildings. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape setting of Linton as the fields that make up this site are all on the edge of the village and many are in locations where development would have significant impacts on the views from the historic centre and long views across the village. The Highway Authority has severe concerns with regards to the accident record of the A1307 and therefore detailed analysis of access points onto the A1307 will need to be completed. The promoter claims these can be adequately addressed, however the scale and likely cost of measures proposed would require a significant level of development.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	51923 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Pembroke College, G W Balaam, and The Fairey Family Trust
	<p>Promoters dispute the critique made in the site assessment. The main concern of the Council is landscape and historic setting impact. Those concerns are not well-founded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is flexibility within the site to form a development that is most sympathetic to its context and have space available for landscape mitigation or public open space.</li> <li>• All views of the developable part of the site will be screened from the conservation area by the existing built form of Linton.</li> <li>• Minimal development has been proposed within the area surrounding the listed Tower Mill due to the exposed nature of the land. Any development would be sensitively located and appear, in the context of Linton, to be viewed as an extension to the built form.</li> <li>• Development proposed will be partially visible from the Barham Hall (listed building), however it will be seen in context to the existing backdrop of Linton thereby not significantly altering the character of the setting.</li> <li>• Within long distance views, the proposed development would appear as a minor extension to Linton.</li> </ul> <p>Specific reference by the Council is made to the delivery of the A1307 junction improvements. A clear proposal was included for the improvement</p>		

	<p>of the junctions to the A1307. Detailed traffic assessment and junction designs have been discussed with the Highway Authority and their preliminary assessment is that the junction designs are appropriate. The land to deliver the junctions is in the sole control of the site promoters and the County Council.</p> <p>The achievability of the site is also questioned. Letters from the landowners confirm their commitment to delivering a high quality site along with community infrastructure, not least improvements to the A1307. There is no technical reason why the proposal cannot be delivered.</p>
<p><b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b></p>	<p>The promoter is suggesting the site offers the opportunity to provide up to 420 dwellings, associated public open space and ecological enhancements, which will be designed to incorporate existing landscape features such as boundary and hedgerows to help integrate it into the landscape.</p> <p>Linton is set within a river valley surrounded by undulating landscape. It is accepted that with a smaller scale of development and careful design, the impacts on the Conservation Area may not be as severe as indicated in the original SHLAA assessment. However, there remains the potential for development on the southern part of the site to impact on the setting of the river valley and the wider setting of the Conservation Area. Similarly, development of the southern and south eastern part of the site would be on hillside facing the Grade II* Barham Hall, whilst the northern part would impact on the setting of the Grade II Water Tower on Rivey Hill, a dominant backcloth to the village.</p> <p>The promoter, through their Transport and Access Appraisal, claims to highway impacts of development can be adequately addressed. The Highway Authority has severe concerns with regards to the accident record of the A1307, the A1307 is a high casualty route, and how a scheme would access this road. The scale and likely cost of measures proposed, including junction improvements and measures to improve access by non-car modes, would require a significant level of development. Any necessary road infrastructure, including potential lighting, on the A1307 is likely to be visually intrusive and impact on the setting of Linton Conservation Area and Barham Hall.</p>

<b>Settlement:</b>	Milton		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Fen Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	094		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. The area is located within the Green Belt. Development would impact on the openness of the Green Belt and consolidate development on the east side of Chesterton Fen Road. The River Cam and its meadows are an important and sensitive location. Part of the site is also situated within Flood Zone 3, which would rule it out from further assessment. The Local Highway Authority would question the suitability of this site for the number of pitches being proposed in addition the existing levels of development.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	40598 (I&O1) 51258 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Jesus College (Cambridge)
	<p>In its initial submission and then in response to the rejection of site 94, the promoter made the following arguments:</p> <p>There is a current unmet need for Gypsy &amp; Traveller pitch provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National planning policy requires that the Council must provide for the needs of the Gypsy &amp; Traveller community, using relevant evidence.</li> <li>• The Council's own evidence shows that South Cambridgeshire needs to provide 65 new pitches to meet the current backlog and a further 20 new pitches to meet future demand by 2026. The site is in single ownership with immediate access to the site being possible to deliver Gypsy and Traveller pitches, which would substantially help to meet this identified need, and also the needs identified for Cambridge, given the site's close proximity to the City.</li> </ul> <p>All adverse impacts relating Site 94 can be effectively mitigated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Transport Appraisal demonstrates that suitable access to the site can be achieved via Fen Road, and that traffic generation associated with the site can be easily accommodated within the existing highway network.</li> <li>• A Flood Risk Assessment for the site demonstrates that the proposed developable area of the site is considered appropriate for caravan pitches and that a suitable sustainable drainage strategy can be provided.</li> <li>• Land between the developable area of the site and the river would be set aside for open space and landscaping purposes. The site is at the heart of an existing established gypsy and traveller community, has no other useable purpose and performs no Green Belt function whatsoever.</li> </ul>		

<p><b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b></p>	<p>In response to the argument that development at this site is needed to meet identified gypsy and traveller needs, sites have come forward through planning applications that are sufficient to meet the level of need identified through the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment. Additional allocations are not needed in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council accepts the Flood Risk Assessment evidence that part of the site would be developable for caravan pitches, and that a suitable drainage strategy can be provided. It also accepts the Transport Appraisal evidence that traffic generation associated with the site can be accommodated within the existing highway network.</p> <p>The site lies within the Green Belt, and no exceptional circumstances for review of the Green Belt have been identified in responses to the consultation. The major impact of development here would be the closure of views to the River Cam – a county wildlife site - and from, across and of Fen Ditton's Conservation Area. It would also link existing residential sites, resulting in a continuous frontage of development, which would adversely impact the rural character of Cambridge's Green Belt. Setting aside the developable area of the site and the river for open space and landscaping would not mitigate either of these adverse impacts.</p> <p>In conclusion, this site has no development potential.</p>
--	--

### **Milton Sites with no objections**

Land west of A10, Milton (SHLAA Site 327): 1 representation from Milton Parish Council supported the continued rejection of the site.

