

Chapter 3: Strategic Sites

Paragraphs 3.1 – 3.3: Introductory Paragraphs	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 9 Support: 3 Object: 6
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Co-location of services is best / most cost-effective way to deliver community services - in community hubs in conjunction with other public and voluntary sector partners, whilst providing space for residents for meetings / activities. Importance of Rights of Way for health and well being of residents, informal recreation. • Support rejection of North of Cambourne SHLAA sites 194 & 265. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council – Given the size of the proposed developments, reference should be made to Minerals and Waste Core Strategy policies that relate to recycling of construction materials and waste minimisation. • Barratt & North West Cambridge Consortium – Bullet 2 should read “1,200 homes”. • Request review of Green Belt to meet objectively assessed needs and deliver sustainable development – promoting North and South of Barton Road. • Reference to Bourn Airfield should be deleted and reference to a new village north of Cambourne added. • Object to these sites as not enough analysis of advantages and disadvantages, loss of Green Belt and lack of plans for public transport between Cambridge and other towns.
Assessment	<p>See the substantive assessments relating to policies: S/4 Green Belt, SS/2 Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, SS/5 Waterbeach New Town, SS/6 New Village at Bourn Airfield, SS/7 Northstowe Extension, and SS/8 Cambourne West.</p> <p>It is not practicable or necessary to insert cross references to other statutory plans in individual policies. To do so comprehensively would be repetitious and to do so selectively would be misleading. A general cross reference to the plans making up the statutory development plan for the district is provided at paragraph 1.17.</p>

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

Development Options

Note: This audit trail for development options should be read with the audit trail for those policies that have resulted in allocations within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. These policies are as follows:

Chapter 3: Strategic Sites

- Policy SS/2: North West Cambridge – Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road
- Policy SS/5: Waterbeach New Town
- Policy SS/6: New Village at Bourn Airfield
- Policy SS/7: Northstowe Extension
- Policy SS/8: Cambourne West

Chapter 7: High Quality Homes

- Policy H/1: Allocations for Residential Development at Villages

Chapter 8: Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

- Policy E/8: Mixed-Use Development in Histon and Impington Station area

<p>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 16</p> <p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1) Chapter 9 including Questions 2 and 3</p> <p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2) Issue 1</p>	<p>Development Options</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and Sustainability Appraisal assessments identify key constraints and considerations relating to potential development sites in South Cambridgeshire. • Site Assessments for Edge of Cambridge Sites 2012 - combined SHLAA and Sustainability Appraisal assessments for sites on the inner boundary of the Cambridge Green Belt (done jointly with Cambridge City Council). • Settlement summaries included in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Reports combine key elements from both assessments to enable the most and least sustainable sites in each settlement to be identified. • The SHLAA assessments have been updated as necessary to correct errors, refine comments and to reflect changes to site boundaries and areas and these are included in the SHLAA (June 2013).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sustainability Appraisal assessments have been updated as necessary to correct errors, refine comments and to reflect changes to boundaries and areas. See the final Sustainability Appraisal. • Evidence relating to the sustainability of settlements including the South Cambridgeshire Village Classification Report 2012 • Evidence relating to the level of objectively assessed housing need to be accommodated including an updated SHMA • Annual Monitoring Reports. • Portfolio Holder Meetings regarding the Local Plan held in 2012 and 2013 • Highway and Education Authority comments. • Representations to Issue and Options consultations. • Evidence relating to the agreed sustainable development strategy approach for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire • Local Plan Member Workshops held in 2013 including consideration of the factors to be taken into account in the selection of sites for allocation in the Local Plan. • Site specific evidence.
Existing policies	<p>Sites allocated in existing plans for housing or with planning permission for housing remain suitable for housing development. Policies have been included to provide a policy context for their completion. Where circumstances have changed that could vary the number of dwellings to be built and their phasing, these have been taken into account through the Annual Monitoring Reports, and have been reflected in policies proposed in the draft plan.</p>
Analysis	<p>Local Plans are required by section 39(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF requires that significant adverse impacts on economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainability should be avoided and wherever possible alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where adverse impacts are unavoidable measures to mitigate the impact should be considered. It follows that housing development allocations are required to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In the local context this means that housing to meet objectively assessed needs must be in the most sustainable locations focussing allocation sites in settlements and locations as high as possible on the sustainable development sequence as far as this is consistent with other sustainability considerations such as environmental impacts such as loss of Green Belt, avoiding land at risk of flooding, and social impacts such as avoiding the provision of new housing in settlements where impacts on school places cannot be satisfactorily mitigated.</p> <p>The sustainable development sequence runs from locations in and on the edge of Cambridge, through New Settlements, to Rural Centre and Minor Rural Centre villages and finally to Group Villages. The process followed to identify and assess development</p>

site options on the edge of Cambridge and across South Cambridgeshire is set out in the SA which reviews the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Cambridge Area. This document also outlines the process followed to narrow down this long list of site options to a preferred package for inclusion in the Local Plan.

The Council is also required by the NPPF is to prepare a proportionate evidence base. The Council has undertaken an extensive and detailed assessment of available housing sites in its SHLAA. The government Practice Guidance that says that sites must be available and deliverable, which it defines as meaning that it is controlled by a housing developer who has expressed an intention to develop or the landowner has expressed an intention to sell. It is common practice for local authorities both locally and around the country to issue a 'call for sites' and invite promoters to put forward sites that are available for development and then to assess them to test if they are also suitable and deliverable for housing. Promoters have had the opportunity to put forward sites on 3 occasions and around 300 sites were put forward to the Council, covering a range of sizes, types and locations, including sites on the edge of Cambridge, new settlements and at villages. At the most sustainable stage in the development sequence, the edge of Cambridge, a comprehensive assessment of land was undertaken and some limited land not promoted to the Council was identified and tested. This was ultimately not found to be suitable. Testing these sites identified 63 site options for consultation at the most sustainable stages in the sequence and at the larger villages.

The SHLAA and SA assessments, together with the settlement summaries and other evidence document the extensive work undertaken to analyse potential development sites.

Potential for Reasonable Alternatives

The 63 site options identified through the SHLAA represent reasonable alternatives and could accommodate many more homes than the target options being consulted on and the target eventually included in the draft plan. There was no need or justification for identifying further sites that may not be available or sites at less sustainable villages. The Issues and Options consultations also tested options for the appropriate focus of the development strategy including a review of the development strategy jointly with Cambridge City Council. Responses to consultation generally supported protecting the green belt and focusing development in new settlements rather than spreading it around villages. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) considered the merits of various strategy options and of the 300 SHLAA sites as well as the 63 site options consulted on for housing. The Council's approach has been soundly based and the process recorded the

	<p>testing of reasonable options.</p> <p>Around 300 potential development sites were submitted to the Council in response to a 'Call for Sites' in 2011. These were carefully assessed through the SHLAA and SA processes and settlement summaries were prepared. All the sites were assessed including those in Group Villages which are small villages with relatively few services and facilities, alongside submitted sites in our larger better served villages (Rural Centre and Minor Rural Centre villages). The sites ranged in size from the scale of new towns and new villages down to small developments in Group Villages and were located across the district with a good spatial coverage. 52 site options were consulted on in Issues & Options 1 in Summer 2012 with a total potential capacity of over 25,000 homes. In addition sites have been assessed on the edge of Cambridge in both Cambridge and in South Cambridgeshire with a potential capacity of around 18,000 homes. 4 Cambridge Edge housing site options were consulted on in in the Issues & Options 2, Part 1 consultation including one site in South Cambridgeshire. In response to the I&O1 consultation, 58 additional sites were submitted as potential development sites. The 30 sites in our larger better served villages were assessed and 10 additional site options were identified for consultation in the Issues & Options 2, Part 2 consultation in January 2013 with an approximate additional potential capacity of 900 dwellings.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p>

	Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Issues and Options 2012</p> <p>Question 16</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which of the following site options do you support or object to and why? • Are there any other sites that we should consider? (These could be sites already submitted through the 'Call for Sites' process or new sites). <p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2)</p> <p>Question 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which of the site options do you support or object to and why? • Do you have any comments on sites rejected by the Council? (see list in Appendix 3). <p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1)</p> <p>Question 2 Which of the site options do you support or object to and why?</p> <p>Question 3 Do you have any comments on the sites rejected by the Councils</p>
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	Individual sites have been tested using the Sustainability Appraisal site testing Matrix, and through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments. Summary sheets drawing together the key findings of these assessments have also been prepared.
Representations Received	<p>Issues and Options 2012</p> <p>Question 16A</p> <p>Appendix 2 (Responding to Representations on Site Options) provides information on the number of representations received on each site option, a summary of the representations, and the Council's response and conclusion on each of the site options. Amended site assessment forms are included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2013) and amended sustainability appraisals and summary tables are included in the final Sustainability Appraisal Report (see Annex B).</p> <p>Question 16B</p> <p>Support: 295 Object: 92 Comment: 98</p>

Total of 690 comments on Question 6 of the questionnaire.

These totals are for all representations against Question 16B. Only a summary of non-site specific representations are included below. Site specific representations are summarised in Appendix 3 (Responding to Representations on Rejected SHLAA Sites), which also includes the Council's response and conclusion on each of the sites. Amended site assessment forms are included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2013) and amended sustainability appraisals and summary tables are included in the final Sustainability Appraisal Report (see Annex B).

Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2)

Question 1A

Appendix 2 (Responding to Representations on Site Options) provides information on the number of representations received on each site option, a summary of the representations, and the Council's response and conclusion on each of the site options. Amended site assessment forms are included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2013) and amended sustainability appraisals and summary tables are included in the final Sustainability Appraisal Report (see Annex B).

Please provide any comments:

Support: 4

Object: 9

Comment: 57

A summary for these non-site specific representations are included below.

Question 1B

Support: 2

Object: 22

Comment: 45

These totals are for all representations against Question 1B. Only a summary of non-site specific representations are included below. Site specific representations are summarised in Appendix 3 (Responding to Representations on Rejected SHLAA Sites), which also includes the Council's response and conclusion on each of the sites. Amended site assessment forms are included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2013) and amended sustainability appraisals and summary tables are included in the final Sustainability Appraisal Report (see Annex B).

	<p>Responding to Representations on Rejected SHLAA sites.</p> <p>Site specific representations are summarised in Appendix 3 (Responding to Representations on Rejected SHLAA Sites), which also includes the Council’s response and conclusion on each of the sites. Amended site assessment forms are included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2013) and amended sustainability appraisals and summary tables are included in the final Sustainability Appraisal Report (see Annex B).</p> <p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1)</p> <p>Question 2</p> <p>Representations to Question 2 (together with other representations to Chapter 9) are summarised in Appendix 4 (Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge: Summary of Representations and Response to Key Issues) which also includes the Council’s response and conclusion on each site and key issue.</p> <p>Question 3</p> <p>Representations to Question 2 (together with other representations to Chapter 9) are summarised in Appendix 4 (Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge: Summary of Representations and Response to Key Issues) which also includes the Council’s response and conclusion on each site and key issue.</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<p>Issues and Options 2012</p> <p>Question 16A</p> <p>Appendix 2 (Responding to Representations on Site Options) provides information on the number of representations received on each site option, a summary of the representations, and the Council’s response and conclusion on each of the site options. Amended site assessment forms are included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2013) and amended sustainability appraisals and summary tables are included in the final Sustainability Appraisal Report (see Annex B).</p> <p>Question 16B</p> <p>Only a summary of non-site specific representations are included below. Site specific representations are summarised in Appendix 3 (Responding to Representations on Rejected SHLAA Sites), which also includes the Council’s response and conclusion on each of the sites. Amended site assessment forms are included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2013) and amended</p>

sustainability appraisals and summary tables are included in the final Sustainability Appraisal Report (see Annex B).

COMMENTS:

- **Natural England** - Welcome consideration of constraints including designated sites, landscape, biodiversity and flooding. No specific comment regarding options, other than to request that options should have least impact on the natural environment, landscape and access to this.
- **Cambridge Past, Present and Future** - Paramount that possible development locations be evaluated in the light of sufficient transport infrastructure provision. This points to favouring locations on transport corridors. A significant development at Waterbeach should be seriously considered.
- **CPRE** - No comment on sites, as arbitrary planning policies should not be imposed on local communities.
- **Comberton Parish Council** - Would object to any other sites next to village framework not proposed as an exception site.
- **Fulbourn Parish Council** - Objects to all the options considered by SHLAA.
- **Caldecote Parish Council** - Support rejection of sites identified in the SHLAA.
- **Great Abington Parish Council** - There is a need for a small development site in the Abingtons of about 30 units.
- **Haslingfield Parish Council** - Regarding the other site options, the pros and cons listed in the local plan are considered appropriate.
- **Litlington Parish Council** - Supports the current policy for most development in major centres. Without detailed knowledge those proposed look viable.
- **Ickleton Parish Council** - Supports the District Council's rejection of site options. Underlying problem with SHLAA process is that it has been developer led.
- **Cottenham Village Design Group** - No comment on individual sites. Near to Cottenham we would be in favour of a combination of development within and around our own village, with the developments being coordinated and integral to the existing village and with the benefit that well thought out and designed additions could bring to the village in terms of investment in the schools and retail core and then the development of larger settlements such as at Northstowe and Waterbeach.
- **Weston Colville Parish Council** - No other areas warrant consideration.
- **Sawston Parish Council** - Sawston parish council would support sites 076 and 116 going forward for the next stage of the assessment process based on the information we have at present. However the Parish Council do have concerns about the infrastructure and traffic.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middle Level Commissioners - Development affecting Uttons Drove WWTW and Swavesey Drain. Flood risk/water level management systems in area are complicated and under stress during certain situations. New developments within its catchment will require regulation to current rates of run-off and large enough to be feasible both technically and financially. Developers should be required to fund provision and maintenance of all necessary flood defences and warning measures required. Concerns about increased volume of treated effluent discharging from Uttons Drove waste water treatment works into Swavesey Drain system which will have a detrimental effect on the surrounding flood risk/water level management systems and will contribute to increased flooding in Board's area unless a more appropriate point of discharge is found. • Wellcome Trust - Support identification of locations in south of district for new housing development. Greater choice of housing locations close to Genome Campus. • Advisory Council for the Education of Gypsy and other Travellers - Consider needs of travellers, sites should be spread over a wide number of villages. • Cam Valley Forum - Some larger villages should be developed especially where work places are also established. • Support for development at Hardwick, to facilitate more facilities e.g. Doctors surgery. • Expansion of the Comberton is inevitable, but must be controlled. If the size becomes enormous then it will not be a village, but becomes an extension of Cambridge. • Hope that the Council will resist suggestions from developers and others to add more sites as with such a long list of sites already identified, adding further ones seems unnecessary. • The potential sites for development do not include any provision in smaller villages, relying on larger settlements. Whilst acceptable to conclude these sites are most sustainable, this does not mean sites within smaller settlements cannot be suitable for smaller scale development. As a consequence, many sites that are viable in isolation are being discarded prematurely. Opportunities in smaller villages should be taken into account, to allow organic growth of villages and to keep communities alive. • Object to sites allocated on edge of Group villages in Green Belt. Should be more flexibility around group and infill villages. • We object to Bourne Airfield and the expansion of Cambourne and question whether these locations will deliver the types of market and affordable housing required in the South Cambridgeshire area. • All rejected sites should remain rejected. • Support for rejection of all sites in Gamlingay. • Support for rejection of SHLAA sites at Fulbourn. the character
--	--

	<p>of Fulbourn as a village depends on the preservation of the Green Belt status of fields south of the Ida Darwin site, especially the three closest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to all the site options. • Sawston – sites on the flood risk zone should be rejected. • Sites in villages where there are existing services the security of which could be preserved by some development: for example villages where there is a school but where there might be a falling school roll. • Meldreth options should not have been rejected, due to access to the railway station. • Those sites already rejected should remain so. It seems extremely unfair that a developer or owner can submit as many planning applications for the same site as they wish and only have to win the once, whereas the Parish Council has to win every time. • Although Bassingbourn Barracks site not currently under consideration. History has been explored of the site in recent research. • Develops at Harston can be done without heritage impact. <p>GENERAL COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES, QUESTION 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for development or brownfield sites rather than Greenfield sites (45 responses). • Support for development in villages (20 responses), and objection to village development (29 responses). • Develop close to transport links, where services can be provided • Build on villages in the guided bus corridor; • Develop close to major employment areas; • Create new settlements rather than swamp existing villages / No more new villages, concreting over south Cambridgeshire; • Locate development away from Cambridge. • Development should reflect Parish Plans. • There should be no new development, it is not needed. Plan to meet local needs. • Support for development in other locations: Over (2), Bassingbourn Airfield (8), Guided bus corridor (2), Hardwick (2), Bourn (1), Hinxton (1), Orwell (2), Little Wilbraham (1), Great Eversden (2), Oakington Airfield (2). <p>New site suggestions at ‘Better Served Group Villages’ or higher in the settlement hierarchy (We consulted on a category of better served group villages in I&O1 at question 13, however qualifying villages are now to be added to the minor rural centre category rather than to complicate the hierarchy through the addition of another category).</p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site SC298) – Cambridge – NIAB 3, land between A14, Huntingdon Road and Histon Road: Propose residential and commercial uses in a key location. REP 39825 • (SHLAA Site 302) – Cambridge - Land north and south of Barton Road: Residential accompanied by substantial amount of community infrastructure, and scope for an element of high tech employment. Location likely to support non-motorised modes of transport. REP 46392 • (SHLAA Site 303) – Cambourne - south of business park: Despite marketing, lack of demand for large plots - propose smaller-scale employment along the road frontage with new homes behind. REP 45370 • (SHLAA Site 304) – Cambourne – north of Cambourne: Scale would allow for original green and spacious design of Cambourne to be maintained and enhanced. Original ethos has been eroded by increase in density of Upper Cambourne in particular. Excellent access to A428, potential to reduce traffic movements as community becomes self-reliant. Good linkages to Cambourne that do not interfere with A428. REP 42838 • (SHLAA Site 305) – Great Shelford - Land east of The Hectare: With the extension of Scotsdales Garden Centre up to Hobson's Brook the boundary of the Green Belt is no longer straight. Suggest Green Belt boundary is amended to follow Hobson's Brook and release site. REP 35302 • (SHLAA Site 306) – Histon – Land West of 113 Cottenham Road: Consider this land for residential development purposes. REP 31128 • (SHLAA Site 307) – Histon - Land r/o 49-83 Impington Lane: Support is given to Site Options 14 & 15 for housing but with boundary amendments. The revised site is enclosed visually. The revised site is 3.193ha and the dwelling capacity is 96 dwellings at 30dph or 112 dwellings at 35dph. The Flood Risk, Drainage and Highways reports attached demonstrate that these important issues can be properly dealt with and the Site Options are deliverable and would not increase flood risk or generate inappropriate vehicular traffic. REP 46590 • (SHLAA Site 308) – Impington - Land at Former Bishops Hardware Store, Cambridge Road: Site within village framework, suitable for redevelopment. REP 39452 • (SHLAA Site 309) – Impington - south-east of Ambrose Way: Should be developed as a continuation of the present Ambrose Way residential development. Whilst Anglian Water advises that the land lies within the flood plain, it has not flooded within the last 100 years, and is set on higher ground than the adjoining brook to the south-west, and part of the south-east of the land. REP 44102 • (SHLAA Site 310) – Sawston - Dales Manor Business Park: Land adjoining Site Option 6, within the Dales Manor Business Park which is similarly available for residential use and equally
--	---

