

Neighbourhood Plan for the former Land Settlement Association's Estate at Great Abington 2018 to 2031: **Consultation Statement February 2018**

Contents:	Page Number
1. Introduction	2
2. General overview of approach to consultation	2
3. Inception stage	3
4. Initial plan development	4
5. Advanced plan development	4
6. Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation	9
Appendices:	
1 - January 2016 Letter to LSA residents	
2 - June 2016 Letter to LSA residents	
3 - June 2017 Letter to LSA stakeholders and businesses	
4 - List of statutory consultees contacted at pre-submission consultation	
5 - Comments received from statutory consultees and residents on the pre-submission neighbourhood plan	

1. Introduction

1.1 This consultation statement has been produced to accompany the submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan for the former Land Settlement Association’s Estate at Great Abington. The consultation statement is required under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) to include information on the following:

1. Details of the people and bodies who were consulted about the proposed NP
2. An explanation of how they were consulted
3. A summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the people consulted
4. A description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed NP.

1.2 The consultation activity undertaken for the NP can be broken down into four key stages as follows:

NP Stage	Time
Inception – NP working group established by the Parish Council	From November 2015 onwards
Initial plan development including evidence gathering and consultation	From June 2016 onwards
Advanced plan development	Autumn 2016 to March 2017. Four-week consultation ran 31 March to 14 April 2017
Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation	24 July to 18 September 2017

1.3 Sections 2 to 6 detail the activity which took place at each of these stages.

2. General overview of approach to consultation

2.1 There are approximately 199 residents in the NP area (Census 2011) and a total of 816 (ibid.) residents in the Great Abington parish in which the NP area is located. The area is often referred to as ‘The Abingtons’ which includes the neighbouring and smaller parish of Little Abington (which is home to a further 538 residents as at 2011 Census). Together, the Abingtons comprise a vibrant community with a primary school, village shop, pub, football and cricket teams and a large number of businesses, most of them located at Granta Park. At the heart of village, is the Village Institute which is the village hall or community centre used by the two communities of Great and Little Abington and situated on the High Street close to the Three Tuns pub, the village shop and the village school. The Institute is home to many clubs and activities and is considered to be a key hub of village life for Great and Little Abington

2.2 Due to the vibrancy of the existing community life, in particular, the hub created by the Village Institute, and due to the special nature of the Land Settlement area, effective community engagement with the residents of the NP area, the wider village and other stakeholders has been a straightforward process.

2.3 During key consultation stages, information has been distributed to residents and businesses in the NP area as well as to residents in the wider parish. Information has been distributed via

regular announcements published in the monthly Abingtons and Hildersham News which is available online at <http://www.theabingtons.org.uk/abingtons-and-hildersham-news/> but also distributed in paper format to all households in the parishes of Great Abington, Little Abington and Hildersham..

2.4 Full use has been made of the Village Institute. All neighbourhood plan consultation events have been held at the Institute and all NP working group meetings are held there. During consultation periods, information on the consultation has put on the display board in the Village Institute. A paper copy of the Abingtons and Hildersham News is also normally on display in the Village Institute

2.5 Information has also been posted onto the Abingtons' website in an area specifically for the neighbourhood plan at <http://www.theabingtons.org.uk/parish-councils/great-abington-parish-council/neighbourhood-plan/>

2.6 Throughout the process, the NP working group have maintained engagement with key statutory consultees including South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC), the Highways Agency, the County Council, Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency.

3. Inception stage – November 2015

3.1 Discussions around planning issues for the Land Settlement have been ongoing for some time. As early as May 2012, Great Abington Parish Council submitted a proposal to South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC) regarding a special planning policy for the former Land Settlement. At that time, it was hoped and anticipated that the issues contained within it would be addressed by the Local Plan.

3.2 As progress on the Local Plan was made and when the Local Plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 8 March 2014, it became clear that the Local Plan would not include a special planning policy for the Land Settlement.

3.3 Later, on 16 October 2015, at an open Parish Council meeting which was attended by approximately 60 residents (mainly from the LSA area), Great Abington Parish Council presented a proposal for a special planning policy area for the Land Settlement. (This meeting had been advertised in the Abingtons and Hildersham Village News and residents and businesses on the Land Settlement had been notified of the meeting directly via a letter sent to every address). In response to this, SCDC advised Great Abington Parish Council to achieve its aims through a Neighbourhood Plan and this was subject to further discussion at an open Parish Council meeting on 22 February 2016.

3.4 At the October 2015 meeting, the Parish Council asked for volunteers to form a Working Group. This request was repeated in local village media and a group of 7 village residents met for the first time as a Working Group in November 2015.

3.6 A letter communicating progress at this stage to residents on the Land Settlement was sent out on 19 January 2016. This is attached as Appendix 1.

4. Initial plan development

4.1 A Neighbourhood Area application was submitted to the SCDC on 31 May 2016. The Planning Portfolio Holder at SCDC subsequently designated the Great Abington Former Land Settlement Association's Estate Neighbourhood Area on 5 September 2016.

4.2 At the beginning of June 2016, a letter was sent to all residents of the LSA confirming the establishment of the Working Group and the names of those on the Working Group. Residents were also invited to complete a simple traffic questionnaire for the LSA. This letter can be viewed in Appendix 2 to this document.

4.3 On Saturday 2 April 2016 an event called 'The Abingtons Open Day' was held at the Village Institute. This was an all-day event for village clubs, groups and societies to promote their activities and draw attention to their work. The NP working group had a stall at this, very well attended event.

4.4 At the end of October 2016, The Abingtons had their regular 'Abington Green' event which showcased various village interest groups and local energy efficient companies. The Working Group had a stand at the event where information on the emerging NP was shared, discussed and disseminated.

4.5 Updates on the neighbourhood plan work was also communicated via articles in the monthly Abingtons and Hildersham News in July and September 2016.

5. Advanced plan development

5.1 To help inform the policies in the NP, the NP working group began work on a character assessment of the area in February 2017.

5.2 Progress on the draft character assessment and the draft NP was shared with the community in the NP area and the wider parish in March 2017 when a two-week consultation period took place on the two draft documents. A questionnaire was made available to help consultees provide feedback on the two documents.

5.3 The two-week consultation period on the draft plan was advertised to residents in the NP area and the wider parish via notices published in the monthly Abingtons and Hildersham News which was delivered to all households in the parish (as well as the neighbouring parishes of Little Abington and Hildersham)

http://www.theabingtons.org.uk/site/assets/files/1462/a_h_news_mar2017.pdf

The consultation period was launched with a late afternoon and evening drop-in consultation event held at the Village Institute on Friday 31 March 2017 from 2pm to 7pm. 150 copies each of the NP and the character assessment were printed for distribution at this event. In addition, the documents were uploaded to the website <http://www.theabingtons.org.uk/parish-councils/great-abington-parish-council/neighbourhood-plan/>.

5.4 A total of 51 people signed the attendance list provided at the event and 80% of these were from the NP area. A total of 36 written responses to the draft NP and the draft character assessment were received by the end of the consultation period.



Figure 1: Drop in event 31 March 2017



Figure 2: Drop in event 31 March 2017

A summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the people consulted

5.5 A summary of the results is set out below:

Table 1: summary of results to the March/April 2017 informal consultation on the draft plan and draft character assessment			
	Yes	No	%
Do you agree with the draft Aims and Objectives of the draft Neighbourhood Plan?	31	5	86/14
Do you agree with the general principles in the draft Neighbourhood Plan?	32	4	89/11
Do you agree with Policy 1.	32	3	91/9
Do you agree with Policy 2.	21	10	68/32
Do you agree with Policy 3.	34	1	97/3
Do you agree with Policy 4.	34	1	97/3
Are you a resident of the NP area?	28		78%
Are you a resident of the wider parish?	8		22%

5.6 A number of open comments were received on the draft plan. These were recorded in full and considered by the NP working group. The comments received are summarised in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Summary of the open comments received on the draft plan
Q1 - Do you agree with the draft Aims and Objectives?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree with broad aims - Will maintain character but enable some development - Could final aim include 'retain all mature trees and woodland'. - Build on a site other than the piggery x 8 - Chalky Rd greenhouses were at the back of the houses as road frontage shorter x 2 - Do not agree with the same pattern of properties close to the road x 2 - Retaining paddock land on some properties might be a problem x 2 - Second properties would be beyond the means of young/elderly - Good in parts but backward and not forward.
Q2 - Do you agree with the general principle?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, it is beautiful and these principles help to maintain - Horse riders with no connection have no right of way x 4 - Some flexibility to be had regarding principle 5¹, especially to allow for interesting eco designs x 2 - Include in Gt Abington or have its own council - Support live/work enterprise - Consider including in village framework 2 - There needs to be a variety of designs but with the basic roof angles x 2

¹ Principle 5 stated that all new housing should be inkeeping with existing housing stock