<b>Settlement:</b>	Papworth Everard		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land at The Ridgeway, Papworth Everard		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	321		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Development of this site would have a significant adverse impact on the landscape and townscape of the area, as the site is located on a ridge and therefore any built development would be a prominent, harsh edge to the village in the wide views across the undulating arable fields. Development of the site would also change the strong linear character of the village. The promoter has indicated that a substantial tree buffer would be provided to screen the site from the surrounding countryside. Development would have a direct impact on the A428 with potential capacity issues.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	50869 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Davison & Sons (Great Barford) Ltd
	<p>We object to the Council's assessment of this site because it is not robust and effectively ignores the Concept Masterplan submitted.</p> <p><i>Townscape and Landscape:</i> There would inevitably be some views of the development from the open countryside but the existing housing along the Ridgeway is already visible and the proposed development would be seen below that and set within a landscape framework. The Concept Masterplan for the site makes provision for planting within and on the edge of the development to ensure that the scheme is assimilated into the surrounding landscape. This approach would minimise the visual prominence of the site. The relatively recent development at Old Pinewood Way (in 2002) to the northeast demonstrates how a soft and robust landscape edge can be created in a short space of time.</p> <p>Papworth Everard originally adopted a linear form but has subsequently expanded and now contains significant areas of development which is set back behind the main street. The construction of the bypass has also had an effect on the form of the village. The roundabout junctions of the bypass effectively contain the settlement in those directions and the most logical and sustainable pattern for future development is to consolidate the village.</p> <p><i>Highways:</i> The assessment identified "potential capacity issues" relating to the A428 corridor between the A1198 (Caxton Gibbet) and the A1 at St Neots. Any development within Papworth Everard will have a dispersed impact on all the approach roads within the area. Only a proportion of that impact will be on the A428 corridor between Caxton Gibbet and St Neots. The greater</p>		

	<p>balance of impact will be on either the A428 towards Cambridge, or northwards to Huntingdon and the A14. It is unlikely that the impact of development at the Ridgeway would be materially significant on traffic flows within the A428 corridor.</p> <p><i>Suitability, Availability and Achievability:</i> The assessment concluded that the site has “no potential suitability, serious availability concerns, serious achievability concerns”. The site is a suitable location for residential development, it is a deliverable housing site - there is developer interest. There is no reason to doubt the viability of the site for development or its attractiveness to developers.</p>
<p><b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b></p>	<p>The north-eastern edge of Papworth Everard is largely screened by a ridge that runs parallel to Rogues Lane and the new tree-belts planted to screen the new housing development at Old Pinewood Way. The areas that are not screened by tree belts (e.g. Ridgeway) still include mature trees that provide a soft village edge. Papworth Wood a distinctive landscape feature and it provides a substantial buffer between the village and the arable fields. The planting that screens Old Pinewood Way also provides an extensive buffer between the existing residential properties and the arable fields that are being proposed for development. New development in this location would therefore be separated from the existing built up area of the village. Due to the topography of the site, planting and landscaping buffers along the new edge will not be sufficient to mitigate the adverse impacts of the development on the landscape. The existence of existing impacts on the landscape is not a good reason to reinforce those impacts through additional development.</p> <p>Papworth Everard has changed considerably since the 1990s due to a new bypass, relocation of some employment uses to the new business park and the building of a significant number of new homes. This change was planned in response to a perceived need to create a more balanced community. To maintain the vitality and viability of the village, there needs to be a continued balance of housing and employment. Altering this balance will make it a challenge to achieve a sustainable future for the village.</p> <p>English Heritage comments that Papworth has already been subject to major expansion over recent years and further expansion will mean the village will be completely out of kilter with its historic core, adversely affecting the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The impact of the site on the A428 and other roads would need to be addressed in a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Although Papworth Everard is one of the more sustainable settlements in the district, this is not outweighed by the harm that this development would have on the landscape. The site has no development potential.</p>