	<p>suitable for such use. Either in isolation or as part of a wider scheme incorporating Site Option 6 and Site Option 7. REP 37129</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 311) – Sawston - land north of White Field Way: Sawston benefits from excellent transport links to the centre of Cambridge and contains a large range of services and amenities. The site is viable in terms of access, flood risk and landscape setting. The site would support the vitality and viability of the local economy and provide an opportunity to bring more services and facilities to the village. The site benefits from existing natural screening which would be improved to ensure any perceived impact on the wider landscape was mitigated. REP 39546 • (SHLAA Site 312) – Sawston - Land at former Marley Tiles Site: Seeks to consolidate existing employment uses within site into a smaller area along the south eastern boundary. Remainder of site would be developed for housing. REP 45030 • (SHLAA Site 313) – Sawston – Land north of Babraham Road. REP 40548 • (SHLAA Site 314) – Cottenham - Land between 130 and 144 Histon Road: The site measures approximately 1.39 hectares and the north-east boundary is only 87 metres to the south-west of the Cottenham development framework (and the site's road frontage is only 119 metres away). If the site had been assessed within the SHLAA it would have confirmed that it is one of the more sustainable options and accordingly, we consider the site should have been identified as a development option in the Local Plan Issues & Options Report. REP 32206 • (SHLAA Site 316) – Cottenham – Land to Rear of High Street: Site provides an opportunity for Cottenham to grow in a unique way with a development form that reflects traditional growth and is well related to settlements core, rather than sterile formulaic expansion associated with other options. Access through demolition of 33 High Street, Cottenham which is a 1970's house in an otherwise traditional street scene. REP 46762 • (SHLAA Site 317) – Gamlingay – Cinques Road: Would consolidate end of Cinques Road into satellite area of Gamlingay. REP 33604 • (SHLAA Site 318) – Linton - Land to the east of Linton: The proposal includes the significant improvement of the Bartlow Road/A1307 junction and the Horseheath Road/A1307 junction. There are no facilities or services that cannot accommodate further development at Linton or for extra provision be provided by the development. REP 40996 • (SHLAA Site 319) – Melbourn – CEMEX site: Sustainable location, near existing infrastructure and services, with access to public transport. REP 46408 • (SHLAA Site 320) – Melbourn - Land to the east of New Road:
--	--

	<p>The site is 26 ha, but it is not proposed that the whole site is intensively developed. The remainder of the site will be used to create a buffer and boundary to the edge of the settlement or to potentially provide open space and play space facilities. The site would provide a logical rounding off to the south of Melbourn and the filling in between New Road and East Farm. REP 41129</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 321) – Papworth Everard - land at The Ridgeway: Smaller site than SHLAA proposal, would not materially impact on character of adjoining area. Could be screened by tree buffer. REP 39697 • (SHLAA Site 322) – Waterbeach - Site Option 50 (Part) / New Site - Site is adjacent to dwellings and sits adjacent to built up area. Would allow comprehensively planned development which provides greater link between village and Barracks, encouraging two areas to feel like one community, without coalescence. Sustainable site offers opportunity to add housing without having detrimental impact on setting. REP 43882 • (SHLAA Site 323) – Willingham - north side of Rook Grove: The site is adjacent to the existing settlement framework and would provide a logical extension to the village. Access could be gained easily from the existing Bourney's Manor Close and could be developed either on its own or in tandem with site reference 157 contained within the SHLAA. REP 42165 • (SHLAA Site 324) – Bassingbourn - North End & Elbourn Way: Part waste ground / part arable. Both relate well to village and built form - easy walking distance. Access could be achieved by demolishing Spar and barn/garage to 37 High Street. REP 34132 • (SHLAA Site 325) – Bassingbourn - Pear Tree Public house site: Perfect infill site. REP 34838 • (SHLAA Site 326) – Comberton - Bennell Farm (in parish of Toft): The site has extensive mature landscaping around all its boundaries which would act as a visual enclosure and screen to surrounding properties and therefore reduce impact on the Green Belt. Opportunity to provide additional local public amenity and community benefits. Consider whether affordable housing could benefit both toft and Comberton. REPS 43761 & 39503 • (SHLAA Site 327) – Milton - Land west of A10: The site is available, suitable, achievable and can be brought forward at an early stage in the period of the emerging Local Plan. The site is seen to be a logical urban extension to Milton being in a sustainable location which is accessible in terms of public transport and key facilities within the settlement. REP 44014 • (SHLAA Site 328) – Milton – Golf Course: On edge of village, Not flood risk, assist securing long term future of existing facilities; Sufficient size to allow mix of private and affordable housing; No known protected species; Allow for new and long
--	---

	<p>term village envelope to be established to north and new tree and other planting to increase biodiversity; No heritage assets in vicinity; Although Green Belt, previously been considered potentially suitable. REP 45728</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 329) – Swavesey - Over Road: This site has the potential to make a significant contribution to meeting the identified demand for residential and employment land. Although the site is currently outside the village framework it is conveniently located close to the guided bus stop and only about half a mile from the village High Street. REP 44732 • (SHLAA Site 330) – Great Chesterford -adjacent to Whiteways, Ickleton Road: The site is a sustainable location, situated within walking distance from existing community services and facilities, close to good transport links and close to existing employment opportunities. The development will also ensure the current facilities are retained and enhanced. The site is unlikely to have any adverse impact on the landscape or ecology. REP 41330 • (SHLAA Site 332 & 333) – Cottenham – Land East of Cottenham: Cottenham Parish Council. Additional sites, subject to a Cottenham Master Plan, as part of a total infill proposal of the arable land twixt Church Lane and Long Drove. Furthermore land to the north and to the rear of houses opposite Smithy Fen on the Twenty Pence Rd (as bordered by Alboro Close Drove and Long Drove/Beach Rd) should be considered in order that sufficient land is available to facilitate housing, infrastructure, and industrial development and provide the bye-pass that the High Street so desperately needs. REP 45737 <p>New Sites suggested at Other Villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balsham - Balsham Buildings, High Street - Deliverable site with highway access, close to village services, potential to enhance conservation area, direct public transport link to Linton Village College. REP 31806 • Barrington - land to rear of West Green- Requesting land be put forward for consideration for development in Local Plan review. REP 41359 • Bourn - Land to rear of Riddy Lane - The property has substantial potential for development. The plot is approximately 1.6hec, set meters outside of the current village boundary. REP 29734 • Duxford - Land at end of Manger's Lane - Lies within Duxford Framework. PVAA designation, mitigate development within it by providing higher level of affordable housing. REP 43683 • Eltisley – Land off St.Neots road - Adjacent to a relatively recent affordable housing scheme. The site had two existing accesses off St Neots Road. The site is contained within defined boundaries and is considered that development would
--	--

	<p>not have a detrimental impact on the existing character of Eltisley. REP 43853</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fen Drayton – Manor Farm- Well related with the existing settlement and would represent a natural rounding off of the southern boundary. The site would also represent a natural continuation of the existing pattern of development by way of an extension of residential development at Vermuyden Way to the north. REP 31114 • Fowlmere - Former Farmyard, Cambridge Road - Has the potential to enhance the townscape of the north-east corner of the village and it represents an unobtrusive location for a small-scale residential development. REP 33188 • Fowlmere – land to rear of Pipers Close - Would contribute to meeting affordable housing needs of Fowlmere. REP 45412 • Guilden Morden - Land south west of 33 Dubbs Knoll Road - The site is between existing housing on Dubbs Knoll Road. There is good accessibility and no flood risk. The site is close to village amenities. REP 31808 • Guilden Morden – Church Lane - Land is left over from previous times, and has no use. Open to the idea of affordable housing, private housing or best use of land that might be considered by the Council. REP 50431 • Hardwick - St. Neots Road - Group landowners who would like to see back scrubland developed to complete Hardwick village. REPS 46780 & 47584 (also included as object to rejection of SHLAA site 180) • Hauxton - Waste Water Treatment Works, Cambridge Road - Currently facilitates remediation of land opposite. Once complete, not required. Can be brought into beneficial use without adverse impact on openness of Green Belt and redevelopment accords with requirements of NPPF. Within outer rural Green Belt area - not impact upon setting of Cambridge. Natural extension to Bayer CropScience. REP 41622 • Highfields Caldecote - rear of 18-28 Highfields Road - Within village framework, capable of accommodating 97 dwellings. Formerly allocated in plan. No constraints. Proposed strategy to define limits on the scale of development within group villages, and indeed other settlements, is inappropriate because it takes no account of whether suitable larger sites within the settlement boundaries exist. REP 36683 • Highfields Caldecote – Land at Highfields Caldecote - Site used by 29 mobile homes. Already has access, and is close to the village. Full range of services. Outside the Green Belt. The existing site's residential use by professionals and retired people proves the need for accommodation; permanent accommodation is preferable to the current mobile homes. REP 36719 • Little Abington - Cambridgeshire County Scout Camp site -
--	---