Table 2: Summary of the open comments received on the draft plan
Q3 - Do you agree with Policy 1.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Important to preserve the village atmosphere - It will help to maintain the character x 3 - Larger plots could have two extra properties rather than one x 3 - Should be allowed to build further back x 5 - Some existing properties are larger than 300 and should be the baseline - If the existing house is still small (150) could the new dwelling be 300 - Allows for reasonable size dwellings in character x 2 - Some plots do not have buildings well-spaced but have them grouped around piggery - Community should be allowed to develop its character and not look to the past
Q4 - Do you agree with Policy 2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good idea to restrict building to avoid overloading x 2 - Good to provide accommodation for family members x 2 - Does this mean three properties per holding? - Piggery is now stables, how do I build a small house to live in? - Restriction of 150 too small x 4 - Could additional dwelling be on site of glasshouses further back than piggery x 2 - Loss of amenity x 2 - Case where neighbouring property now owns the piggery x 2 - Loss of property value due to proximity of extra dwelling x 2 - Do not restrict to site of piggery x 6 - Allow more properties on larger sites x 4 - Suggested wording 'unless there are material considerations ...' - Query 'Lifetime homes' as reasonable - Mechanism needed re the Road Management - Query on comment about PD rights - Too much control, too insensitive to community requirements
Q5 - Do you agree with Policy 3.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peaceful setting and controlled traffic speed a positive x 2 - As the roads can't be changed traffic should not be allowed to increase unnecessarily. - Do not want to see another business park x 2 - Existing businesses already create traffic problems x 2
Q6 - Do you agree with Policy 4.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree only if it fits with Pol 3 - Concern about some forms of outdoor recreation (off-road motor bikes) - Existing businesses must be allowed to continue - May be unenforceable, has been breached at No 31 - Would not want to see large scale development of these uses due to roads x 2
Q7 - Do you have any other comment on the draft Neighbourhood Plan?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent plan. Well brought out and pleased it retains character x 4 - If agreed policy must be adhered to. - Inaccuracy, plot 12.6 acres and some less than 1 acre x 2 - Clarity needed on comment about buildings without planning permission - Abington Estate Management Limited and not other references - Clarification of 'agricultural and paddock land' needed - Backward looking document.
Q8 - Do you have any comment on the draft Character Assessment?

Table 2: Summary of the open comments received on the draft plan

- Brilliantly done, Captures it well, An excellent assessment x 3
- Agree poor land and better for controlled development x 2
- Good to keep style of existing buildings
- Accuracy needs checking
- Describe location of area differently
- Change comment on trees and hedges
- Use of terms 'small holding' and 'smallholding' confusing.
- Better description needed of glasshouse situation
- Description of verges and reasons for them
- Some houses have been demolished and rebuilt
- Abington Park Farm, not Top Farm
- Descriptions of major growers
- Check accuracy of Fig 32 and 33
- Other types of business will also increase traffic.

Key areas of concern raised at informal draft stage:

5.7 As can be seen from Table 1, the draft NP and the draft character assessment received broad support from the community. In addition, many constructive comments were also received regarding points of clarity, corrections and areas of concern.

5.8 A key area of concern received from consultees was the way in which draft Policy 2 restricted the development of the dwellings to the site of the original piggery. Responses were received (some of the below overlap):

- From six consultees specifically requesting that additional dwellings should not be restricted to the site of the original piggery.
- From four consultees requesting that those with larger plots should be able to develop more properties
- Two consultees requesting that the additional dwelling be allowed to be located on site of glass houses further back from piggery and a further five consultees requesting that additional dwellings could be located further back.

5.8 In total, (taking account of multiple comments from the same consultees) seven consultees raised objections to extent in which Policy 2 restricted the building of the additional dwelling to the site of the piggery.

5.9 SCDC were also invited to comment on the draft NP at this stage. Generally, SCDC were supportive of the draft NP and highlighted the following as areas for further work:

- A map would be helpful in order to provide clarity to decision makers with regards to the location of existing dwellings and existing piggery sites
- Querying the rationale for the floorspace figures
- Requesting further clarity regarding policy wording on a number of areas
- Questioning the compatibility of Policy 2 with adopted and emerging Local Plan policy in that Policy 2 restricts development proposals that would lead to the creation of additional residential dwellings other than those specifically allowed under Policy 2.

A description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed NP.

5.10 All the comments made on the March 2017 version of the plan were logged and considered by the NP working group during the meetings of the working group held on 20 April 2017, 22 May 2017 and 6 June 2017. The pre-submission version of both the plan and the character assessment was prepared in light of those comments.

5.11 Key changes made to the plan were:

- The provision of Maps 1 and 2 which shows the location of existing dwellings and piggery sites
- Provision of more flexibility in Policy 2 by allowing additional dwellings to be provided on *or adjacent* to site of the piggery
- Improvements in the policy wording to increase clarity in light of comments received from residents and SCDC.
- Improvements made to the Character Assessment in light of comments and further information received from residents within the Land Settlement area.

6. Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation

6.1 Pre-submission consultation was undertaken on the NP from 24 July to 18 September 2017 in line with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations.

Who was consulted and how were they consulted:

6.2 A letter was sent to all households and businesses located in the NP area notifying them of the formal consultation period. Other local businesses and those not resident on the LSA but owning land were also written to. Printed copies of the plan and the character assessments were widely distributed, and further copies made available on request. The documents were also uploaded on to the website at <http://www.theabingtons.org.uk/parish-councils/great-abington-parish-council/neighbourhood-plan/>

Consultees had the choice to respond by open letter, completing a form online using survey monkey or completing an interactive PDF which they could then email back to the group. Paper copies of the feedback form were also made available.

6.3 Residents in the wider parish were notified of the consultation via notices published in the July and August version of the Abington and Hildersham News which is available on line at <http://www.theabingtons.org.uk/abingtons-and-hildersham-news/> and delivered in paper format to all in the NP area as well as households in the wider Great Abington parish (as well as to those in the neighbouring parishes of Little Abington and Hildersham). All residents were invited to a drop-in consultation event on the Neighbourhood Plan on Friday 8 September from 2.30 until 7.30pm at Abington Village Institute.

6.4 A list of statutory consultees (listed in Appendix 4) were directly notified of the pre-submission consultation on the draft neighbourhood plan.

6.5 A copy of the pre-submission plan was sent to the offices at South Cambridgeshire District Council.

A summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the people consulted

6.6 Seven statutory consultees responded to the pre-submission consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan. A detailed consultation log is available to view in Table 1 in Appendix 5 to this report. The key issues were raised by SCDC and these are summarised below:

- Clarification of their support for the intentions of the NP to provide clear, consistent and transparent policies for the future development of the area.
- The draft NP meets the basic conditions required of neighbourhood plans with the exception of Policies 2 and 4 on the basis that they are not in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted LDF or emerging Local Plan.
- Support expressed to the findings of the independent health check undertaken by NPIERs of the plan and recommendation that those recommendations are given careful consideration.
- Objection to penultimate sentence in Policy 2 which stated *“that no additional dwellings requiring planning permission will be permitted in the NP area”* on the basis that this contradicted with Policy HG/8 (Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use); Policy HG/9 (Dwelling to Support a Rural Based Enterprise) which in principle would allow for other residential dwellings provided a set of criteria are met.
- Objection to the last sentence in Policy 2 which stated *“it is a condition of development that the owners of the new dwelling must be or become members of the Abington Estate Management Limited and accept liability for the charges and conditions associated with the new dwelling”* on the basis that such a condition could not legally be attached to a planning permission.
- With regards Policy 3, SCDC advise that it is not sufficiently clear how and by who a decision can be made on whether a development would lead to a substantial increase in traffic or result in a need for ‘significant’ road related development or large numbers of vehicle movement.
- Objection to Policy 4 on the basis that it was not in general conformity with strategic policies in LDF and emerging Local Plan.
- A series of further comments intended to provide constructive assistance to refine the neighbourhood plan.

6.7 Fifteen responses were received from residents and businesses in the NP area at the pre-submission consultation stage of the plan. A detailed consultation log is available to view in Table 2 in Appendix 5 to this report. The key issues are summarised below:

- Broad support from thirteen of the consultees for the plan
- Concern that 44a North Road is segregated unfairly from the rest of the LSA

- Concern that the maximum floorspace figures allowed under the plan are too restrictive
- Concern by one consultees of the anti-agricultural/pro-domestic base of the document
- Concern by 5 consultees that Policy 2 is still too restrictive in that it only allows the creation of an additional dwelling **on or adjacent** to the site of the original piggery

A description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed NP.

6.8 Between the pre-submission and submission stage, the neighbourhood plan was amended in light of consultation responses and further refined in order to improve the document. The key changes are summarised below:

Change	Why
Deletion of Policy 4	In light of issues raised in the NPIERS health check, the NP steering group did not consider the policy necessary and caused confusion by linking Policy 3 to non-residential proposals which had not been the intention of the policy. The key intention is that the NP area remains outside the Great Abington village development framework and this can be expressed in supporting text.
Commissioning of a transport assessment of the NP area in order to inform the policy wording and supporting text to Policy 3 in the plan	<p>To address concern raised by SCDC that it would be difficult for a development management officer to know when a proposal would trigger a substantial increase in traffic or result in a need for ‘significant’ road related development or large numbers of vehicle movement. SCDC suggested further work was undertaken in order to understand the capacity of the unadopted roads and any infrastructure requirements. This work informed the rewording of Policy 3 so that it now clarifies that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development proposals that would lead to significant traffic generation and damage residential amenity would not be supported • development proposals that would lead to traffic impacts that would then necessitate traffic mitigation measures which themselves would damage the character of the NP area would be refused • development proposals that would trigger the need for minor mitigation measures/road infrastructure such as an additional passing place would be supported subject to the mitigation measures being secured through the development proposal <p>This work led to the deletion of the last paragraph in Policy 2 which at pre-submission stage required the owner of new dwelling to accept liability for the charges raised by the Abington Estate Management Limited for purpose of maintaining the unadopted roads.</p>
Clarifying in the policy wording of Policy	In response to comments in the health check and from

Change	Why
2 the cases where the opportunity to develop a dwelling on or adjacent to the site of the piggery had already been exhausted through development undertaken to date.	SCDC.
Minor amendments throughout to improve policy wording and correct errors.	In light of advice and comments provided by SCDC, the health check report and by residents.
Rewording of the penultimate sentence in Policy 2 which stated <i>“that no additional dwellings requiring planning permission will be permitted in the NP area”</i>	In light of advice provided in the NPIERS health check and ongoing concerns expressed by SCDC officers Policy 2 still clarifies that additional residential proposals requiring planning permissions will be resisted although the wording has been reviewed. The supporting text has also been revisited.