<b>Settlement:</b>	Swavesey		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land abutting Fen Drayton Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	065		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts of development of this site. The site is in an exposed location and does not relate well to the built form of this part of the village. Further investigation and possible mitigation will be required to address the physical considerations, including potential for noise.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	1 representation support rejection of this site.		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	42437 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> A E Johnson
	<p>Object to rejection of this site. We note that SHLAA site 83 has been included as a potential option. We consider that given the identified sustainability of Swavesey (highly accessible to the CGB) that it is a settlement capable of taking at least one additional residential allocation.</p> <p>Ours is the only other potential site allocation, at least in part, as it lies outside the flood zone and Green Belt, and does not impact on heritage assets. Visual impact on the countryside can be mitigated through sensitive design, layout and landscaping. The site is an unencumbered greenfield site readily deliverable in the short term.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Swavesey. The site is very open and rural in character and development on this site would be very large scale and harmful to the character of the village. It would constitute substantial back land development, poorly related to the existing built-up part of the village. It would result in a large scale westwards expansion of the village along School Lane, having a significant impact on the approach to the village. A previous attempt to gain planning permission for residential development has also been unsuccessful as it would adversely change its character.</p> <p>Although Swavesey has access to the Guided Busway and is one of the more sustainable villages in the district this is outweighed by the harm to the townscape and landscape. Site with no development potential.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Swavesey		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land south of Market Street & at Fenwillow Farm		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	169		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. The whole site is within Flood Zone 3a. PPG25 Table D2 confirms that houses are not appropriate in this zone. Historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts, in this historically sensitive part of the village. Potential for land contamination and noise, vibration, odour impacts, which it may not be possible to mitigate. It is unclear whether appropriate access can be secured to the site as it is not linked to the adopted public highway.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	46182 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Mr Keith Wilderspin
	This land is essential to the viability of the ongoing farming enterprise at Fenwillow Farm and its loss would render holding unviable. Any proposals to bring the land forward for recreation use must therefore also address the future of the land to the north (SHLAA site 169), enabling the farm to be restructured.		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The whole site is within Flood Zone 3a and national planning guidance confirms that houses are not appropriate in this zone.</p> <p>Development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Swavesey. The site is close to the historic core of the village and forms an important part of the setting of the Conservation Area and several Listed Buildings, including two that are Grade I Listed. It provides a soft edge and rural setting to the village.</p> <p>The site has been considered through two Local Plans and both independent planning inspectors concluded the site was not suitable for housing, as the whole site was in the flood zone; it would represent a clear extension of the village into generally flat and open countryside; and the benefits offered [removal of intensive pig rearing unit and provision of additional public open space] would not justify the intrusion into the countryside. Planning permission has also been refused as the proposed access is inadequate and below the minimum standard required (being a private unmade road).</p> <p>Site with no development potential.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Swavesey		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Driftwood Farm		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	250		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. It is adjacent to a nationally important Scheduled Monument and it will not be possible to mitigate impact. Part of the site is also within Flood Zone 2 and most of the site is within the Minerals Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Swavesey. It is not possible to provide safe highway access to the site and it is not linked to the adopted public highway.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	50433 (I&O1) 55166 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Mr & Mrs R Smart
	<p>Site's current lawful use and nature has significant potential to cause harm, particularly following the construction of residential estate bordering to south.</p> <p>Brownfield site located adjacent to village boundary and outside area at risk from flooding.</p> <p>Allocation for housing would remove a potential nuisance and help to enhance character and appearance of locality and setting of nearby heritage asset.</p> <p>In the absence of any harm to anything of acknowledged importance and with a number of significant advantages we ask the Council to put this site forward as a housing allocation.</p> <p>A more robust strategy must refocus towards delivery of sustainable new homes at a larger number of locations throughout the district. More development should be directed towards larger villages such as Swavesey which are sustainable locations and which, with additional development, could be more sustainable as growth could help facilitate provision of additional facilities within village.</p> <p>The site is within 1km of Guided Busway and previously developed, currently comprising mixed use of general industrial, warehousing open storage and residential. Limited development (for small number of executive homes) will help enhance setting of conservation area and nearby SAM.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	The site is adjacent to the nationally designated earthworks of Swavesey Castle Scheduled Monument. Development would have a significant negative impact on the Scheduled site, and undesignated remains which may survive in the proposal area. It will not be possible to mitigate the		

impact of development.

Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Swavesey. The site is close to the historic core of the village and forms an important part of the setting of the Conservation Area. Development of this site would have a negative impact on the setting of this historic part of the village.

The proposed site does not appear to have a direct link to the adopted public highway. It is unlikely that access would be able to meet highway standards to provide satisfactory access without significant harm to the character and appearance of this very rural and historic part of the village.

The site has been considered through three Local Plans and independent planning inspectors who make the following comments:

- a small proportion in the middle of the site is occupied by commercial buildings;
- access is by a narrow road leading out of the Conservation Area (Taylors Lane); any significant additional amount of traffic upon it in its present state would seriously erode its character, as would any substantial upgrading
- nearby housing is visible but surrounded by substantial hedge;
- there are long views across open land to the north and west;
- new buildings would intrude into the countryside, effectively severing the Conservation Area (and the town ramparts within the Ancient Monument) from their rural setting;
- this site would be detached from the main body of the village and, despite the buildings which it contains, would remain more part of the open countryside.

Although Swavesey has access to the Guided Busway and is one of the more sustainable villages in the district and there is potential to improve the site, this is outweighed by the harm to the nationally important Scheduled Monument, townscape and landscape. It is not clear that suitable safe access can be achieved in an acceptable manner. Site with no development potential.

## **Swavesey Sites with no objections**

Land adjacent to Fen Drayton Road, Swavesey (SHLAA Site 287): 1 representation supported the continued rejection of the site.