	<p>Include site in village envelope to facilitate future development as camp site or housing. We are aware that full development of the site would not be possible, as part of it is flood plain, and in any case, we would not wish to see overcapacity on the site. REP 30801</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orwell - Leaden Hill - The site is contained within defined boundaries and it is considered that development would not have a detrimental impact on the existing character of Orwell. REP 43762 • Over – New Road and Station Road - Ideal spot for a tasteful residential development. Not only is it convenient for the Guided Bus, there are also two other routes out of the village via the Longstanton by-pass and through Swavesey to the A14. REP 34803 • Steeple Morden - Station Road - Close to village centre and various amenities; Enhance viability of local primary school, pub/shop/ post office and garage; Development without any adverse impact upon landscape and townscape character or heritage assets. REP 44722 • Croydon - land south of High Street - Site is at the centre of the village, and existing facilities, and able to be integrated with the community through the public bridleway on the west boundary. The site is screened to east and west and has an established frontage hedgerow. Suitable for sensitive development of market and affordable housing. REP 41127 • Great Eversden - Land north of High Street and west of Chapel Road - Should be allocated for a small-scale residential development Close to three village services, and direct public transport to Comberton VC. REP 32014 • Landbeach – Land of Chapmans Close - Near to services and facilities of Landbeach, major employment areas, public transport between Ely, Waterbeach and Cambridge. Would not undermine primary Green Belt objectives. REP 45266 • Lolworth - South of Redlands Road - Available for development and would be deliverable within the plan period. Site is in single ownership and could come forward for residential use to 2031. REP 41034 • Lolworth - Land at High Street - Available and could accommodated residential development within the plan period. The land is in single ownership and is therefore deliverable. REP 41050 • Lolworth - North of Redlands Road - Available for development and would be deliverable within the plan period. Site is in single ownership and could come forward for residential use to 2031. REP 46941 • Land at Old North Road, Kneesworth - Brownfield land within Kneesworth could provide a mix of market and affordable housing to support the local community, and that the Local Plan could allow a greater amount of market housing on such a site
--	---

	<p>to support the provision of much needed affordable housing and help in meeting local housing needs. REP 42522</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pampisford - land east of the High Street - Undeveloped parcel of land which is overgrown with vegetation but which has an access from the High Street and is closely related to built form to the west and the south. It is presently outside the development framework of Pampisford but immediately adjacent to it. REP 45766 • Shepreth – Meldreth Road - Recent affordable housing developments have been absorbed into village, this site could be too. Hourly train service. Logical infill site. REP 45336 • Toft – Powell Close - The site lies outside the settlement framework for Toft. The site is approximately 0.288 hectares and could provide low density residential development (2-4 dwellings). The new dwellings could be sited to leave a managed woodland area which would provide both retained ecological habitat areas as well as acting as mature screening of the development from the countryside to the west. REP 50349 <p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 2)</p> <p>Question 1A</p> <p>Appendix 2 (Responding to Representations on Site Options) provides information on the number of representations received on each site option, a summary of the representations, and the Council’s response and conclusion on each of the site options. Amended site assessment forms are included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2013) and amended sustainability appraisals and summary tables are included in the final Sustainability Appraisal Report (see Annex B).</p> <p>A summary of non-site specific representations are included below:</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support development in larger villages in district. • RLW Estates and Defence Infrastructure Organisation: recognise and support provision of additional development in rural settlements of district, at a scale commensurate with their local needs and other circumstances. Evidently there are constraints affecting each of the site options included in consultation document. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of these sites are needed. Covering ground in concrete. Sufficient small sites within villages to meet need. • Object to current villages, already being infilled and losing their individuality and identity, being further developed out of all
--	---

	<p>proportion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to all sites in Sawston. • Objections to sites in Cambourne. • Shepreth Parish Council objects to all housing sites – new housing should be in north of district in new settlement. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection to building on brownfield sites but greenfield is irreversible. • Brown field not Green Belt. • Prefer small infill sites. • I think any developments should be spread proportionally around the villages in South Cambs. • Due to housing need in area parishes should be prepared to accept housing developments where suitable sites exist but only where adequate infrastructure exists to accommodate increased housing. • Local people to decide. Not for developers to be asked to promote suitable sites. • Orwell Parish Council believes parish council should have first say on sites – process too biased towards developers and landowners. Infrastructure to be in place before development started. No building in flood plain. • Development should be concentrated in Cambridge not pushed out into villages – not sustainable. • Only small developments so they do not swamp existing communities. • Allow infill at small scale – self building will create character. • Object to lots of small sites because cumulative effect will impact on services – need long term planning. • Do not need new sites until Northstowe and Waterbeach completed. • All development will impact on traffic in Cambridge area. • New housing needs to be near to services in villages. • New houses not for local people - bought by speculators. • Infrastructure cannot cope with increased housing. • Foxton Parish Council do not support housing developments on business park land, as it will deduce the space available for expansion of local businesses. • No provision for elderly pensioners in housing schemes in Sawston – need retirement apartments. • Priority to sites accessible by train for commuters to London. • No more developments in north unless A10 improved. • Should take into account Parish / Village Plans. • Expand Cambourne, infill at Histon and regenerate Waterbeach. • Trinity College (represented by Bidwells): maintain commitment to bringing forward site option 34 which is in single ownership, vacant, no loss of employment unlike other sites in Gamlingay,
--	---

viable and deliverable.

Question 1B

Site specific representations are summarised in Appendix 3 (Responding to Representations on Rejected SHLAA Sites), which also includes the Council's response and conclusion on each of the sites. Amended site assessment forms are included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2013) and amended sustainability appraisals and summary tables are included in the final Sustainability Appraisal Report (see Annex B).

A summary of non-site specific representations are included below:

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

- Support those where buildings already exist e.g. Histon former bishops store.
- Houses needed.
- Support the concept of a mix of housing and work places, so transport needs are reduced.

OBJECTIONS:

- Oppose any development in the Green Belt – these areas were designated as Green Belt to stop development on them!
- Object to those proposals for building on farm land.
- Failure to account for adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the traveller pitch need and social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area, as required by Paragraph 9 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and Paragraph 158 of the NPPF.
- Why are you not considering 'brown field' / conversions more i.e. the empty pub in Bassingbourn that could be converted into a number of homes!?
- Object to any removal of Green Belt land, a greater vision is needed on the way forward for Cambridge as an alternative to destruction of Green Belt land.
- **Shepreth Parish Council** can see no benefit in Meldreth Road site inside village framework (rep 55329) but could see considerable benefit in keeping land agricultural outside envelope.

COMMENTS:

- Some larger villages should be developed especially where work places are also established.
- Don't allow development in existing villages – infrastructure won't take it and rural feel will be destroyed.
- New housing sites would be better situated on the edges of Cambridge where most of the employment is. We shouldn't be encouraging more commuting.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrate efforts towards building towns at Northstowe and Waterbeach and improving facilities at Cambourne. • Likely that no further housing growth can be accommodated within the city or on its edges, turning to new settlements as a solution to the, Bourn Airfield presents itself as the only new settlement location proposed that strikes the right delivery balance between meeting needs for new homes and jobs, and which also addresses environmental, infrastructure and quality of life factors. • Clarify the need for rural affordable homes. • All the prospective sites West of Hauxton Road have been rejected, as have the sites West of the Trumpington Road. This includes the site for the proposed Community Stadium, despite the fact that this is still included in the Joint Consultation on the City Edge Site Options (CS5). • Do not support the selection of Comberton for expansion due to its poor travel routes. • Do not support the SCDC strategy of targeting villages with a college because pupils can travel from neighbouring villages by existing buses, the proportion of houses with school age children is low and households make far more journeys for other reasons than for the school-run. • What happened to east and north proposals in Sawston – both were good options. • Cambourne was designated for this role years ago and it should be maximised – question whether any of these sites in villages are sustainable. • See no justification in granting additional planning permission to satisfy demands of speculative developers. • Great Eversden – obvious reasons for not allowing development: no school, sharp bends in High Street and Church Street, virtually no employment in village. • Cam Valley Forum & Countryside Restoration Trust: Concerns over Hauxton Site as ex-pesticide manufacturing plant – no building should start before the remediation process is complete. Plan houses only when sure there people to live in them - forecasts of jobs should not be over ambitious. Major concern is sustainability new housing - benefits of using sustainable building materials, creative and alternative energy creation, economic use of energy and water. Concerns for new developments near rivers and brooks. Waterbeach, Bourn and Melbourn expansion should be limited and constructed to protect rivers as well as providing public space for enjoyment. No building in flood plains. • Countryside Restoration Trust: Support the use of mixed use development so that jobs, shops and houses are close to each other and a diversity of buildings is achieved. Some larger villages should be developed especially where work places are
--	---