6.9 Careful consideration was given to the objection raised by SCDC to the fact that Policy 2 did not allow for other additional residential uses coming forward (other than that allowed under the plan) in the NP area. According to SCDC, this would not be in broad conformity with adopted LDF policy and emerging Local Plan policy. The NP steering group however are very aware of the level of other non-residential development and buildings in the NP area. They are also aware of the residential uses that have in the last few years been permitted on former agricultural sites (not just the piggery sites) in the NP area although decision making in this area has been far from consistent. The NP steering group are keen to avoid unacceptable cumulative impacts (and this concern is also expressed in feedback from the wider community) and in order to ensure a consistent approach with regards to new residential development proposals, it is necessary to adopt an approach which resists other potential sources of additional residential dwellings in the NP area. The submission version of policy 2 therefore includes the wording: *“Other residential development proposals requiring planning permission that result in additional dwellings in the NP area (such as residential conversions and new rural dwellings) shall be resisted.”*

6.10 The health check examiner also looked carefully at Policy 2 and questioned the reasoning for it appearing to conflict with adopted strategic Local Plan policies HG/8 and HG/9. He notes in paragraph 23 of his report that it was following his visit to the area he could see there was clear evidence justifying *“an extremely cautious approach to a permissive regime for new agricultural dwellings”*.

GREAT ABINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Mrs. PM Harper

17 Lewis Crescent, Great Abington, Cambridge CB21 6AG

Telephone: 01223 892000

Email: harper802@btinternet.com

Resident of the former Land Settlement, Abington

19/01/2016

Dear Resident

As you will probably be aware Great Abington Parish Council has been actively working towards achieving a special planning status for the former Land Settlement area. A proposal was sent to South Cambs District Council in 2012, and the Parish Council have recently decided to update and resubmit it. The proposal was discussed at the well attended, special meeting of the Parish Council in October 2015 when a working group was set up to progress the matter. A copy of the updated proposal is attached to this letter.

Representatives of the working group met with officers of SCDC on Monday 11th January to explore the idea of putting in place either a Local Development Order (LDO) or a Neighbourhood Development Order (NDO). Each of these options will be explored by the SCDC officers to see which one is likely to best achieve the ambitions of our proposal. We were encouraged by this initiative and agreed that it should be progressed.

Great Abington Parish Council discussed this matter at the Parish Council meeting on Monday 18th January and agreed that the working party should continue to pursue this encouraging avenue on the Parish Council's behalf.

As soon as possible a timetable for achieving an order will be set out and circulated but as there are no existing LDOs or NDOs in South Cambridgeshire it is difficult to estimate of how long the process will take. Residents who are currently involved in making an application can choose whether they wait for this initiative to proceed or allow their case to be determined in the normal way. Officers at the planning department are happy to provide any further information.

Full consultation will take place as part of the process and we will also seek to keep you informed as matters progress.

Yours sincerely



Bernie Talbot
Chair
Great Abington Parish Council

GREAT ABINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Mrs. PM Harper

LSA Working Group

Dear LSA resident

As you will be aware the Parish Council is working with South Cambs District Council to develop a neighbourhood plan for the area defined as the LSA.

The designated area would cover all 62 houses on Pampisford, North, South and Chalky Roads as shown on the map attached.

The content of the plan will be based on the discussion document which was tabled at the Parish Council meeting on 16th October 2015, which many of you attended. At that meeting the Parish Council working group was formed and the following points explain the process the application now has to go through:

- An application has been submitted to SCDC planning team to start the process of developing a Neighbourhood plan.
- SCDC then have internal processes they need to undertake.
- Once they confirm that they are ready a 4 week consultation period takes place.
- SCDC will then make its decision on the principle of developing a neighbourhood plan.

Whilst this application process is in progress the Parish Council working group need to build a picture of the LSA, especially in relation to traffic movements and sustainability, as these are the main reasons planning permission has been refused in the past.

The information requested on the following form is essential to help build a clear picture of the LSA so please return it to one of the members of the working group by June 24th (see below).

Jeremy Zelinski, 34, South Road
Emma Stewart, 56, North Road
David Hefford, 6, Chalky Road
Bernie Talbot, 63 Mortlock Gardens

Alison Johnson, 23, South Road
Jane Bowen, 8, Chalky Road
Edward Garnish, 54 North Road

Thankyou in advance for your support.



Bernie Talbot
Chairman

Land Settlement Neighbourhood Plan traffic movement and sustainability survey per property.

Please include the return journeys for the residents of your property. A return journey is out and back.

House Number:	
---------------	--

Mode of transport	Number of return journeys with each mode of transport per week.
Motorised	
On foot	
Bicycle	

Please note the information will be collated and will not be shared on an individual basis, but will be aggregated to form an overall picture.

If you could return this information by June 24th it can be collated to support the next stage of the process.

Please return your form to any member of the working group

Jeremy Zelinski, 34, South Road
 Alison Johnson, 23, South Road
 Emma Stewart, 56, North Road
 Jane Bowen, 8, Chalky Road
 David Hefford, 6, Chalky Road
 Edward Garnish, 54 North Road
 Bernie Talbot, 63 Mortlock Gardens

Thankyou for your co-operation



Bernie Talbot
 Chairman

GREAT ABINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Mrs. PM Harper

LSA Working Group Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission consultation

Dear Business/Stakeholder Consultee

24/07/2017

As you will be aware the Parish Council is working to develop a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for the former LSA area. The NP area was designated in September 2016 and covers all 62 former LSA holdings on Pampisford, North, South and Chalky Roads.

The Parish Council Working Group drew up the first draft of the plan which was put out to consultation in March and April 2017. The responses received to that consultation have been carefully considered along with comments from South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC). The NP has now been redrafted taking the comments into consideration and a new version is available for you to consider.

This time, we are consulting as required by Regulation 14, Neighbourhood Planning Regulations². This is a key milestone in the production of the NP and, once again, we are inviting comment from residents, the wider community and other key stakeholders. Following this stage the plan will be submitted to (SCDC) for publication and independent examination.

The NP is being widely distributed within the NP area but is also available on to be viewed on <http://www.theabingtons.org.uk/parish-councils/great-abington-parish-council/neighbourhood-plan/> or you can request an emailed or printed copy from Bernie Talbot, 63 Mortlock Gardens - bernie.talbot@btinternet.com.

The consultation period will begin on July 24th and end on September 18th. There will be a consultation event on Friday 8th September from 2.30 until 7.30pm at Abington Village Institute when you can come along to share your thoughts and ask questions of members of the Working Group.

How to comment on the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan:

Comments on the plan can be made:

- Online from The Abingtons website through either an on line survey or an interactive pdf. If using the interactive pdf please save and email to bernie.talbot@btinternet.com.
- By post, by printing the pdf or collecting a form at the consultation event and returning it to Bernie Talbot, 63 Mortlock Gardens

Written responses which are not made via the feedback form will also be accepted. All responses must be received by **5pm on Monday 18 September 2017**. Please note that responses will, in due course, be made publicly available although personal details will not.