<b>Settlement:</b>	Waterbeach		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land north of Poorsfield Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	142		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	This site has no development potential. It would be very difficult to mitigate any impact on the historic environment as development would impact on the setting of three Grade II Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area due to the loss of significant green setting. The site forms a semi-rural transition area between the village and the countryside beyond, and retains the rural character of the local footpaths. Development of this site would therefore have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	40976 (I&O1) 51921 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Ashdale Land and Property Company Ltd
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is an underused site (a derelict orchard) and immediately adjoins an existing residential development on the western edge of Waterbeach;</li> <li>The site can be accessed from the existing residential development via Poorsfield Road, which is entirely under the control of Ashdale Land;</li> <li>The site would therefore represent a natural rounding off of residential uses in this part of Waterbeach;</li> <li>Ashdale Land is aware that the site falls below the Council's minimum thresholds. However, sites 043, 142 and 270 should be considered as one development opportunity.</li> </ul>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>While the site itself is not used by the public, its significance lies in its landscape role providing a semi-rural transition area between the village and the countryside beyond. An appeal inspector noted the trees on this site provide screening in this part of the village. Together with the adjacent plots of land to the east and west, the site therefore provides an important amenity area, since it forms an undeveloped green wedge coming in almost to the heart of the village. The appeal inspector also noted the rural character of the footpaths that run along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site.</p> <p>When considered as a single site, development would create adverse impacts on the setting of numbers 5 and 19 Greenside, and on 10 Cambridge Road, all Grade II Listed Buildings. Development here would also adversely impact on the setting of Waterbeach Conservation Area, and on the rural character of the footpaths referred to above. When considered together with sites 043 and 270, development would wholly remove the current green wedge, increasing the accompanying adverse landscape impacts noted above. This site therefore has no development potential.</p> <p>Waterbeach Barracks is proposed for development in the draft Local Plan and further development in the village is not considered appropriate.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Waterbeach		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Cambridge Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	202		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Considering the whole site as proposed by the promoter, this site has no development potential. The site falls within an area where development would have some adverse impact on Green Belt purposes and functions. Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach, given that it does not relate well to the built-up part of the village.</p> <p>N.B. The Council considered that a smaller scale of development along the Cambridge Road frontage at this site did have limited development potential. Two smaller areas within the site were therefore consulted upon in July 2012 Issues &amp; Options consultation as Site Option 52.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	36501 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Mr M Gingell
	<p>Objections to the rejection of the site argued that the whole of site 202 should be allocated for housing development, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is deliverable;</li> <li>• The site has suitable access to the local highway network;</li> <li>• It would create a logical extension to the village;</li> <li>• The site has the potential to complement development at the barracks site through housing delivery early in the plan period;</li> <li>• It represents an environmentally sound approach;</li> <li>• Development here would not lead to the coalescence of settlements.</li> </ul> <p>The objector commented that the Council had incorrectly assessed the site in relation to the impact on noise, light pollution, odour and vibration in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The Council has already amended the Sustainability Appraisal to address the objector's concerns (this is referenced in the errata and the revised site assessment form has been published on the website).</p> <p>The site is open and exposed to the wider countryside, visible over long distances to the south and west, and the land clearly performs a Green Belt function. Development on the whole of this site would adversely impact on the rural character of this landscape, and therefore on the rural setting of Waterbeach.</p> <p>Cambridge Road to the north and Car Dyke Road to the south provide strong boundaries to the edge of the built up area of Waterbeach. The site is</p>		

	<p>therefore somewhat separated from the village, and as a result does not relate well to it. The site would not therefore create a logical extension to the village.</p> <p>Objections to the rejection of this site do not address the adverse impacts discussed above. When considered as a whole, therefore, this site has no development potential.</p> <p>Waterbeach Barracks is proposed for development in the draft Local Plan and further development in the village is not considered appropriate.</p>
--	---

<b>Settlement:</b>	Waterbeach		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land off Gibson Close		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	270		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Development at this site would have an adverse effect on the setting of Waterbeach Conservation Area due to loss of green rural backdrop and countryside setting, and major adverse effects on the setting of number 5 Greenside, a Grade II Listed Building. Overall, development of this site would have an adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Waterbeach.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	51541 & 40691 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Foregreen Developments Limited
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Planning Inspector for the 2004 Local Plan concluded that this site, and adjacent sites, should be brought within the development framework boundary.</li> <li>A well-designed development could retain the character of the surrounding area and prevent any impact on the conservation area and listed buildings, and appropriate landscaping could mitigate any impact on the natural environment and the character of the area.</li> <li>In terms of highway access, we consider that if three sites were combined (SHLAA Ref 270, 142 and part of 043) that vehicular access could be provided from Mill Road and Poorsfield Road, with limited vehicular access from Gibson Close.</li> </ul>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>This site would have major adverse effects on the setting of a Grade II Listed Building, which is adjacent to the proposed access road. If, as the promoters suggest, access were to be provided via Mill Road and Poorsfield Road by combining sites 270, 142 and part of 043, some of the noted impacts on the setting of number 5 Greenside Listed Building would be reduced.</p> <p>However, changing vehicular access to the site does not mitigate the broader landscape / townscape impacts. The site is adjacent to the Waterbeach Conservation Area, and the Green is a "key landmark". A footpath runs along the northern boundary of this site leading from The Green to the open countryside to the west. An appeal inspector adjudged the site provides an undeveloped green wedge coming in almost to the heart of the village, acting as an important amenity area, and as a setting for the Conservation Area with the Green at its centre. The introduction of built form at this site would be harmful to the rural attributes of this part of the village, and would therefore adversely impact on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>This site therefore has no development potential. Waterbeach Barracks is proposed for development in the draft Local Plan and further development in the village is not considered appropriate.</p>		

<b>Settlement:</b>	Willingham		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land to the south of Over Road		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	047		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	<p>Site with no development potential. Approximately 2/3 of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Significant townscape and landscape impacts as development would be to the rear of the site, closest to the countryside. This would not relate well to the built form, with a largely linear pattern of development. Further investigation and possible mitigation will be required to address the physical considerations, including potential for land contamination, noise, odour and dust. However it is not clear that these impacts can be overcome. The current status of the A14 gives rise to concern regarding the cumulative effect of developments in the area. The Highway Authority has concerns in relationship to the provision of suitable inter vehicle visibility splay for this site.</p>		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	Access onto Over Road would be too dangerous and disruptive to traffic flows and pedestrian safety.		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	33040 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Mr John Wynn
	<p>Additional land to be included and site reconsidered.</p> <p>Well related to the town centre, school and shopping and other facilities, and is closer than site options. It has good sustainability.</p> <p>Flood Risk - principally zone 3 but moderate zone 2, but surrounding land same level and Environment Agency's maps may be inaccurate. Low flood risk which should not rule site out.</p> <p>Townscape - well related to Willingham and facilities.</p> <p>Noise - Aspinall's yard ceased as builders merchants years ago.</p> <p>Access - suitable access retained when frontage parcels sold off for development.</p> <p>Redundant horticulture and storage - tidy up area which may become nuisance to adjoining residents.</p>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>The Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment shows approximately 2/3 of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. With a large proportion of the site situated within Flood Zone 3, the remaining land is located to the rear of the site, away from the road frontage, within an area characterised by a largely linear pattern of development. Development would therefore have considerable landscape and townscape impacts as it would not relate well to the built form of the village, as there would be a large area of open land between the road frontage and potential development. It would not be possible to mitigate these impacts.</p>		