	<p>also established. These plans should link with sustainable transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Chesterford Parish Council: particularly are concerned at the in-filling developments proposed in Sawston, Shelford and Stapleford. Cumulative numbers of new dwellings go well into the hundreds, our village alone will also increase by 100 houses and we ask that housing developments in Uttlesford are also factored into a Traffic strategy. • Histon & Impington Village Action Group: want to see a community which evolves in a way that does not impact on quality of life of people. Services are already over-stretched and need investment in schools and healthcare, community facilities and traffic management, surface water and sewerage management and creation of safe pathways and cycle paths. cursory references to infrastructure in SHLAAs do not reflect true picture of Histon and Impington's current infrastructure capacity. • Natural England: majority of rejected sites were rejected due to a poor rating through the Sustainability Appraisal process and for negative impacts on natural environment. <p><u>New Sites (Edge of Cambridge)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 334) Cambridge, Fen Road, Cambridge City Council Property & Building Services: Has made representation previously and wishes site to be considered – sustainable edge of Cambridge, opportunities for a co-ordinated housing development with the adjacent allocated housing site in Cambridge City Council area and new proposed Science Park station makes the site highly sustainable. REP 51275 <p><u>New Sites (Rural Centres)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 335) Fulbourn, Land to the rear of 12-18 Teversham Road: rural centre making it suitable for development, within development framework boundary, smaller site than rejected Fulbourn sites. REP 51952 • (SHLAA Site 336) Impington, Land off Lone Tree Avenue: suitable for residential development, access off Lone Tree Avenue, outside of the flood plain, but within Green Belt. REP 55117 <p><u>New Sites (Minor Rural Centres)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamlingay, The Cinqes: 2 new sites, The Cinqes somewhat disjointed, some consolidating development would benefit the hamlet. REP 51350 • (SHLAA Site 337) Waterbeach, Land adjacent to Bannold Road: considered that all land north of Bannold Road (H9) together with land west up to Cody Road should be confirmed as proposed housing allocation, opportunity to master plan in
--	---

	<p>association with neighbouring land. REP 54745</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (SHLAA Site 338) Waterbeach, Bannold Road: Object that our Clients land was not included for consultation purposes; the site was not promoted by the landowner through the 'call for sites', it probably should have been and these representations seek to rectify that. The site represents a suitable location for development, and other sites within the vicinity of Bannold Road have been identified as potential development options. REP 51222 <p><u>New Sites (Group Villages)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote, Land to the rear of Highfields Road: object that site was not included for consultation as a potential development option (also submitted during Issues & Options 1 rep 36683). The site represents the final parcel of land to be delivered as part of the previous village growth strategy. REP 50865 • Caldecote, Land at Highfields Caldecote: development boundaries should be established around site, its proposed extension and adjoining two dwellings, should include sufficient land to east to provide an extension to the mobile home park (also submitted during Issues & Options 1 rep 36719). REP 55457 • Dry Drayton, Cotton's Field: working alongside Parish Council to consider the benefits of allocating land for affordable housing. REP 51825 • (SHLAA Site 339) Fen Ditton, High Ditch Road (part of SHLAA Site 061): smaller site with different characteristics to previous larger submission, impact on Green Belt can be mitigated, existing buildings on site, natural infill. REP 55513 • Fowlmere, Land to the rear of Pipers Close: previously submitted during Issues & Options 1 (rep 45412) with no evidence in SHLAA update of inclusion, consequently the Council has not fully complied with the Regulations. Site should be designated for housing to meet local needs, currently Green Belt, however it does not fulfil any of the objectives and functions of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF. REP 54306 • Guilden Morden, South of 33 Dubbs Knoll Road: small quantity of affordable housing, would reflect size and character of village, acceptable within the infrastructure capacity, enhance character and settlement distinctiveness of this part of Guilden Morden (also submitted during Issues & Options 1 rep 31808). REP 54294 • Steeple Morden, North of Bogs Gap Lane (part of SHLAA Site 209): smaller site for 3 dwellings than previously submitted SHLAA Site 209. REP 55229 • Whittlesford, Land northwest of Church Lane: should be considered for housing, including affordable housing and a care home, scheme would sit well on the site without detracting from
--	--

or causing nuisance to nearby dwellings. REP 51310

New Sites (Infill Villages)

- **Great Chishill:** 5 new sites, (1) Land south of Barley Road, west of the village - Would allow some expansion and add to the grouping at the windmill area; (2) Land south of Barley Road on village's west edge -This would "round-off" the village; (3) Land east of May Street on village's south edge - This would "round-off" the edge of the village; (4) Land south of Hall Lane on village's east edge - Seems the logical place to allow expansion. (5) Land east of New Road on village's north edge - This site could be developed without detriment to the village. REP 53580
- **Landbeach, Land off Chapmans Close, Cambridgeshire County Council:** within easy reach of A10 and A14 and Waterbeach Station, currently vacant greenfield, and available for residential development, including affordable local needs (plot A) and a small number of private market housing (Plot B). REP 55654
- **Little Gransden, The Drift:** planning permission for a bungalow previously turned down, building plans at other end of the street. REP 51354
- **Shepreth, Land at Bexwell Farm:** The site is currently developed, consisting of several farm buildings and a farm cottage. Replacing these buildings with a residential development would represent a growth adjoining the existing village settlement boundary and railway line. The site is not within the Green Belt or subject to any other strategic consideration that has potential to make the site unsuitable for development. REP 50808
- **Shepreth, Meldreth Road, Cambridgeshire County Council:** bordered by landscaping and railway line to west, agricultural land beyond. To south west, area received planning permission for 12 affordable houses and associated open space including BMX track. Beyond is existing scheme of 14 affordable units. Land currently vacant greenfield - opportunity for residential led mixed use development (medium density 30dph). Further phase of solely affordable housing would be inappropriate, logical rounding off. REP 55329
- **Whaddon, west of Church Street, Cambridgeshire County Council:** site benefits from mature boundary of vegetation, although in an Infill Village, within close proximity of services and facilities of nearby Group Villages and Minor Rural Centre, easy access onto A10 and M11, and train services towards London and Cambridge from nearby Meldreth station. Land currently vacant greenfield - opportunity for residential led mixed use development (medium density 30dph). REP 55324

Responding to Representations on Rejected SHLAA sites.

	<p>Site specific representations are summarised in Appendix 3 (Responding to Representations on Rejected SHLAA Sites), which also includes the Council’s response and conclusion on each of the sites. Amended site assessment forms are included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2013) and amended sustainability appraisals and summary tables are included in the final Sustainability Appraisal Report (see Annex B).</p> <p>Issues and Options 2013 (Part 1)</p> <p>Chapter 9</p> <p>Site specific representations are summarised in Appendix 4 (Site Options on the Edge of Cambridge: Summary of Representations and Response to Key Issues), which also includes the Council’s response and conclusion on each of the sites.</p>
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>To include site allocations to meet the full objectively assessed housing needs. The reasons for the selection of sites and responses to specific points raised are as set out under Issue 9 Strategy for Strategic Sites.</p> <p>Responses to specific sites are in Appendices 2 – 4, together with other relevant documentation set out under ‘key evidence’ above. The Council has sought to identify the most sustainable sites, in the best locations. All of the sites identified are considered to be developable and more than a 5 year supply of sites are considered to be deliverable. Developable sites are allocated for the whole plan period including a considerable capacity which will only be delivered after the end of the plan period in 2031.</p> <p>The sites are identified in the Local Plan and on the Policies Map. The preferred approach is as follows:</p> <p><u>Cambridge Edge Sites</u> <u>NIAB3 (site option GB6 Issues and Options 2013 part 1)</u> NIAB3 will enable the delivery of 1,000 homes on the combined NIAB2 and 3 sites, which is 100 homes less than had previously been planned for the NIAB2 site alone, in order to ensure an appropriate form and density of development.</p> <p>The site is in a sustainable location and could be developed with little impact on Green Belt purposes. Environmental issues such as air quality and noise are capable of appropriate mitigation, and the site boundary has been drawn to avoid development in the identified Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal for the NIAB3 site (site option GB6) in the</p>

'Site Assessments for Edge of Cambridge Sites' section and a sustainability appraisal of the combined NIAB2 and NIAB3 sites reflecting the site allocated in the draft Local Plan in the 'Housing and Mixed Use - Sites carried forward from the Local Development Framework' section.

Strategic Sites

Northstowe Reserve (site option 1 Issues and Options 2012)

The Northstowe Reserve site will enable the delivery of planned housing delivery at Northstowe but is not expected to deliver any additional housing.

Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal for this site in the 'Housing and Mixed Use - Sites submitted during the Call for Sites Summer 2011' section (see site 242).

Waterbeach New Town (site option 2 Issues and Options 2012)

Expected completions during the plan period are 1,400 dwellings. The remainder of the dwellings would be delivered after the plan period.

The Local Plan proposes to allocate a new town at Waterbeach, with the development area somewhere between site options 2 and 3, and an area to be addressed by an area action plan similar to site option 2.

Subsequent to the Portfolio Holder meeting of 11 June 2013, the site area and policy were amended following site visits and discussions with English Heritage, with particular reference to the historic significance of Denny Abbey.

Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal for a proposal for a new town at Waterbeach submitted during the Call for Sites (see the 'Housing and Mixed Use - Sites submitted during the Call for Sites Summer 2011' section, site 231). This was subject to consultation as site option 2.

Two alternative proposals were developed that were subject to public consultation as site options 3 and 4. A sustainability appraisal of each of these sites was undertaken and are included in the 'Housing and Mixed Use - Sites submitted during the Call for Sites Summer 2011' section of Annex B, see site 231 (MOD only) and site 231 (built area only).