² The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)

Thankyou in advance for your support.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bernie Talbot', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Bernie Talbot
Chairman

Appendix 4 – list of statutory consultees contacted at pre-submission stage of the NP

Pre Submission Consultation on the Great Abington Neighbourhood Plan: Consultation Bodies		
Consultation Body under Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations		
	Relevant organisation	Individual
Local Planning Authority	SCDC	AlisonTalkington; Jenny Nuttycombe
County Council	Cambridgeshire County Council	Graham Hughes graham.hughes@cambridgeshire.gov.uk
Neighbouring Parish	Little Abingdon	Clerk - Genevieve Dalton littleabington@clara.co.uk
Neighbouring Parish	Pampisford	Clerk - Michelle Facer clerk@pampisford.org.uk
Neighbouring Parish	Hildersham	Clerk - Paula Harper harper802@btinternet.com
Neighbouring Parish	Great Chesterford	Clerk - Alan Cattley, clerk@chesterfords.info
Neighbouring Parish	Hinxton	Clerk - Anne Angell hinxtonpc@gmail.com
Neighbouring Parish	Babraham	Clerk - Samantha Bramley clerk@babraham-village.net
The Coal Authority		NA
Homes and Communities Agency		Dean Harris dean.harris@hca.gsi.gov.uk
Natural England	Natural England	Ross Holgate ross.holdgate@naturalengland.org.uk
Environment Agency	Environment Agency	Adam Ireland adam.ireland@environment-agency.gov.uk
Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission	Historic England	Greg Luton eastplanningpolicy@historicengland.org.uk
Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Network Rail	Mike Smith townplanningse@networkrail.co.uk
Highways Agency	Highways England	David Abbott david.abbott@highwaysengland.co.uk
Marine Management Organisation	Not applicable	NA
Any person i) to whom the electronic code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106 (3) (a) of the Communications Act 2003; and ii) who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority	Not applicable	NA
Where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A primary care trust established under section 18 of the NHS Act 2006 or continued existence by virtue of that section 	NHS England (Midlands & East) NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Clinical Commissioning Trust CamHealth - Local Commissioning	england.contactus@nhs.net capccg.communications@nhs.net capccg.camhealth@nhs.net

Appendix 4 – list of statutory consultees contacted at pre-submission stage of the NP

Pre Submission Consultation on the Great Abington Neighbourhood Plan: Consultation Bodies		
Consultation Body under Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations		
	Relevant organisation	Individual
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A person to whom a license has been granted under section 6 (1) (b) and (c) of the Electricity Act • A person to whom a license has been granted under section 1(2) of the Gas Act 1986 • A sewage undertaker • A water undertaker 	<p>Group UK Power Networks</p> <p>Transco National Grid</p> <p>Anglian Water Services Limited</p> <p>Cambridge Water</p>	<p>jim.whiteley@ukpowernetworks.co.uk</p> <p>jemima.matthews@nationalgrid.com</p> <p>Sue Bull planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk</p> <p>Phil Newland at South Staffs Water PIC philnewland@south-staffs-water.co.uk (Cambridge Water)</p>
Voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area	<p>Abington Village Institute</p> <p>Ramblers' Association [Cambridge Group]</p> <p>Cambridge Past Present and Future</p> <p>The Magog Trust</p> <p>British Horse Society (east of England regional manager)</p> <p>Abington and Hildersham News</p>	<p>Secretary Christine Talbot Christine810@btinternet.com</p> <p>Ms Jill Tuffnell jill.tuffnell@ntlworld.com</p> <p>sec@cambridgeppf.org</p> <p>administrator@magogtrust.org.uk</p> <p>j.pamment@bhs.org.uk</p> <p>news@theabingtons.org.uk</p>
Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area	<p>Cambridge Ethnic Community Forum</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Race Equality and Diversity Service</p>	<p>CecfEnquiries@cecf.co.uk</p> <p>creds@cambridgeshire.gov.uk</p>
Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area	<p>St Mary's Church Gt Abington</p> <p>Cambridgeshire Ecumenical Council</p>	<p>Church Warden - Tony Collett tony.collett@talktalk.net</p> <p>Mrs Priscilla Barlow priscilla.barlow@keme.co.uk</p>

Appendix 4 – list of statutory consultees contacted at pre-submission stage of the NP

Pre Submission Consultation on the Great Abington Neighbourhood Plan: Consultation Bodies		
Consultation Body under Schedule 1 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations		
	Relevant organisation	Individual
Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area	<p>All businesses with addresses in the NP area</p> <p>Abington Stores and Post Office</p> <p>Anagram, The Depot, Cutting Rd</p> <p>Senovo Ltd. 49 North Road</p> <p>Julie Barnes, 110 High Street</p> <p>Solopark, Station Road</p>	<p>Bob Sangha Bob.Sangha@live.co.uk</p> <p>Mark Bailey mark.bailey@anagram.biz</p> <p>info@senova.uk.com</p> <p>barnesgtab@gmail.com</p> <p>info@solopark.co.uk</p>
Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area	<p>Alzheimer's Research UK Granta Park</p> <p>Abington Forget-me-not club</p> <p>Disability Cambridgeshire</p> <p>Cambridge Forum of Disabled People</p> <p>Cambridge Dial-a-Ride</p>	<p>enquiries@alzheimersresearchuk.org</p> <p>Anne Hall anneandglyn@magna12.fsnet.co.uk</p> <p>info@disability-cambridgeshire.org.uk</p> <p>Mrs Geri Bird thecfdp@yahoo.co.uk</p> <p>camdar05@hotmail.co.uk</p>

Appendix 5 - Comments received from statutory consultees and residents on the pre-submission neighbourhood plan

Responses were received from seven statutory consultees and fifteen residents and business during the pre-submission consultation on the draft neighbourhood plan. The responses are detailed in Tables 1 and 2, alongside details of responses made by the NP working group.

Statutory Consultee	ID
Natural England	S1
The Environment Agency	S2
Anglian Water Services	S3
Sport England	S4
South Cambridgeshire District Council	S5
Historic England	S6
Highways Authority – Cambridgeshire County Council	S7

Residents & local businesses	ID
Andrew and Liz Pepperell – 38 South Road	R1
? (email address provided but unclear)	R2
Scott Rumble	R3
Julia Rumble	R4
Cristina Martinez Blaya	R5
Nick Rumble	R6
Survey Monkey 1	R7
Survey Monkey 2	R8
Survey Monkey 3	R9
Survey Monkey 4	R10
Alison Johnson	R11
Neil Griffiths	R12
Lizzie Paine	R13
Anne Jedrzejewski	R14
Mr and Mrs C.Harper, Great Abington & 36A South Road	B1

Appendix 5 - Table 1 – Statutory Consultees			
Policy No etc.	ID	Resident Comment	Comment/response
General			
	S1	Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Greater Abington former land Settlement Neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted
	S2	You will be aware that the Agency has previously responded to the local planning authority in respect of your Neighbourhood Plan and included a copy of our Planning Application Guidance (PAG) document. I have copied this document for your information which includes relevant guidance on drainage, including non mains options, and ground contamination investigations which may be necessary in view of the site location, above source protection zones and water abstraction points, and the historic usage which has potential for creating contamination. Subject to any subsequent planning proposal satisfying the above criteria the Agency would find your proposed Neighbourhood Plan acceptable.	Noted
	S3	<p>Anglian Water is the sewerage undertaker for Great Abington Parish. The views of Cambridge Water who are responsible for water services in the Parish should also be sought on the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policy 2 Additional dwellings and Policy 4 Other development in the Neighbourhood Plan area</p> <p>It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of policies which are intended to be used to determine application for residential and commercial development within the land settlement area as defined in the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Policy 2 refers to replacement dwellings with the intention being that the scale of residential development is limited (no more than 1 replacement dwelling).</p> <p>We would comment on any proposals for housing which include 10 or more dwellings or 0.5ha or more for employment proposals as part of the planning application process. In the case of employment development the scale of development is not specified.</p> <p>Therefore for the above reasons Anglian Water has no comments to make relating to the content of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	The NP group have sent the consultation to South Staffordshire Water who now own Cambridge Water. Previously sent to Affinity Water in error.
	S4	<p>A generic response providing guidance as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport England’s playing fields policy is set out in our Planning Policy Statement: ‘A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England’. http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy • Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/ <p>Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 74 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body</p>	Noted

Appendix 5 - Table 1 – Statutory Consultees			
Policy No etc.	ID	Resident Comment	Comment/response
		<p>time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport England’s guidance on assessing needs may help with such work. http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance • If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/ • Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place. <p>In line with the Government’s NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England’s Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p> <p>Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPPF Section 8: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities • PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing • Sport England’s Active Design Guidance: https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign <p>(Please note: this response relates to Sport England’s planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.</p>	
	S6	<p>Having had a chance to review the draft plan we do not consider that there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the development of the strategy for your area at this time. However in light of the heritage assets that are within and adjacent to the area, we consider that the conservation officer at South Cambridgeshire District Council is the best placed person to assist you in the development of your Neighbourhood Plan with regards to the historic environment.</p> <p>We welcome the Character Assessment provided alongside the plan, which will be a useful tool to aid the future management of development in the neighbourhood area. However, in light of the presence of the Scheduled Brent Ditch, you might also consider contacting the staff at Cambridgeshire County Council who look after the Historic Environment Record and give advice on archaeological matters. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk <http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk>). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as</p>	Brent Ditch is on the periphery of the NP area and would not be affected by any development.