	<p>The Highways Agency has concerns regarding the cumulative impact of developments in the area on the A14. The Highways Authority does not consider it possible to achieve appropriate visibility splays necessary for safe access to the site.</p> <p>Although Willingham is one of the more sustainable villages in the district and there is potential to remove redundant horticulture and storage to tidy up the site, this is outweighed by the harm to the landscape and townscape. The site has no development potential.</p>
--	--

<b>Settlement:</b>	Willingham		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land to the rear of High Street / George Street		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	157		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. A small part of the site located within Flood Zone 3. The whole site is within the Minerals Safeguarding Area for sand and gravel. Significant historic environment, townscape and landscape impacts on this historically sensitive part of the village. The current status of the A14 gives rise to concern regarding the cumulative effect of developments in the area. It is unclear whether appropriate access can be secured to the site as it is not linked to the adopted public highway.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	N/A		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	42164 (I&O1)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> Mr B Papworth
	It is considered that site 157 within the Council's SHLAA be considered suitable for development and be consulted upon formally as such. The location of site 157 relates well to our client's site (see details below) and both sites could be developed in tandem to provide for housing in the village that would relate well to the existing character and nature of development in Willingham.		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	<p>Development of this site would have a significant adverse effect on the landscape and townscape setting of Willingham. Development would intensify development, extending the built area of the village outwards into land that is open and rural in character, resulting in the loss of historic burgage plots characteristic of the village. This would have a significant adverse effect on the setting of the Conservation Area and several Listed Buildings due to the loss of burgage plots and views out from the High Street into open countryside.</p> <p>Several attempts for planning permission for various scales of development on parts of the site have been unsuccessful as it would represent too large an extension to the village and adversely change its character; it would seriously detract from the living conditions of nearby residents; it would not represent a logical extension or rounding off of existing residential development on this edge of the village but an intrusion into the surrounding area of land in horticultural use.</p> <p>The Highways Agency has concerns regarding the cumulative impact of developments in the area on the A14. The Highways Authority does not consider it possible to achieve access to the site as it does not appear to have a direct link to the adopted public highway.</p> <p>Although Willingham is one of the more sustainable villages in the district, this is outweighed by the harm to the landscape and townscape, and</p>		

	significant harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and listed buildings. It is not clear whether suitable safe access can be achieved to the site. The site has no development potential.
--	---

<b>Settlement:</b>	Great Chesterford (in the parish of Ickleton)		
<b>Site Address:</b>	Land adjacent to Whiteways, Ickleton Road, Great Chesterford		
<b>SHLAA Reference:</b>	330		
<b>Summary of Council's Original Reasons for Rejection (as published in the SHLAA):</b>	Site with no development potential. Development of this site would result in an isolated housing estate that does not relate well to the built-up area of Great Chesterford. The Highway Authority has concerns over this site as it is very close to the main trunk network and therefore has the potential to impact on the working of the network as a whole. Adjoins M11/A11 and mainline railway, therefore this site requires full noise and air quality assessments including consideration of any noise attenuation measures.		
<b>Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s):</b>	<p>2 representations supporting the rejection of this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ickleton Society: Good quality agricultural land should not be developed. Below a raised section of the M11 and would suffer from traffic noise. Access to the site would be close to the level crossing, rail underpass, a bend in Ickleton Road and two M11 flyovers which obscure the view. It would increase traffic through Ickleton where rat running is already a major problem.</li> <li>Ickleton Parish Council: Development here would be completely severed from Great Chesterford village and would not be capable of integration with that community. An unacceptable level of car-based travel associated with this site, much of it impacting upon Ickleton, which is already struggling with the adverse effects of current levels of through traffic.</li> </ul>		
<b>Summary of Objection(s):</b>	<b>Representation Number(s):</b>	54194 (I&O2)	<b>Respondent(s):</b> KMBC Planning (Katherine Munro)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In our view the site is in a truly sustainable location.</li> <li>Air quality and noise concerns – no concerns were expressed in the accompanying sustainability appraisal of the site. The site is not in an AQMA. Some housing sites proposed are in similar proximity to major roads however they are still included as noise concerns can be mitigated against.</li> <li>Townscape and landscape concerns – the site is adjacent to existing housing in Great Chesterford, and is opposite to shops and facilities at Riverside, it is therefore not isolated or completely separate from the built up area.</li> <li>Access concerns – the sustainability appraisal only makes reference to 'minor' negative effects. The potential development of the site will not materially impact on the working of the transport network, as the development proposed is relatively small in scale and being close to the major routes of A11 and M11 means it is likely most road users will access these routes. The development could allow for the upgrade of the road for the benefit of the community.</li> </ul>		
<b>Council's Response and Conclusion:</b>	The site lies adjacent to the A11/M11 and mainline railway, and therefore lies near the source of air pollution (although the area is not a designated AQMA) and is subject to traffic and railway noise. Significant levels of ambient / diffuse traffic noise dominant the environment both during the day and night.		