Annex B also includes a sustainability appraisal for the revised site boundary included in the draft Local Plan (see the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Re-Assessments of Sites to take account of Revised

	<p>Site Boundaries and Proposals’, site 231).</p> <p><u>Bourn Airfield New Village (site option 5 Issues and Options 2012)</u> Expected completions during the plan period are 1,700 dwellings. The remainder of the dwellings would be delivered after the plan period.</p> <p>Note that in the draft Local Plan a larger Area Action Plan boundary has been included to enable opportunities outside the built development area to be fully explored. The site assessment and sustainability appraisal have been updated to reflect the new site boundary. The revised sustainability appraisal is included in Annex B (see ‘Housing and Mixed Use - Re-Assessments of Sites to take account of Revised Site Boundaries and Proposals’, site 238). The sustainability appraisal of the original proposals submitted during the Call for Sites is also included in Annex B (see ‘Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted during Call for Sites Summer 2011’, sites 057 and 238).</p> <p>Following the Portfolio Holder meeting of 11 June 2013, the reduced capacity at Cambourne West was compensated for by bringing development at Bourn Airfield forward a year, development having been held back in the housing trajectory by two years to provide flexibility and ensure a 5 year supply of housing land.</p> <p><u>Cambourne West (site option 17 Issues and Options 2012)</u> Expected completions during the plan period are 1,200 dwellings. Note that the site boundary of this option has been amended to help mitigate its impacts. The site assessment and sustainability appraisal have been updated to reflect the new site boundary. The revised sustainability appraisal is included in Annex B (see ‘Housing and Mixed Use - Re-Assessments of Sites to take account of Revised Site Boundaries and Proposals’, site 239). The sustainability appraisal of the original proposal submitted during the Call for Sites is also included in Annex B (see ‘Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted during Call for Sites Summer 2011’, site 239).</p> <p>Subsequent to the Portfolio Holder Meeting of 11 June 2013, the capacity of the site was reduced from 1,500 to 1,200 dwellings, the site boundary was not changed. Topography and the development pattern of Cambourne suggest that more of the Major Development area will need to remain open or be used for water management features and therefore the capacity has been reduced from a total of 1,500 dwellings, including the land in the business park, to 1,200 dwellings.</p> <p>The policy was also refined to clarify the nature of transport access through the business park, and that residential development can</p>
--	---

only come forward once replacement employment land is secured in Cambourne West. The area of employment land was corrected to 8.1 hectares, to reflect the area within the business park.

Village Sites

The strategic sites will be supported by limited development at the more sustainable villages in the order of 900 homes to provide flexibility and help ensure a continuous supply of housing land over the plan period, including if there is any delay in progress on any of the major sites.

The first choice of village sites was at Rural Centres, the highest order villages in the district with the best access to services and facilities. In particular development has focused on Sawston, the village that scored highest in the village hierarchy assessment. Sites offered particular opportunities to utilise previously developed land, as well as improve the eastern edge of the village. They also have the benefit of being located in the southern part of the district where there is otherwise limited housing development and where a number of research parks are located. Histon and Impington is also a Rural Centre, and the site small site north of Impington Lane is well integrated with the village. They involve release of land from the Green Belt which is considered to be justified in order to provide an element of housing development at the most sustainable villages. Other sites at Rural Centres have been rejected due to environmental or other impacts. Details can be found in Appendix 2 of this document.

Although Minor Rural Centres generally have a lower level of services and facilities and public transport than Rural Centres, they are better served than the majority of villages in the district. Sites at Melbourn, Gamlingay, Willingham and Comberton have been identified, reflecting the specific opportunities they provide.

Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston (site option H5 Issues and Options 2013 part 2)

Expected completions during the plan period are 200 dwellings. This is a lower figure than the 260 subject to consultation, the site has a net developable area of 6.6 ha, at 30 dph this would deliver 200 dwellings allowing for some new employment development. The density of development has reduced from 40dph in Issues & Options 2012 and 2013, to reflect the agreed approach to density included in policy H/7 'Housing Density'. The site assessment and sustainability appraisal have been updated to reflect a density of 30dph. The sustainability appraisal of the site remains a sound assessment of the site, and is included in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted to Issues and Options 2012 consultation' section of Annex B.

Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston (site option H6 Issues and Options 2013 part 2)

Expected completions during the plan period are 80 dwellings. This is a lower figure than the 110 dwellings subject to consultation. The density of development has reduced from 40dph in Issues & Options 2013, to reflect the agreed approach to density included in policy H/7 'Housing Density'. The sustainability appraisal of the site remains a sound assessment of the site, and is included in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted to Issues and Options 2012 consultation' section of Annex B.

Land south of Babraham Road, Sawston (site options 8 and 9 Issues and Options 2012)

Expected completions during the plan period are 260 dwellings. This is a lower figure than the 480 dwellings that the Issues and Options 2012 consultation described as the total capacity of the two sites.

The southern boundary of the site has been moved north and the capacity has been reduced to provide increased opportunity for landscaping mitigation, including for the setting of Sawston Hall. The density of development has reduced from 40dph in Issues & Options 2012, to reflect the agreed approach to density included in policy H/7 'Housing Density'. The site assessment and sustainability appraisal have been updated to reflect a density of 30dph and the revised site boundary. The original sustainability appraisals for sites 178 and 258 are included in Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted during the Call for Sites Summer 2011' section and the revised sustainability appraisal for the combined smaller site is included in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Re-Assessments of Sites to take account of Revised Site Boundaries or Proposals' section.

Land north of Impington Lane, Impington (site options 14 and 15 Issues and Options 2012)

Expected completions during the plan period are 25 dwellings. This is a lower figure than the 35 dwellings that the Issues & Options 2012 consultation describes as the total capacity of the two sites. The density of development has reduced from 40dph in Issues & Options 2012, to reflect the agreed approach to density included in policy H/7 'Housing Density'. The sustainability appraisal of the site remains a sound assessment of the site, and is included in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted during the Call for Sites Summer 2011' section of Annex B.

Land off New Road and to the rear of Victoria Way, Melbourn (site options 30 and 31 Issues and Options 2012)

	<p>Expected completions during the plan period are 65 dwellings. The sustainability appraisal is included in Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted during the Call for Sites Summer 2011' section.</p> <p><u>Green End Industrial Estate, Gamlingay (site option 33 Issues and Options 2012)</u></p> <p>Expected completions during the plan period are 90 dwellings. The sustainability appraisal is included in Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted during the Call for Sites Summer 2011' section.</p> <p><u>Land East of Rockmill End, Willingham (site option 46 Issues and Options 2012)</u></p> <p>Expected completions during the plan period are 50 dwellings. The sustainability appraisal is included in Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted during the Call for Sites Summer 2011' section.</p> <p><u>Land at Bennell farm West Street, Comberton (site option H10 Issues and Options 2013 part 2)</u></p> <p>Expected completions during the plan period are 90 dwellings. This is a lower figure than the capacity of 115 dwellings subject to consultation through Issues and Options 2013 part 2. This reflects that a substantial part of the site will be used to provide a community football pitch with changing rooms, and car parking to serve both the community and Comberton Village College. A revised sustainability appraisal has been prepared to reflect this. The original sustainability appraisals for the site is included in Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted during the Call for Sites Summer 2011' section and the revised sustainability appraisal for the revised site is included in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Re-Assessments of Sites to take account of Revised Site Boundaries or Proposals' section.</p> <p>New site suggestions at 'Better Served Group Villages' or higher in the settlement hierarchy that were submitted through the Issues & Options consultation in Summer 2012 and that met the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) criteria were assessed. The site assessment forms were included in the December 2012 Update to the SHLAA and the sustainability appraisal for each site was included in Appendix 3 of the Supplementary Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report (January 2013). The sustainability appraisals of these sites are also included in Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report, see the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted to Issues and Options 2012 consultation' section. Sites that were considered to have development potential or limited development potential in these</p>
--	---

	<p>villages were subject to consultation in Issues & Options 2013: Part 2.</p> <p>New sites suggested on the edge of Cambridge, and at Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres, submitted through the Issues & Options 2013 consultation in early 2013 and that met the SHLAA criteria have been assessed and a sustainability appraisal completed. Site assessment forms, sustainability appraisals and summary tables for the new sites submitted through the 2013 issues and options consultation are included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2013) and the final Sustainability Appraisal Report (see the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites submitted to Issues and Options 2013 consultation' section in Annex B).</p> <p>New sites suggested at other villages lower in the settlement hierarchy that were submitted through the Issues & Options 2012 consultation in Summer 2012 and the Issues & Options 2013 consultation in early 2013 were not assessed. Group and Infill Villages are smaller villages which provide a lower level of services and facilities than larger villages classified as Rural Centres and Minor Rural Centres. Development in Group and Infill Villages is less sustainable than development in locations higher in the sustainable development sequence which runs from locations in and on the edge of Cambridge, through New Settlements, to Rural Centre and Minor Rural Centre villages and finally to Group and Infill Villages. Sufficient sites have been identified for allocation in locations higher in the sustainable development sequence and therefore no development allocations are justified in Group and Infill Villages.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy SS/2: North West Cambridge – Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road Policy SS/5: Waterbeach New Town Policy SS/6: New Village at Bourn Airfield Policy SS/7: Northstowe Extension Policy SS/8: Cambourne West Policy H/1: Allocations for Residential Development at Villages Policy E/8: Mixed-Use Development in Histon and Impington Station area</p>