Appendix 5 - Table 1 – Statutory Consultees			
Policy No etc.	ID	Resident Comment	Comment/response
		<p>the local Civic Society, local history groups, building preservation trusts, etc. in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Your local authority might also be able to provide you with more general support in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance is clear that where it is relevant, Neighbourhood Plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide planning decisions and to put broader strategic heritage policies from your local authority led local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. If appropriate this should include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions.</p> <p>A neighbourhood plan is also an opportunity to identify any potential Assets of Community Value and Local Green Spaces in the neighbourhood area. There is useful information on these processes on Locality's website here: http://mycommunity.org.uk/take-action/land-and-building-assets/assets-of-community-value-right-to-bid/ and here: https://mycommunity.org.uk/resources/neighbourhood-planning-local-green-spaces/.</p> <p>Further information and guidance on how heritage can best be incorporated into Neighbourhood Plans has been produced by Historic England. This signposts a number of other documents which the community might find useful in helping to identify what it is about the area which makes it distinctive and how they might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. This can be found at: http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/</p> <p>The following general guidance may also be useful to the plan forum in preparing the neighbourhood plan, or considering how best to develop a strategy for the conservation and management of heritage assets in the area:</p> <p>HE Advice Note 1 - conservation area designation, appraisal and management: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/conservation-area-designation-appraisal-management-advice-note-1/</p> <p>HE Advice Note 2 - making changes to heritage assets: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/making-changes-heritage-assets-advice-note-2/</p> <p>HE Advice Note 3 - site allocations in local plans: https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans</p> <p>HE Advice Note 7 - local listing: https://www.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/local-heritage-listing-advice-note-7</p>	
Assessment of the plan against the basic conditions			
	S5	<p>We are supportive of the intentions of the Great Abington Former LSA Estate Neighbourhood Plan to provide clear, consistent and transparent planning policies for the future development of the area.</p> <p>We have the following comments based on an assessment of the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan against the 'basic conditions':</p> <p>a. Has regard to national policies and advice</p> <p>We consider that the Neighbourhood Plan is consistent with national policies and advice in that the core land use planning principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) have been embodied in the Neighbourhood Plan. Specifically, the Neighbourhood Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> empowers local people to shape their surroundings through a succinct Neighbourhood Plan that sets out a positive vision for the future of the area (paragraph 17); seeks to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings (paragraph 17); 	

Appendix 5 - Table 1 – Statutory Consultees			
Policy No etc.	ID	Resident Comment	Comment/response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside whilst supporting the community within it (paragraph 17); contributes to conserving and enhancing the natural environment (paragraph 17); helps plan for a mix of housing based on demographic trends and the needs of different groups in the community (paragraph 50); promotes housing to enhance or maintain the vitality of the rural community (paragraph 55); sets out the quality of development that will be expected based on an understanding and evaluation of the defining characteristics within the area (paragraph 58); seeks to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment, including by protecting the landscape (paragraph 109); and provides a tool for local people to ensure they get the right types of development for their community (paragraph 184). <p><i>b. Contributes to the achievement of sustainable development</i></p> <p>We consider that the Neighbourhood Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development, specifically by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> enabling the delivery of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; seeking to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings; and contributing to the protection and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment of the former LSA estate. <p><i>c. General conformity with the strategic policies contained in the adopted Local Development Framework and emerging Local Plan</i></p> <p>We consider that Policies 1-3 of the Neighbourhood Plan are in general conformity with the strategic policies in the adopted LDF and emerging Local Plan. We do not consider that Policy 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the adopted LDF and emerging Local Plan.</p> <p><i>d. Does not breach and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations</i></p> <p>We consider that the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan does not breach and is compatible with EU Obligations.</p> <p><u>Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment:</u> a Strategic Environmental Assessment screening has been undertaken that determines that the Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to result in significant environmental impacts and therefore does not require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. A Habitat Regulations Assessment screening has also been undertaken that indicates that the Neighbourhood Plan is not predicted to have significant effects on any European site, either alone or in conjunction with other plans and projects.</p> <p><u>Human Rights:</u> we would recommend that an Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) is undertaken to examine the impact of the Neighbourhood Plan policies on persons who have a ‘protected characteristic’ and to provide evidence to demonstrate compliance with this basic condition. We consider that an EqIA is likely to conclude that the Neighbourhood Plan will have a neutral and / or positive impact on persons with a ‘protected characteristic’.</p> <p>Health Check by NPIERS</p> <p>We are supportive of the conclusions of the health check undertaken by Christopher Lockhart-Mummery QC, which has considered the pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan against the basic conditions we would recommend that his suggested amendments are given careful consideration. Our comments have been made having regard to the contents of the health check.</p>	

Appendix 5 - Table 1 – Statutory Consultees			
Policy No etc.	ID	Resident Comment	Comment/response
Contents Page			
	S5	Firstly, it would be useful if the contents page included a list of the policies included in the Neighbourhood Plan, and it might be clearer, given the limited number of policies in the plan, if paragraph 1.4 referred to all four policies.	Paragraph 1.4 refers to all three policies and the contents page now includes the policies.
Chapter 3			
	S5	<p>“...it would be worthwhile including additional wording in chapter 3 or in the ‘current situation’ section of chapter 4 in order to provide greater planning context for the proposals included in the Neighbourhood Plan. The following wording could be used alongside the existing paragraphs to provide a greater context for the policies set out in chapter 6:</p> <p><u>In planning terms, the former LSA estate is defined as being in the countryside as it is located outside of the village framework for Great Abington. Development outside of village frameworks is restricted to: that required for the functioning of a viable rural enterprise or tied to an agricultural use; the conversion of existing buildings for either residential or employment uses subject to specific eligibility criteria; outdoor recreation; and other uses that need to be located in the countryside.</u></p> <p><u>The Neighbourhood Plan should also be seen in the context of its location adjoining the village of Great Abington, which is categorised as a Group Village in the Core Strategy DPD and Local Plan. Policies for development within the village framework of Great Abington seek to limit development to a scale in keeping with this relatively small village.</u></p> <p><u>The former LSA estate at Great Abington lies in an area where there is normally a restraint on the level of development that is considered appropriate. The Neighbourhood Plan allows a greater scale and range of development than would normally be allowed in the countryside.</u></p>	This will be considered. The LSA is not in the open Countryside, however it is outside the village framework
Policy 1			
Comments relating to basic conditions	S5	<p><u>Policy 1 (Original Dwellings)</u></p> <p>Within the adopted LDF, Policies DP/2 (Design of New Development), HG/6 (Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside) and HG/7 (Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside) are considered by the Council to be strategic policies for the purposes of neighbourhood planning. Policy DP/2 seeks to deliver new developments of a high quality design that preserve and enhance the character of the local area, provide a sense of place and respond to the local context, and are appropriate in terms of scale, mass, form, siting, design, proportion, materials, texture and colour in relation to the surrounding area. Policies HG/6 and HG/7 seek to ensure that careful consideration is given to the impact of any new development in the countryside on the landscape and its surroundings, and also by including size restrictions these policies seek to prevent a gradual reduction of small and medium sized dwellings in the countryside. The proposed replacement policies in the emerging Local Plan, Policies HQ/1 (Design Principles), H/12 (Extensions to Dwellings in the Countryside) and H/13 (Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside) are also considered by the Council to be strategic policies for the purposes of neighbourhood planning. Emerging Policies H/12 and H/13 do not include specific size restrictions for either an extension or replacement dwelling.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan also includes Policy H/11 (Residential Space Standards for Market Housing) which is considered by the Council to be a strategic policy for the purposes of neighbourhood planning. The policy seeks to ensure the delivery of new dwellings that meet or exceed the nationally described space standards.</p> <p>Policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan is generally aligned with these policies in that it allows extensions to or the rebuilding of dwellings in the countryside, provided that specific criteria taking account of local circumstances are met. The maximum size thresholds included in</p>	Noted

Appendix 5 - Table 1 – Statutory Consultees			
Policy No etc.	ID	Resident Comment	Comment/response
		<p>the policy exceed the minimum sizes set out in Policy H/11.</p> <p>We consider that Policy 1 is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the adopted LDF and emerging Local Plan as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Neighbourhood Plan policy would support and uphold the general principle that the strategic policies are concerned with; the Neighbourhood Plan policy provides an additional level of detail and distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policies without undermining those policies; and there is a rationale for the approach taken in the Neighbourhood Plan and evidence to justify the approach. 	
Specific comments to provide constructive assistance.	S5	<p>Policy 1 (Original Dwellings)</p> <p>“.....to avoid any ambiguity, the policy wording should refer to ‘as at the 1983 baseline’ as well as original dwellings, in the same way as Policy 2. The policy wording should also refer to the maps that identify the original dwellings. The following wording could be used:</p> <p><i>Extensions to and rebuilding of original dwellings as at the 1983 baseline (identified on Maps 1 and 2) will be permitted provided the development does not result in a building that has a gross internal floor area exceeding 300 square metres.</i></p> <p><i>Replacement of original dwellings as at the 1983 baseline (identified on Maps 1 and 2) will be permitted providing the development does not exceed the gross internal floor area of the existing dwelling, or 300 square metres, whichever is the larger.</i></p> <p>Secondly, paragraphs 6.5 to 6.6 of the Neighbourhood Plan provide some evidence for the chosen maximum size, but also highlight that the proposed maximum size is significantly more than the nationally described minimum space standard for a 6 bedroom dwelling. To provide justification for your chosen approach, to make it clear that you have considered the impact of your policy on the character of the area, and to demonstrate that the policy meets your aims and objectives, we suggest that your Neighbourhood Plan is supported by a short evidence base document that provides consideration of information on dwelling sizes and the possible impacts of different sizes on the character of the area. A summary of this evidence that supports the approach in the policy should then be included in the Neighbourhood Plan in these paragraphs. In Appendix A of this response, we have provided some sources of information and data that you could use.</p> <p>Thirdly, paragraph 6.6 states that the maximum gross internal floorspace for the original dwelling excludes basements, buildings such as garages or any other buildings ancillary to the dwelling but separate to the dwelling. This leaves it open for applicants to apply for large garages, and potentially other large ancillary buildings, that could cumulatively with the original dwelling and an additional dwelling, change the character of the area by ‘urbanising’ the street scene. Therefore, you may wish to consider including a maximum size for any new outbuildings, or additional wording in the policy or supporting text setting out design principles for any ancillary buildings. Additionally, is there a reason why the supporting text to Policy 2 does not include the same wording as Policy 1 has in paragraph 6.6 explaining that the maximum gross internal floorspace does not include basements and ancillary buildings? Finally, is there a reason why a replacement dwelling under this policy is not required to be suitable for independent living and built to the accessible and adaptable dwellings (M4(2)) standard, which is requirement for new dwellings under Policy 2?</p>	<p>Information on the baseline has been inserted.</p> <p>The criteria relating to maximum gross internal floor area threshold has been moved to the end of the policy.</p> <p>An evidence base document on dwelling sizes has been prepared to support the plan. Information has been inserted into the supporting text. A generic requirement in the policy regarding garages has been included.</p> <p>Supporting text to Policy 2 now specifies that floorspace figures do not include garages.</p>
Policy 2			
Comments relate to basic conditions	S5	<p>Policy 2 (Additional Dwellings)</p> <p>Within the adopted LDF, Policies DP/2 (Design of New Development) and DP/7 (Development Frameworks) are considered by the</p>	