	<p>This site requires full noise and air quality assessments including consideration of any noise attenuation measures such as noise barriers / berms. The sustainability appraisal should be updated to reflect these conclusions that were included in the site assessment proforma, it was an error that these had not been completed rather than meaning that there was no harm.</p> <p>The western edge of Great Chesterford adjacent to the level crossing is predominantly commercial uses, and the site is separated from Great Chesterford by the railway line. The site is adjacent to an isolated cluster of houses and additional land submitted for housing. Riverside Barns, which are located between Ickleton and Great Chesterford, is a collection of small retail units including galleries, craft and gift shops, and a cafe. Uttlesford District Council's Town and Village Profiles (2012) lists Great Chesterford as having a "thriving" post office / shop, and the nearest supermarkets as being at Saffron Walden (4 miles) and Sawston (5 miles). Uttlesford District Council's Historic Settlement Character Assessment (2007) considers that development in this area would diminish the sense of place and local distinctiveness of the settlement and would extend the village beyond the clearly defined boundary formed by the railway. Development of this site would result in an isolated housing estate that does not relate well to the built-up area of Great Chesterford.</p> <p>Suitable access would need to be agreed with the Highways Authority. The impact of the site on the surrounding roads would need to be addressed in a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Even if the access issues can be overcome, the site would have no development potential as there are other issues that cannot be overcome such as the isolation of the site from the built up area of Great Chesterford.</p>
--	---

## Sites in Group Villages

Representations were received on 51 specific sites in Group Villages as outlined in Table 1.

### Council's Response and Conclusion:

Group Villages are smaller villages which provide a lower level of services and facilities than larger villages classified as Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres. Development in Group Villages is less sustainable than development in locations higher in the sustainable development sequence which runs from locations in and on the edge of Cambridge, through New Settlements, to Rural Centre and Minor Rural Centre villages and finally to Group Villages. Sufficient sites have been identified for allocation in locations higher in the sustainable development sequence and therefore no development allocations are justified in Group Villages.

**Table 1: Summary of Representations on Rejected SHLAA Sites in Group Villages**

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land between 12 & 22 Shepreth Road, <b>Barrington</b>	012		Neglected derelict land. Group village status permits additional development. Existing developments set precedence and compromise visual amenity. <b>REPS 36966 &amp; 52125</b>
Land north of Comberton Road, <b>Barton</b>	222 & 223		Should be reconsidered for inclusion as the sustainability appraisal is considered to present an inaccurate assessment of the potential impacts of development. Sustainability Appraisal makes no allowance for benefits that may accrue from new housing. Without new development in village future viability of local shops, pub, school and other local services will come under increasing threat. <b>REP 45814</b>

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land opposite Sadlers Close, Whitwell Way, <b>Coton</b>	147		Two thirds of the site lies within the designated Green Belt with the remainder fronting Whitwell Way located outside the Green Belt and outside the village framework. It is not known what the historic reasoning for the exclusion of this part of the site from the Green Belt but it is quite clear this is an anomaly which we consider can be appropriately addressed by allocating the site for development and allowing the continuation of the built up frontage along this road, will not impact on neighbouring properties nor the wider countryside. <b>REP 37053</b>
Land opposite Silverdale Avenue, Whitwell Way, <b>Coton</b>	148		The opportunity exists to create a new residential environment in one of the necklace villages around Cambridge and in a location which has good cycling and walking connections via the Coton footpath into the town. We consider that a review of the Green Belt in this location provides the opportunity to secure much needed new housing within the District and in a location which minimises impact upon neighbouring existing development and the wider landscape. <b>REP 37049</b>
The Paddock, End of Mangers Lane, <b>Duxford</b>	092		The site forms part of the centre of Duxford and falls completely within the village framework. The sole constraint to development of the site is the existing PVAA designation, despite its complete unsuitability. <b>REP 55882</b>

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land west and north of <b>Duxford</b>	131	2 representations: i. Ickleton Parish Council: A development of this size would be utterly inappropriate and would not integrate with the existing settlement of Duxford. Proximity to the M11 junction would encourage medium and long distance car based commuting. ii. Ickleton Society: adverse impact on Ickleton which already suffers from a large amount of rat running traffic.	Duxford compares favourably with other better served Group villages. Greater weight should be given to proximity to employment and rail services. Would generate funds for local infrastructure. <b>REP 395559</b>
Rear of 8 Greenacres, <b>Duxford</b>	166		
Land to the rear of 28 The Green, <b>Eltisley</b>	022	2 representations: Noise, pollution, access, impact on historic environment. Lack of amenities. Sewer problems.	
Land south of St Neots Road, <b>Eltisley</b>	035	1 representation: Would be detrimental to listed buildings and conservation area. Lack of amenities.	
Land west and east of Ditton Lane, <b>Fen Ditton</b>	159 & 160		Development providing approximately 400-500 new homes. Strong links to green infrastructure and sustainable modes of transport into Cambridge City centre. Maintain Green Belt buffer between development and A14. <b>REP 45598</b>

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land behind Ridgeleys Farm House, <b>Fen Drayton</b>	064		Outside of the floodplain. A small-scale development could enhance the town and landscape, and could mitigate noise and pollution on-site. It could enable working from home, as well as reuse of existing buildings in the countryside on brownfield land. Development here could improve biodiversity. A low-carbon scheme could mirror the SPD for the LSA land. <b>REP 42557</b>
Appleacre Park, London Road, <b>Fowlmere</b>	077		Located at the edge of Fowlmere, Appleacre Park is already a well-established residential park. We contend that the proposed site which is within the perimeter of the park is well capable of residential development. <b>REP 41029</b>
Land west of High Street, <b>Fowlmere</b>	107		<p>Contrary to the SHLAA, a sensitive development would have no negative impact upon the setting of the village or the open countryside. The site already reads more as an element of the built area presenting an opportunity for a mixed use development in a sustainable location. <b>REP 40706</b></p> <p>Objection to rejection of site, failure to account for adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area, as required by Paragraph 158 of the NPPF, and in specific relation to the village of Fowlmere. Essential in retaining in excess of 40 jobs at Ion Science. <b>REP 51627</b></p>