Policy SS/1 Orchard Park

Issues and Options 2012 Chapter 13 – Orchard Park	Cambridge Northern Fringe West (Orchard Park)
Key evidence	Orchard Park Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document
Existing policies	Site Specific Policies DPD: Policy SP/1 Cambridge Northern Fringe West (Orchard Park)
Analysis	<p>The Orchard Park site was originally allocated for mixed-use development including 900 dwellings in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 and the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document (adopted January 2010) carried forward the allocation. Outline planning permission was granted in 2005 and has lapsed. The majority of the development has been completed. Pre-application discussions are on-going to bring forward Parcel K1 for 36 self-build dwellings, which is the last remaining housing parcel from the original Development Framework Plan.</p> <p>There is potential for additional dwellings by using parcels originally envisaged for commercial development adjacent to the A14 and for mixed use development and a Heritage Resource & Conservation Centre (HRCC) in the south west corner of the site. A hybrid planning permission for the south west corner including Parcels Q, Com 2a, Com 2b, E3, E4 and HRCC was granted in February 2013, incorporating outline planning permission for 112 dwellings and full planning permission for 28 dwellings, retail units and open space. For Parcels L2 and Com 4 adjacent to the A14, pre-application discussions with the landowners are on-going.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: None. The policy should be carried forward into the new Local Plan and remain until the development has been completed. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector.</p>
Which objectives does this issue or policy address?	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p>

	<p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
Preferred Approach and Reasons	Carry forward the existing policy for Orchard Park into the new Local Plan. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector. Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal for this site in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites carried forward from the Local Development Framework' section.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy SS/1: Orchard Park
Policy SS/1 Orchard Park (paragraph 3.5)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 12 Support: 8 Object: 4
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council – Support section 3 concerning assessments of noise and air quality. • Natural England – Support strategic sites policies - references to environmental and ecological issues. • Support the provision of ecological features and open space in the development. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council – Support the ongoing development of Orchard Park, but consider that the final sentence of paragraph 3.5 should not refer to a landmark building as this is often used to denote a building of significant height. • English Heritage – Part 2c) and paragraph 3.5 refer to gateway features and a landmark building. The scale form and massing of such a building must be appropriate. • The Local Centre should include a public house.

Assessment	<p>Policy SS/1 has been carried forward largely unchanged from the adopted Site Specific Policies DPD which was previously tested through examination and found sound. The reference to a landmark building is included in the adopted policy. The adopted Orchard Park SPD identifies the need for a landmark building in this location with the following wording:</p> <p>“High quality architectural landmarks to accentuate a ‘gateway’ feature when approaching Orchard Park from the west.”</p> <p>and also advises:</p> <p>“12m building height for gateway buildings”</p> <p>This design direction is considered to remain appropriate in this location and its provisions should not be of concern to the City or English Heritage.</p> <p>Disagree that the policy should require the provision of a public house in the local centre. The NPPF includes local centres in its glossary of terms at page 57 under the heading of ‘town centre’ and makes clear that they are areas which will be predominantly occupied by main town centre uses. The definition of main town centre uses in the NPPF includes bars and pubs as well as retail and other appropriate uses. There is no evidence to support a requirement to provide a pub in this location, and if one were to be proposed its acceptability would be determined against plan policies including SS/1 which does not prevent such provision.</p>
Approach in Submission Local Plan	No change

Policy SS/2: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road

Note: See also the audit trail for Development Options in Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy

<p>Issues and Options 2012 Chapter 13 – NIAB2</p>	<p>North West Cambridge – Huntingdon Road to Histon Road (NIAB2)</p>
<p>Key evidence</p>	
<p>Existing policies</p>	<p>Site Specific Policies DPD: Policy SP/2 North West Cambridge Huntingdon Road to Histon Road</p>
<p>Analysis</p>	<p>Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road, known as Darwin Green 2 and formerly NIAB 2, was released from the Green Belt for a sustainable housing-led urban extension of Cambridge in the Site Specific Policies Development Plan Document (adopted in January 2010). The site is adjacent to the Cambridge City Council allocation at NIAB1. The site was identified for approximately 1,100 dwellings in the LDF with associated development including a secondary school to serve the whole of the north west part of Cambridge. The capacity of the site is reduced to 900 in the Local Plan informed by pre-application discussions and concerns that the higher figure cannot be achieved with an appropriate density of development taking account of its edge of Cambridge location. This is consistent with the Council’s advice to the Inspector at the time the LDF was examined. Development of the site is dependent on sufficient transport capacity on the A14. Pre-application discussions are ongoing.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: None. The policy should be carried forward into the new Local Plan and remain until the development has been completed. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and</p>

	<p>well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Carry forward the existing policy into the new Local Plan but include amendments to reflect the inclusion of the adjoining land (NIAB3). This additional site was considered through the joint edge of Cambridge Green Belt review, and subject to consultation as site GB6 in the joint Issues and Options 2013 consultation. Responses to representations are addressed in Appendix 4.</p> <p>An analysis of the NIAB2 site through the pre-application discussions that have taken place subsequent to its allocation has indicated that a more appropriate and robust capacity would be 900 instead of 1,100 houses, which has been reflected in the draft policy.</p> <p>The additional area of GB6 will add approximately 100 dwellings to the capacity subject to detailed masterplanning and a design-led approach. The site boundary has been drawn to avoid housing development in the area of the AQMA, and to consider landscape and townscape impacts and provision of necessary infrastructure including noise bunds and balancing ponds to serve the whole of the NIAB development, including land in Cambridge City Council's area, assuming that the balancing pond for NIAB1, which lies within the area of NIAB2, will be relocated as part of the development.</p> <p>Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal for the NIAB3 site (site option GB6) in the 'Site Assessments for Edge of Cambridge Sites' section and a sustainability appraisal of the combined NIAB2 and NIAB3 sites reflecting the site allocated in the draft Local Plan in the 'Housing and Mixed Use - Sites carried forward from the Local Development Framework' section.</p>
<p>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</p>	<p>Policy SS/2: North West Cambridge – Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road</p>

Policy SS/2: Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (paragraphs 3.14, 3.16, 3.18, and 3.19)

Proposed Submission Representations Received

Total: 38
 Support: 15
 Object: 23 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC))

Main Issues

Support

- **Anglian Water** – Capacity in the Water Recycling Centre, but some localised enhancement to network may be required to receive Foul Water.
- **Natural England** – Support strategic sites policies - references to environmental and ecological issues.
- **The Wildlife Trust** – Supports production of Countryside Enhancement Strategy which protects and provides ecological features. Must also consider connections to wider network. Support provision of opportunities for enhanced nature conservation and quiet enjoyment of natural environment.
- Welcome reduction in capacity of Darwin Green 2 to deliver more favourable environment at lower density and residential only on Darwin Green 3. Green fringe must be maintained. Support improved countryside access and informal recreation space. Management strategies should be applied to initial provision of facilities as well as long-term maintenance.
- Masterplan should be developed before piecemeal development granted. Support Darwin Green 3 delivering reduced densities.
- Bullet 11 – If Green Belt land released, must include comprehensive landscape enhancement scheme.
- Inter-connectivity of green areas for walking, links to amenities, leisure, and retention of ‘pocket parks’ and trees.
- Support using green separation for walking, cycling, leisure, sports, play, ‘fit trails’ for adults of variable abilities, bird watching and flood attenuation ponds, linked transport routes.

Object

- **Anglian Water** – Bullet 12 – for clarity, amend sub-title to ‘drainage’ as it is not limited to surface water.
- **Barratt and North West Cambridge Consortium (site promoters)** – Support policy and allocation subject to changes to allocate a larger site including some commercial uses. Policy should allocate 1,200 homes in South Cambridgeshire.
- **Cambridge City Council** – Bullet 2b/para. 3.16 – Should refer to a design code rather than design guides/design codes.

	<p>Important to be consistent with design code for NIAB1 – should be site-wide rather than separate, as implied. Bullet 5/para 3.18 – Refers to provision of off-site services and facilities within NIAB1 - needs further consideration as limited space in local centre and revenue funding implications for City Council. Bullet 13 – Support but concerned about air quality and noise on quality of life close to A14 – should be fully investigated / resolved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Object as Green Belt and not demonstrated ‘exceptional circumstances’ for release. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation – Falls within statutory height safeguarding zone around Cambridge Airport. • Histon and Impington PC – Vulnerable to flooding and drainage issues – must not put village at risk. Use noise barriers that do not cause unacceptable noise levels / reflection. Eastern access too close to Arbury Road junction. Traffic predictions too low. • Swavesey and District Bridleways Association – Horse rider needs should be included. • Support that all ‘necessary’ services and facilities will be provided by development but needs defining more precisely. Include statement that will consider provision across whole site and work in conjunction with Cambridge City Council. • Bullet 5 - include public house. • Develop more of the Green Belt here – poor quality and more sustainable for commuting by cycle etc. Takes pressure off rural hubs. • Green Belt performs important function preventing City merging with surrounding villages – development compromises. Take into account cumulative development.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>The Council considers the capacity of the larger NIAB site to be approximately 1,000 dwellings. However, the policy is clear that the final capacity number will be informed by a design-led assessment and this may be higher or lower, than the approximately 1,000 dwellings that the policy allows for. The Council supports making the best use of this site at the top of the sustainable spatial development sequence compatible with achieving a quality development. The final number of homes will be determined and fixed through the planning application process. It would not be appropriate to include a higher number than is likely to be deliverable or for the plan to rely on a higher number than is robust.</p> <p>Disagree that land at the immediate west of Histon Road south of the A14 should be released from the Green Belt for commercial development. This land fulfils important Green Belt purposes regarding setting, and physical separation between Cambridge</p>