Appendix 5 - Table 1 – Statutory Consultees			
Policy No etc.	ID	Resident Comment	Comment/response
		<p>Council to be strategic policies for the purposes of neighbourhood planning. Policy DP/2 seeks to deliver new developments of a high quality design that preserve and enhance the character of the local area, provide a sense of place and respond to the local context, and are appropriate in terms of scale, mass, form, siting, design, proportion, materials, texture and colour in relation to the surrounding area. Policy DP/7 seeks to prevent the development of additional dwellings in the countryside, except where they can be permitted by Policies HG/8 (Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use) and HG/9 (Dwelling to Support a Rural Based Enterprise). The proposed replacement policies in the emerging Local Plan, Policies HQ/1 (Design Principles) and S/7 (Development Frameworks) are also considered by the Council to be strategic policies for the purposes of neighbourhood planning. A modification has been proposed to Policy S/7 to enable development to be permitted outside of development frameworks if it has been allocated within a made Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan also includes Policies H/8 (Housing Mix) and H/11 (Residential Space Standards for Market Housing) which are considered by the Council to be strategic policies for the purposes of neighbourhood planning. These policies seek to secure 5% of homes on developments of 20 dwellings or more built to the accessible and adaptable homes standard and require that new dwellings meet or exceed the nationally described space standards.</p> <p>Policy 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan departs from the approach set out in Policy DP/7 because it takes a more flexible approach to the provision of new dwellings in the countryside. However, the policy is generally aligned with Policy S/7 (as proposed to be modified), as although the Neighbourhood Plan does not specifically allocate a site for housing, the Neighbourhood Plan creates a special policy area for the former LSA estate that is akin to an allocation.</p> <p>However, we have concerns relating to the final two sentences in the policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“No other additional dwellings requiring planning permission will be permitted in the NP area.”</i> We do not consider that this statement is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the adopted LDF and emerging Local Plan, such as Policies HG/8 (Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use) and HG/9 (Dwelling to Support a Rural Based Enterprise), and replacement policies H/16 (Reuse of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use) and H/18 (Dwellings to Support a Rural Based Enterprise), which would allow additional dwellings within the former LSA estate provided that specific criteria are met. • <i>“It is a condition of development that the owner(s) of the new dwelling must be or become members of the Abington Estate Management Limited and accept liability for the charges and conditions associated with the new dwelling.”</i> We do not consider that this could legally be attached to a planning permission as a condition; instead this would need to be secured through an alternative legal process. <p>With the removal of the final two sentences in the policy, we consider that Policy 2 is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the adopted LDF and emerging Local Plan as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Neighbourhood Plan policy would support and uphold the general principle that the strategic policies are concerned with; • the Neighbourhood Plan policy provides an additional level of detail and distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policies without undermining those policies; and • there is a rationale for the approach taken in the Neighbourhood Plan and evidence to justify the approach. 	<p>The supporting text justifying the approach taken in the plan has been strengthened. The policy wording has also been amended.</p>
Specific comments to provide constructive	S5	<p>Policy 2 (Additional Dwellings)</p> <p>Firstly, to avoid any ambiguity, the policy wording should refer to ‘as at the 1983 baseline’ as well as original dwellings, and should also refer to the maps that identify the general locations for the additional dwellings. The following wording could be used:</p> <p><i>The development of one additional dwelling on, or adjacent to, the site of each original piggery as at the 1983 baseline</i></p>	<p>The policy now refers to ‘as at the 1983 baseline’</p>

Appendix 5 - Table 1 – Statutory Consultees			
Policy No etc.	ID	Resident Comment	Comment/response
assistance.		<p><u>(identified on Maps 1 and 2)</u> will be permitted provided that: ...</p> <p>Secondly, decisions on planning applications will largely be made based on the wording in the policies. The supporting text provides the justification and explanation. We suggest that the information contained in the notes on the maps is included in the policy wording. The following wording could be inserted into Policy 2, after bullet point 11:</p> <p><u>Where a piggery has already been converted to or replaced by an annex (as identified on Maps 1 and 2) or dwelling (as identified on Maps 1 and 2), the opportunity to develop an additional dwelling under this policy on that plot has already been taken. However, proposals to extend or replace the annex or dwelling, or that seek to remove any occupancy restrictions on these existing dwellings or annexes will be considered against the requirements of this policy.</u></p> <p>We would also suggest that supporting text paragraph 6.14 should be expanded to provide a more detailed explanation of what the policy intends in relation to annexes, and possibly also existing additional dwellings if the intention is that the policy would allow these to be extended up to a maximum of 175 sqm gross internal floor area.</p> <p>Thirdly, should the policy set out that the piggery must either be incorporated into the proposed additional dwelling through its refurbishment or redevelopment, or must be demolished if the proposed additional dwelling is located elsewhere, and that this will be required through a condition on all planning permissions allowed under this policy? This would provide clarity and ensure that the piggery building is not used for an alternative use at a later date.</p> <p>Fourthly, paragraph 6.12 of the Neighbourhood Plan provides some evidence for the chosen maximum size, but also highlights that it is not considered appropriate to allow large extensive dwellings as to do so would distort the existing character of the former LSA estate, that these smaller dwellings would help maintain a housing mix, and that these dwellings would be ideal for older residents and young people wishing to stay in the area</p> <p>We would like to highlight that if all the additional dwellings are permitted at the maximum size of 175 sqm, that this may not deliver smaller dwellings and cumulatively could have an adverse impact on the openness of the landscape in this area. This would be in conflict with the intentions of the policy and also your aims and objectives. Again, to provide justification for your chosen approach and to make it clear that you have considered the impact of your policy on the character of the area, we suggest that your Neighbourhood Plan is supported by a short evidence base document that provides consideration of information on dwelling sizes and the possible impacts of different sizes on the character of the area. A summary of this evidence that supports the approach in the policy should then be included in the Neighbourhood Plan in this paragraph. In Appendix A of this response, we have provided some sources of information and data that you could use.</p> <p>Fifthly, if a single storey dwelling is proposed, which may be attractive to older residents, this may have a greater impact on the space between the dwellings than a two storey dwelling. You might want to consider including additional wording in the policy or supporting text setting out design principles for any single storey dwellings.</p> <p>Finally, to provide more clarity and certainty to applicants and planning officers, we would suggest that either Abington Estate Management Limited (who have responsibility for the roads within the former LSA estate) or the Parish Council (who have responsibility for the Neighbourhood Plan) commission a proportionate transport assessment to consider the highways and transport implications of the additional dwellings that could be allowed by this policy. This assessment should also consider what, if any, mitigation measures are required to either the adopted public highway or un-adopted roads, and the mechanism(s) to secure the delivery of these mitigation measures. This assessment should then be used to inform the policies and supporting text included in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Policy has been amended.</p> <p>Policy has been amended to clarify this.</p> <p>NP is now supported by an evidence base document on dwelling sizes. This shows that already over half of the existing dwellings in the NP area exceed a floor area of 175 sqm. It is therefore considered overly restrictive to limit the size of the piggery below this threshold. The supporting text to the policy provides more information on the rationale for 175 sq m size threshold.</p> <p>A transport statement has now been produced which concludes the impact of the additional dwellings is acceptable.</p>
Policy 3			