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land at Triangle Farm, <b>Fowlmere</b>	218		Villages such as Fowlmere have an irregular settlement pattern such that small areas of land could be released for residential development without causing harm, either to the character or wider setting of the village. Flexibility should be built into the overall strategy relating to the settlement hierarchy. <b>REP 41352</b>
Land west of Station Road, <b>Foxton</b>	233		Foxton has a sustainable base to accommodate some new development. The site is well related to the settlement pattern of Foxton and would have very little visual encroachment into the countryside. <b>REP 38086</b>
Land east of <b>Great Abington</b>	027		Residential led sustainable extension to village. Short walking distance to services and facilities, bus stop with direct public transport link to Cambridge, Haverhill. Deliverable, available and suitable. <b>REP 47014</b>
104 High Street, <b>Great Abington</b>	293		Little Abington Parish Council: the Abingtons housing survey 2011 indicated a current need for at least 10 affordable houses and 10 "retirement" bungalows for local residents and their families. <b>REP 41746</b> Infill development, with no trees on site, good access, would not impact on listed building. Would provide affordable housing for village. <b>REP 53655</b>

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land off St Neots Road, <b>Hardwick</b>	180		Propose between 175 and 200 dwellings, with additional open space, and new doctors surgery. Vehicular access from St Neots Road, with emergency links at Hall Drive, providing footpath / Cycleway links. Will link the existing village with the Meridian Close development. Site comprises underused paddock or garden land, surrounded by existing residential development. <b>REP 42450</b>  Objection to rejection of site, neighbourhood centre including doctors and dentist facilities, further shopping facilities could be considered if required, access from St Neots road will provide for 125 dwellings or so with additional open space and community woodland, footpath / cycleway facilities, financial contribution to Parish Council for community facilities improvement. <b>REP 55462</b>  This part of Hardwick comprises an opportunity for a comprehensive approach to development to provide a positive scheme of development. <b>REPS 46780 &amp; 47584</b>
Land off St Neots Road, <b>Hardwick</b>	180 & part new site		
158 High Street, <b>Harston</b>	164	1 representation: High water table, High Street already busy.	

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land to rear of High Street, <b>Harston</b>	226 & 289		<p>Contrary to the SHLAA, a sensitive development would have no negative impact upon the setting of the village and listed buildings or the openness of the wider Green Belt but would deliver much needed housing in a sustainable location. <b>REP 41001</b></p> <p>Objection to rejection of site, failure to account for adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area, as required by Paragraph 158 of the NPPF, and in specific relation to the village of Harston. <b>REP 51621</b></p>
Land at River Lane, <b>Haslingfield</b>	150	<p>8 representations (including Harlton and Haslingfield Parish Councils): Access inadequate, flood risk, infrastructure at capacity. Impact on rural character. Detrimental impact on grade 2 listed buildings.</p> <p>2 representations supporting rejection from Haslingfield and Harlton Parish Councils.</p>	
Land at Barton Road, <b>Haslingfield</b>	163		
72 and 64A West Drive, <b>Highfields Caldecote</b>	052		<p>The village is suburban in character, and has grown through 'backland' development. Site would be entirely in keeping with this character. The nearby factory has closed, ending potential noise problems. The biodiversity and environmental factors are less than described in the SHLAA report. <b>REP 36986</b></p>

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Rear of 104 West Drive, <b>Highfields Caldecote</b>	010		Can mitigate landscape impacts, access can be achieved. <b>REP 47499</b>
Rear of 10 West Drive, <b>Highfields Caldecote</b>	011		Landscaping can be achieved, access can be achieved, highly accessible. <b>REP 47507</b>
Bancroft Farm, Church Lane, <b>Little Abington</b>	028		Capable of providing house types that Parish Councils support - enable older residents to 'downsize'. No flood risk. Small scale residential development. Potential to enhance townscape of Conservation Area. <b>REP 47013</b>
Green End Farm, <b>Longstanton</b>	002		Little Abington Parish Council: the Abingtons housing survey 2011 indicated a current need for at least 10 affordable houses and 10 "retirement" bungalows for local residents and their families. <b>REP 41746</b>
Land west of Over Road, <b>Longstanton</b>	244		Within boundary of bypass, good access to employment, deliverable. <b>REPS 32165 &amp; 34219</b>
Land east of B1050, <b>Longstanton</b>	246		Has been discounted even though it is part of Longstanton which with Northstowe will be the largest settlement in the District. <b>REP 46254</b>
Land off Clive Hall Drive, <b>Longstanton</b>	257		It is superior to many of the sites suggested within the Issues and Options document and also consider that Longstanton / Oakington / Northstowe should be upgraded in terms of the flawed settlement hierarchy. <b>REPS 34089 &amp; 46257</b>
			There is justification for rationalising and rounding off village framework by including land for residential development Would follow a defined property boundary. <b>REP 43124</b>

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land north of Gables Close, <b>Meldreth</b>	100		The conclusion that site "has no development potential" is flawed, and does not seem to be based on any logical conclusions but on the council's strategic preference for large, edge of Cambridge sites. Re Heritage Considerations, the proposed site is set well back from the High Street and, with due consideration for the existing trees, would make no visual impact on the backdrop of the High Street. No incidents of flooding over last 50 years. <b>REPS 39395 &amp; 41636</b>
Land adjacent to Whitecroft Road, <b>Meldreth</b>	191		Suitable location, subject to detailed findings of noise assessment. Previously developed site, within village framework. <b>REP 39169</b>
80a High Street, <b>Meldreth</b>	264	2 representations: Would destroy small orchard, important habitat in river Mel corridor. Impact on riverside footpath. The development could result in the destruction of a number of trees, included some covered by a TPO.	Site does not flood, no smell from sewage works, near to services. Site is fully screened from the public footpath. <b>REP 37503</b>

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land at Kettles Close, <b>Oakington</b>	185		<p>The land is brownfield. Our Drainage consultants have confirmed extensive drainage works at Northstowe will significantly reduce run-off at Oakington Brook, and remove flood risk (Flood Risk Assessment attached). The logical boundary is along the firm line of the Oakington Brook. Given site is surrounded on three sides by residential development it would help round off development in this part of Oakington. <b>REP 42476</b></p> <p>Objection to rejection of site, clear advantages in changing the site from engineering to residential use. Notwithstanding the rejection of this site at the initial local plan stage, circumstances have fundamentally changed with the construction of the guided bus, improvement of the access into Cambridge, and facilities of the market town of St Ives. <b>REP 55463</b></p>
Land adjacent to Petersfield Primary School, off Hurdleditch Road, <b>Orwell</b>	020		<p>Object that only larger Group Villages have been identified. Site performs better than some site options. <b>REP 41236</b></p> <p>Objection to rejection of site, support local services, close proximity of Mainline Railway Station, opportunity to provide mix of housing, including affordable and enhancement of community facilities. <b>REP 55124</b></p>

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land at and to the rear of 16 The Lanes, <b>Over</b>	097		The existing PVA design should be removed and a sensitive development of around 20 dwellings allowed to be delivered in this highly sustainable location providing much needed housing and securing considerable improvements to the adjacent public footpath realm. No substantive reasons why it should not be allocated. <b>REPS 40718 &amp; 51620</b>
Land at Station Road and New Road, <b>Over</b>	121 & 256		Located just outside the village framework, adjacent to existing dwellings. Development of these areas of land for housing would allow for small extensions to the village, without damaging the existing character of Over. <b>REP 43745</b>
Land fronting New Road and Station Road, <b>Over</b>	121		Has a very real development potential for residential housing given its location, the character of the surrounding area, ease of access to and from the guided busway, Swavesey village college and the Longstanton bypass, and the fact that it does have access to both New Road and Station Road, and all service utilities are available to the site directly from the public highway. It is immediately deliverable for such development, and is sufficiently extensive to result in a number of affordable housing units being included. <b>REPS 55115, 42652 &amp; 43140</b>

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land off Meadow Lane, <b>Over</b>	165		All of the concerns raised by the Council regarding this housing land proposal can be satisfactorily addressed. The sustainability of the site has increased significantly since the opening of the Guided Busway system at the neighbouring villages of Swavesey and Longstanton. <b>REP 38366</b>
Land north of New Road, <b>Over</b>	182		Site within the structure of the village ideally sited for housing, close to community centre, school, shops and footpath links. Two potential options for housing: Whole site for approximately 50-60 dwellings with access from New Road, or 2. Approximately half of the site for 20-30 dwellings, with access from New Road. Other half of site for extension to playing field. <b>REP 31158</b>  Objection to rejection of site, Facilities at Over, with deletion of new village at Bourn, and lack of any development at Northstowe, can justify scale of development. Object to use of land for open space (SP/14(1a)) - offer compromise - transfer some land to Parish Council as extension to playing fields (conditional on planning permission being granted) with remainder of land (min 3 acres) for 28 dwellings. <b>REP 55449</b>
Land east of Mill Road, <b>Over</b>	290		Was only dropped due to status of village. Should be upgraded due to Guided Bus. Also high level of need for affordable housing in village. <b>REP 34004</b>

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land north of Bogs Gap Lane, <b>Steeple Morden</b>	209		Does have adequate access to the adopted highway and is already connected to the existing drainage system. The Tier 2 issues can be mitigated by reducing the number of proposed new dwellings. <b>REP 31127</b>
Land to south of Pembroke Way, <b>Teversham</b>	099		Extensive natural screening along its western and southern boundaries limits its impact on the wider landscape. Within its boundary is a large area which could be used for public open space or play space and enhanced to benefit both existing and future residents. Careful design and layout will mitigate any impacts of a potential scheme on the surrounding landscape and ensure that the southern edge of the village remains rural in character and retains its permeability. <b>REP 39418</b>
The Grain Store, Lodge Road  Land west of Rectory Farm, Middle Street  Land east of Farm Lane, <b>Thriplow</b>	016, 062 & 063	1 representation: Landscape and transport impacts.	

Site Address	SHLAA Reference	Summary of Support(s) and Comment(s)	Summary of Objection(s)
Land at rear of Swanns Corner, Mill Lane, <b>Whittlesford</b>	210		There are some inaccuracies in the assessment of the site contained in the SHLAA. A stable has been erected on the site, and while this represents appropriate development in the Green Belt, it would still have an impact on the openness of the area. There are no Elm trees within the site. There is a sewage pipe within the site, but not a sewage pumping station. The site does have an existing access to the highway network. <b>REP 40724</b>
Highway Agency depot, Station Road East, <b>Whittlesford Bridge</b>	278		Good public transport access. Whittlesford plus Whittlesford Bridge justify status as minor rural centre. Would not harm setting of listed buildings. <b>REP 45254</b>