Appendix 5 - Table 1 – Statutory Consultees			
Policy No etc.	ID	Resident Comment	Comment/response
These comments relate to basic conditions.	S5	<p><i>Policy 3 (Road usage limitation in the Neighbourhood Plan area)</i></p> <p>Within the adopted LDF, Policies TR/1 (Planning for More Sustainable Travel) and TR/3 (Mitigating Travel Impact) are considered by the Council to be strategic policies for the purposes of neighbourhood planning. These policies seek to locate developments where there are opportunities for using sustainable forms of transport, to mitigate any travel impacts of new developments, and to prevent developments that will give rise to a material increase in travel demands.</p> <p>The proposed replacement policy in the emerging Local Plan, Policy TI/2 (Planning for Sustainable Travel) is considered by the Council to be a strategic policy for the purposes of neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>Policy 3 of the Neighbourhood Plan is generally aligned with these policies in that it seeks to prevent developments that would result in significant travel and highways impacts.</p> <p>We consider that Policy 3 is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the adopted LDF and emerging Local Plan as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Neighbourhood Plan policy would support and uphold the general principle that the strategic policies are concerned with; • the Neighbourhood Plan policy provides an additional level of detail and distinct local approach to that set out in the strategic policies without undermining those policies; and • there is a rationale for the approach taken in the Neighbourhood Plan and evidence to justify the approach. 	Noted
Specific comments to provide constructive assistance.	S5	<p>Policy 3 (Road usage limitation in the Neighbourhood Plan area)</p> <p>We understand that Policy 3 (and its supporting text) is intended to be used when considering proposals for business uses. We have concerns that this policy does not make it clear how and by who a decision will be made on whether development would result in a ‘substantial’ increase in traffic, the need for ‘significant’ road related development, or ‘large’ numbers of vehicle movements.</p> <p>If it is anticipated that the planning officer will make the decision on what is ‘substantial’, ‘significant’ or ‘large’ when considering a planning application, they will need additional guidance included in this policy of the Neighbourhood Plan to understand your intentions and enable them to make that decision. We suggest that you include definitions and/or criteria in the policy that would provide this additional guidance, in a similar way to Policy TI/2 (Planning for Sustainable Travel) of the emerging Local Plan which includes definitions of ‘larger developments’ and ‘developments with significant transport implications’.</p>	<p>Ok key importance is that decision makers take into consideration the limited capacity of the existing single tracked unadopted roads on the estate. The policy now clarifies this.</p> <p>The policy wording has also been revised to provide added clarity to the decision maker. See</p> <p>The transport statement supporting the plan advises that in terms of what constitutes a substantial increase in traffic, the severity of impact has been defined as the point at which the increase in journey time delay becomes</p>

Appendix 5 - Table 1 – Statutory Consultees			
Policy No etc.	ID	Resident Comment	Comment/response
			<p>unpredictable as the performance of nearby junctions changes to an extent that it does not match the expectations of the road users.</p> <p>The supporting paragraphs to the policy have been reviewed to provide additional guidance in this regard</p>
	S7	<p>The Highway Authority have concerns regarding Policy 3 (and its supporting text) in that it is not clear how and by who a decision will be made on whether development would result in a 'substantial' increase in traffic, the need for 'significant' road related development, or 'large' numbers of vehicle movements.</p> <p>Given that the majority of the roads within the former LSA estate are un-adopted, the Local Highways Authority would only provide comments to planning officers in relation to the transport implications, including visibility splays, at the junctions with the adopted highway. If specifically asked, Local Highways Authority officers will comment on other highways implications but only in their capacity as professional engineers, not as the local highway authority.</p> <p>To provide more clarity and certainty to applicants and planning officers, the Highway Authority would suggest that either Abington Estate Management Limited (that have responsibility for the un-adopted roads within the former LSA estate) or the Parish Council (that have responsibility for the Neighbourhood Plan) commission a transport assessment to consider the transport implications of the worst case scenario in terms of the number (and locations) of the additional dwellings that could be built on the former LSA estate under the terms of the policies included in the Neighbourhood Plan. This transport assessment should then be submitted to the Local Highways Authority, who will review the document and determine if, when and what transport improvements would be required should all the additional dwellings be built.</p> <p>From this additional work, Abington Estate Management Limited can work out what contributions they would need to accrue from any new dwellings (or if considered necessary all dwellings) within the former LSA estate to pay for any improvement works and the neighbourhood planning group can use the information to inform Policy 3 and its supporting text, and any other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan</p>	See above
Policy 4			
These comments relate to basic	S5	<p><i>Policy 4 (Other development in the Neighbourhood Plan area)</i></p> <p>We have concerns regarding Policy 4 (and its supporting text) and the implications that district wide policies will not apply and will be overridden in this neighbourhood area. The adopted LDF and emerging Local Plan policies that the Neighbourhood Plan is proposing will</p>	

Appendix 5 - Table 1 – Statutory Consultees			
Policy No etc.	ID	Resident Comment	Comment/response
conditions.		<p>not apply have been identified as strategic policies. It is not appropriate or necessary to include Policy 4 and its supporting text in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We therefore do not consider that Policy 4 is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the adopted LDF and emerging Local Plan as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Neighbourhood Plan policy does not support and uphold the general principle that the strategic policies are concerned with; • there would be conflict between the Neighbourhood Plan policy and the strategic policies; and • there is not a rationale for the approach taken in the Neighbourhood Plan and there is no evidence to justify the approach. 	
Specific comments to provide constructive assistance.	S5	<p>Policy 4 (Other development in the Neighbourhood Plan area)</p> <p>As set out above, it is not appropriate or necessary to include Policy 4 and its supporting text in the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the Neighbourhood Plan could include additional wording in paragraph 1.2 to make clear that development proposals in the neighbourhood area that are not subject to the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan will continue to be strictly controlled by national and local planning policy. The following wording could be used:</p> <p><i>1.2 The intention of the neighbourhood plan is to clarify and regularise the development which is permitted on the Land Settlement so that there are clear, consistent and transparent policies to control development. <u>Development proposals in the neighbourhood area that are not subject to the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan will continue to be strictly controlled by national planning policy, and policies in the adopted LDF and emerging Local Plan.</u></i></p>	Policy 4 has been deleted and replaced by supporting text. The overall quantity of development in the NP needs to managed. The last sentence in Policy 2 therefore continues to resist additional residential development proposals in the NP area.

Appendix 5: Table 2 comments received from residents and businesses during pre-submission consultation			
Policy no etc.	ID	Resident Comment	NP steering group response
Aims and Objectives - "Do you agree with Aims and Objectives?"			
	R1	Yes	
	R2	Yes	
	R3	Yes	
	R4	Yes	
	R5	Yes	
	R6	Yes	
	R7	Yes	
	R8	Yes	
	R9	Yes	
	R10	Yes	
	R11	Yes	
	R12	No. I am not sure why the former LSA should be any different to any other area. The current building line on the former playing field (on 44a North Road) has its building line adjacent to the road and not set back like the rest of the estate. For this reason I object as I feel it is unfair to be segregated in this way.	There is no intention to make any resident on the former LSA to feel segregated. The purpose of the plan is to remove the uncertainty that arises in relation to development proposals concerning redundant agricultural buildings on the LSA. This does not apply to 44a as it is not an original house.
	R13	Yes. I would, however emphasize that the aspiration for high quality should not obstruct the approach for affordability.	The group noted this
General Principles - "Do you agree with general principles?"			
	R1	Yes	
	R2	Yes	
	R3	Yes	
	R4	Yes	
	R5	Yes	
	R6	Yes	

Appendix 5: Table 2 comments received from residents and businesses during pre-submission consultation			
Policy no etc.	ID	Resident Comment	NP steering group response
	R7	Yes	
	R8	Yes	
	R9	Yes	
	R10	Yes	
	R11	Yes	
	R12	No	
	R13	I fully support the criteria 1, 3-6. In respect of criteria 2, the requirements should acknowledge that modular built units are acceptable due to their sustainable nature and energy saving qualities and its affordability.	Noted
Policy 1			
	R14	<p>We note that under Policy 1: Original dwellings (including those that have been rebuilt) requirement 6 is that the height of the original dwelling is not exceeded for extensions or re-building. Historically this has not been the case, although it was a requirement for our recent extension. Many extended or replaced dwellings on the former LSA therefore already exceed this original height.</p> <p>The knock-on effect of this perpetuates the inequity and discrimination as Policy 2: additional buildings requirement 6 is that the additional building does not exceed the height of the PRINCIPAL dwelling with which it is associated. This means that those properties that have already benefitted from the previous lax rules and have taller properties, will gain a further advantage of a taller additional dwelling.</p> <p>This is a crucial point because the the original properties effectively have the upper floor WITHIN the roof space, which radically reduces the usable first floor area, and produces restrictions on the use of this floor as there are few full height walls, and there is also virtually no loft storage. Any future piggery development will suffer the same problems, which will mean the building of dormers to help ease and redress some of the issues, resulting in a higher build cost still for less usable area, than would be the case for a "normal" 2 storey house.</p> <p>Those with taller principal houses will not suffer from this, and this discrimination against the "standard" original building owners/for the taller original building could be corrected by requiring that the additional building does not exceed the height of the ORIGINAL (1983 baseline) building instead of the PRINCIPAL building. That would be fair to all, and that way all additional dwellings would conform, maintain and enhance the character of the former LSA, and all owners would be treated equally in terms of the piggery development.</p> <p>Alternatively, but less satisfactory, instead of using a 175 sq m floor area restriction, a VOLUME limit could be imposed , although we accept that this would be difficult to assess and police.</p> <p>We would like to know how the height of the new dwelling is to be determined? Is it external height relative to the original</p>	<p>With regards to the roof height the previous planning may have allowed for increased height. The NP seeks to ensure that the existing height is not exceeded and a line has to be taken from somewhere</p> <p>Planners ask for sq m rather than volume so this has been used for the NP</p>

Appendix 5: Table 2 comments received from residents and businesses during pre-submission consultation			
Policy no etc.	ID	Resident Comment	NP steering group response
		building, or from ground level? In some instances the ground level is not the same as the original building, and also of course it would be possible to reduce the ground level at the piggery site by excavation to effectively gain a full 2 storey building. In this context Policy 2 6.12 states that the figure of 175 sq m allows for a dwelling to be built on the footprint with a second floor and "a little bit of leverage	
Policy 1 - "Do you agree with Policy 1?"			
	R1	Yes	
	R2	Yes	
	R3	Yes	
	R4	Yes	
	R5	Yes	
	R6	Yes	
	R7	Yes	
	R8	Yes	
	R9	Yes	
	R10	Yes	
	R11	Yes	
	R12	No	
	R13	Again, the criteria are supported subject to the comments made in relation to Policy 1.	Noted
Policy 2			
	R14	We note that under Policy 2: Additional dwellings it is stated that it is a condition of development that the owner(s) of the new dwelling must be, or become, members of the Abington Estate Management Ltd (AEM Ltd) and accept liability for the charges and conditions associated with the new dwelling. AEM Ltd is set up specifically to manage the roads, and pays for the maintenance of such roads. This implies that we would become liable for a share of any charges. Given that the 3 properties on Pampisford Road have no direct access on, nor use of , the unadopted roads (with perhaps the slight exception of no 1 which opens to the top of Cutting Road), it would seem we would be expected to pay for roads we do not use. We are on council maintained Pampisford Road so this does not seem equitable. Therefore we would suggest that Nos 1, 2, and 3 Pampisford Road be exempt from this stipulation.	This applies to No 2 and 3 as No 1 exits onto Cutting Road. The LSA is being taken as a whole and the policies apply to the whole of the designated area.
	R14	See under Policy 1 comment.	Noted
	B1	We refer to policy 2 & 3: Policy 3 states: any development that will result in a substantial increase in traffic will not be permitted. Para. 6.24 states: Any development that would individually or cumulatively lead to a substantial increase in traffic will not be appropriate. 'Policy 3 will apply to <u>all</u> proposals requiring permission in the NP area, not just the residential proposals.' However policy 4	The contradiction in Policy 4 was not deliberate and this is now addressed since this policy has been deleted due to

Appendix 5: Table 2 comments received from residents and businesses during pre-submission consultation			
Policy no etc.	ID	Resident Comment	NP steering group response
		<p>states that all residential proposals requiring permission will be assessed against policy 1 & 2 of this plan. Any non-residential proposals eg agricultural uses, that need to be located in the countryside will be assessed against the local plan and policy 3 of this plan.</p> <p>While this is contradictory, either deliberately or accidentally, our point is that this plan seeks to allow and encourage over 60 new dwellings in NP area which must lead to a substantial increase in traffic which policy 3 will not permit, if as paragraph 6.24 states all proposals will be assessed. However if it is the case, that as policy 4 states that only non-residential proposals will be assessed against policy 3, we must object to the anti-agricultural/pro-domestic bias of this document and request that both agricultural and domestic proposals either be assessed against the same criteria (policy) or that non-domestic/agricultural proposals be assessed solely against the local plan.</p> <p>We refer to paragraph 6.21. Policy 2 of this plan (under item 11), ‘No other additional dwelling requiring planning permission will be permitted in the NP area’, this seeks to override policy DP/7 Development Framework and ignores the requirements of those businesses mentioned in policy DP/7. It is vital that such businesses be allowed to apply for permission, through the proper channel, to provide staff accommodation in order to attract and retain key workers. While it is accepted that this plan will increase the total stock of housing in the immediate area, it would be unrealistic to expect that the purchase of either the new or the original dwellings would be affordable to agricultural workers.</p> <p>It is important to remember that the whole aim of this land settlement association estate was to allow younger people or those from non-farming backgrounds to gain experience and build horticultural/agricultural businesses. Indeed whist the total number of businesses has declined, the and total area under intensive cultivation has remained static (my figures), since the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s.</p> <p>This proposal is generally anti-business and pro-domestic development. This plan proposes to allow doubling of the number of domestic properties with all the attendant traffic movements and without any controls or improvements to the infrastructure. This would appear to be ‘a substantial increase in the traffic’ that is allowed. However a business requiring ‘large numbers of vehicle movements’ (unspecified) will not be permitted.</p>	<p>it being superfluous.</p> <p>The maximum number of additional homes that could come forward under Policy 2 is less than 60.</p> <p>The original purpose of the LSA was lost a long time ago when it closed as a going concern.</p> <p>The area is now domestic in nature and the NP seeks to reflect the current feel of the area.</p> <p>The NP seeks to support the existing local businesses and has not been written with an anti-business sentiment.</p> <p>The NP plan is dealing with the domestic side and decisions about businesses and non-domestic applications will be decided by SCDC under the normal planning policies</p>
Policy 2 - “Do you agree with Policy 2?”			
	R1	<p>No.</p> <p>We do not agree to a uniform general principle of development on, or adjacent to the site of the original piggery. Specifically see Retaining Character of Rationale and Intent for Policy 2. 6.10 “Restricting the development to the site of the piggery will help to maintain the pattern of building on the land settlement, comprising a house with outbuildings surrounded by open land”. The location of our piggery is next to our eastern boundary and cannot realistically be developed in or adjacent to its location and would not maintain the open character as required by the policy. Our is the only piggery on South Road without land around its piggery. Inspection of the map shows how our buildings are clustered in the eastern corner of the plot. As the policy makes allowance for 2 non-existing piggeries, we believe provision should be made to locate a new dwelling in the very large gap between the houses at 38 and 37.</p>	<p>A principal aim of the NP is to keep the historic pattern of building on the land settlement comprising a house with outbuildings surrounded by open land separating each holding.</p> <p>Policy 2 therefore only allows for new dwelling on or</p>

Appendix 5: Table 2 comments received from residents and businesses during pre-submission consultation			
Policy no etc.	ID	Resident Comment	NP steering group response
			adjacent to the site of the piggery.
	R2	Yes	
	R3	Yes. I would like the ability to build in another area, the other side of the main house the same distance as the piggery.	See answer to policy 2 R1
	R4	Yes. I agree with all of the proposals but for the good of our horticultural business, the other side of the house, same distance, would be preferable.	See answer to policy 2 R1
	R5	Yes. Being able to build the other side of the house would be preferred, due to closeness of barn and stables.	See answer to policy 2 R1
	R6	Yes. Option to build in other location as piggery is in use for essential business purposes and is very close to stables and barn.	See answer to policy 2 R1
	R7	Yes	
	R8	Yes	
	R9	Yes	
	R10	Yes	
	R11	Yes	
	R12	No	
	R13	I fully support this policy proposal	noted
Policy 3 - "Do you agree with Policy 3?"			
	R1	Yes	
	R2	Yes	
	R3	Yes	
	R4	Yes	
	R5	Yes	
	R6	Yes	
	R7	Yes	
	R8	Yes	
	R9	Yes	
	R10	Yes	
	R11	Yes	
	R12	No	

Appendix 5: Table 2 comments received from residents and businesses during pre-submission consultation			
Policy no etc.	ID	Resident Comment	NP steering group response
	R13	I fully support this policy proposal	noted
Policy 4 - "Do you agree with Policy 4?"			
	R1	No. "because of our comments on Policy 2".	noted
	R2	Yes	
	R3	Yes	
	R4	Yes	
	R5	Yes	
	R6	Yes	
	R7	Yes	
	R8	Yes	
	R9	Yes	
	R10	Yes	
	R11	Yes	
	R12	No	
Do you have any other comments on the Neighbourhood Plan?			
	R2	Good Plan	Noted
	R7	I fully support the plan.	Noted
	R8	There is no mention in the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) of the proposed North Uttlesford Garden Community (NUGC) immediately to the south of the boundary. This will have an impact on the character of the Land Association at Great Abington. There are proposals to provide a northern link road from the proposed NUGC to the A11 and the roundabout at Granta Park (using the old A11 alignment) which will run parallel with the NP area. The potential highway impact from this new road will be significant to the area and needs to be referenced to in the NP.	The NUGC is not certain to go ahead and the NP cannot wait for the decision to be made on this. This is outside our control.
	R9	The only change I would suggest is that with regard to policy 2 the additional building be restricted to 120 square metres in area.	Noted, the sizes in the NP are maximum sizes and smaller units can be built.
	R10	I thought that it was a comprehensive and well thought through proposal. It is both fair and reasonable to all residents.	Noted
	R13	The neighbourhood character assessment does not identify the existence of, or appropriation of, modular constraints of both stand-alone residential units or extension to existing properties. This should be acknowledged as acceptable within the ambit of the proposed Policies 1 & 2 - please see the below box.	See previous comment regarding modular buildings
Character Assessment - Do you have any comment on the character assessment?.			

Appendix 5: Table 2 comments received from residents and businesses during pre-submission consultation			
Policy no etc.	ID	Resident Comment	NP steering group response
	R2	Excellent	
	R13	The neighbourhood character assessment does not identify the existence of, or appropriation of, modular constraints of both stand-alone residential units or extension to existing properties. This should be acknowledged as acceptable within the ambit of the proposed Policies 1 & 2. I would particularly urge that acknowledgment of this style of construction - single storey modular building is acceptable where a second residential unit is located in place of the former pigsty	See previous comment regarding modular buildings
Map			
	R14	Map 1: Neighbourhood area EAST is incorrect in relation to our property, 2 Pampisford Road. The green dot showing the site of the piggery is in fact our dwelling, and the red dot shown as our house is actually the piggery. They need to be swapped over to avoid any possible issues with any future planning proposal if we wish to develop the piggery.	Noted and has been amended.