	<p>and its necklace villages. It should be retained as an undeveloped green break between Cambridge and Impington as required by section 3 of the policy which refers to a set back to provide effective visual separation.</p> <p>There is no evidence that the site is at risk of any significant flood risk. Policy CC/9 requires that a flood risk assessment be prepared.</p> <p>Agree that the sub-title to section 12 of the policy could be clarified by amending it to refer to 'Drainage'.</p> <p>Regarding the objections from Cambridge City Council no changes to the policy or supporting text are necessary. A design code is to be prepared for the land in South Cambridgeshire which will have regard to the approved design code for the land in Cambridge in order to ensure a coherent approach across the two sites.</p> <p>Regarding noise from the A14, landscaped bunds of an appropriate profile are absorbent, and non reflective. The location, design and profile of such bunds are matters for consideration at planning application stage.</p> <p>Regarding the needs of horse riders, agree that the Local Plan should include appropriate references. The existing Development Control DPD requires such provision. It is proposed that appropriate references are included in policy HQ/1 'Design Principles' at part f), where they would apply to all scales of housing development.</p> <p>Further consideration is given to Green Belt issues in relation to policy S/4, and to the provision of new jobs and homes in policy S/5, and to the development strategy to 2031 in policy S/6.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend the wording of the section 12 sub-title from 'Surface Water Drainage' to '<u>Drainage</u>'.</p> <p>Include provision for horse riders in policy HQ/1 at criterion f) as follows: "...conveniently accessible streets <u>routes</u> both within the development...delivering attractive and safe opportunities for walking, cycling, <u>horse riding</u> and public transport;"</p>

Policy SS/3: Cambridge East

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 108	Cambridge East
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Cambridge East Area Action Plan
Analysis	<p>The development of a major new urban quarter for Cambridge at Cambridge East, comprising 10,000-12,000 new homes, was a key part of the spatial strategy in the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, and the Cambridge Local Plan. In February 2008, the Councils jointly adopted the Cambridge East Area Action Plan (AAP).</p> <p>Whilst Marshalls had been actively looking into relocation options for the airport activities since 2006, they announced in April 2010 that after a lengthy search, their favoured sites at Wyton and Waterbeach were not deliverable at the present time and they intended to remain at Cambridge Airport for the foreseeable future. This means that the Councils need to explore what this means for the future direction of development in their respective areas as well as how the current allocation should be dealt with through the review process.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</p> <p>The following alternative options have been identified for the way the new Local Plan deals with the Cambridge East site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the current allocation for development at Cambridge East – The allocation could remain ‘live’ in case the area became available for development. This would provide flexibility, but as it could not be relied upon the Council could not include the housing numbers in its calculations towards meeting need. It could also create uncertainty and any implications for the delivery of development proposals elsewhere would need to be considered. • Safeguard it for possible future development after 2031 - Safeguarding the site would mean that it could be brought forward through a future plan review if Marshall's plans were to change, but there is no certainty it will ever become available. This approach is consistent with the NPPF and would provide flexibility for the future whilst also providing certainty to developers of other allocations in the Local Plan that their sites can come forward. • Return either the whole site to the Green Belt to reflect the original Green Belt boundary, or just the open parts of the site. The land was removed from the Green Belt for the purpose of housing-led development, and as this is no longer anticipated a further option is to return some or all of the land to the Green Belt.

<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 108: What approach should the Local Plan take to Cambridge Airport?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Retain the current allocation for development at Cambridge East. ii. Safeguard the site for development after 2031 or through a review of the Local Plan. iii. Return the whole site to the Green Belt or just the parts of the site which are open
<p>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</p>	<p>Retaining the Cambridge East AAP means that the wider airport site could still come forward for development, but there is considerable doubt whether it would actually be delivered, with Marshalls stating their intention to remain on the site. Cambridge East offers an opportunity to make a significant contribution to housing needs in a location close to Cambridge.</p> <p>It would also deliver significant employment development. A development of this scale would have a significant impact on the landscape, but the AAP includes policies requiring mitigation measures. The site offers opportunities for biodiversity improvements in association with the development. Additional development would increase scale of resource use, such as</p>

	<p>demand for water, above the planned level of development. Cambridge East was to provide employment development equivalent to 5,000 jobs on the edge of Cambridge. This loss could impact on the economy objectives, although the Employment Land Review 2012 identified that land availability and changes in the economy meant the loss was not critical. It recommended further employment opportunities may be needed on the edge of Cambridge.</p> <p>As the site is not expected to come forward, this would actually create uncertainty for developers of other sites, and potentially create uncertainty regarding the scale of development that will take place in the district up to 2031.</p> <p>If the land is safeguarded (option ii) the site specific impacts of development will not take place during the plan period, but the location would be reserved for development beyond the plan period. This could have positive benefits in the future, but still no certainty it would be developed.</p> <p>Returning land to the Green Belt (option iii) would restrict inappropriate development, and offer protection to the setting of Cambridge.</p>
Representations Received	<p>i. Retain the current allocation for development at Cambridge East. (S: 9 (2 PC), O: 2, C: 0)</p> <p>ii. Safeguard the site for development after 2031 or through a review of the Local Plan. (S: 18 (7 PC), O: 2, C: 0)</p> <p>iii. Return the whole site to the Green Belt or just the parts of the site which are open. (S: 14 (2 PC), O: 2, C: 2)</p> <p>Please provide any comments. (S: 1 (PC), O: 0, C: 7)</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>Main Views Received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marshalls of Cambridge – most sustainable location and no exceptional circumstances to justify changes to Green Belt. Safeguard the site. • Cambridgeshire County Council - retain a policy and safeguard land for post plan development. An HRC is still required in Cambridge East area. • Cambridge City Council – both councils working together and consulting on options – results will inform preferred options in draft plans. • Whilst Marshalls have no current intention to move, it may change in period 2011-31. Most sustainable location - should be retained. • Marshalls indicated no longer looking to relocate - confirms it will not be delivered in foreseeable future. Unavailable - 'unsound' to retain. Return to Green Belt. • Will not come forward in plan period. If it comes forward it can be reintroduced after thorough vetting. • Provides green barrier and open space to this sector of

	<p>Cambridge. If Marshalls left, a better use would be nature reserve or country park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of (unbuilt) area should be returned to Green Belt, but built-up areas important for employment safeguarded as such. • What was in Green Belt should be returned to ensure clear separation between city and villages. Return proposed green corridor west of Teversham to Green Belt and where possible increase biodiversity. • Little point returning to Green Belt now it has been removed – may yet be windfall.
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Safeguard the Airport site for future development beyond the plan period and firmly allocate land north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton for residential development, the latter with adjoining land allocated in the Cambridge Local Plan.</p> <p>Marshall has made clear its intention for Cambridge Airport to remain at its current site for the foreseeable future. Notwithstanding, in the event that Marshall were to decide in the longer term to make the site available for development, a major urban expansion to Cambridge at the Cambridge Airport site remains the most sustainable location for long term development.</p> <p>In plan making terms, it is a reasonable and appropriate response to the changed circumstances since the current plan to apply a safeguarding policy to the Airport site, safeguarded for possible long term new urban quarter to Cambridge if it becomes available, and that it would be brought forward through a review of the Local Plan. The Cambridge East Area Action Plan would remain ‘live’ and could be drawn on as necessary, either in its current form or through a review depending on circumstances at the time of any future development.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy SS/3: Cambridge East

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 109	Cambridge East – North of Newmarket Road
Key evidence	
Existing policies	Cambridge East Area Action Plan
Analysis	Land north of Newmarket Road and north and west of the Park and Ride was identified in the Area Action Plan for development for 1,500 to 2,000 new homes. It is not constrained by the Airport relocation and could come forward for development on its own. It lies almost entirely within South Cambridgeshire District. It had been expected that the site would be developed by 2016, but no significant progress has yet been made and we need to decide what to do with the site in the Local Plan.

	<p>The housing targets do not currently take any account of development North of Newmarket Road given the uncertainty that it can be relied on to deliver new housing. The future of the site needs to be established in the new Plan.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Council could:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclude that development cannot be relied on and the site be treated in the same way as Cambridge Airport. • Rely on the existing Cambridge East Area Action Plan policies to guide any development that might come forward north of Newmarket Road. • Include a new specific policy for the site in the Local Plan allocating the land for a housing-led development.
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
<p>Final Issues and Options Approaches</p>	<p>Question 109: What approach should the Council take to the potential for housing development on land North of Newmarket Road at Cambridge East? Should the Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Conclude that development cannot be relied on and the site be treated in the same way as Cambridge Airport? ii. Rely upon the policies of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan to determine any planning applications for development?

	<p>iii. Include a new policy for the site in the Local Plan allocating the land for a housing-led development?</p>
<p>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</p>	<p>If the site was not relied upon, it would be addressed in the same way as the wider airport site covered by Issue 108. It is therefore not appraised separately here.</p> <p>The second option would be to rely on the existing Area Action Plan to provide policy guidance. This contains a range of policies, and has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal prior to its adoption. A direct comparison is difficult, as contrast with the third option to include a policy, as the wider policy framework of the Local Plan is dependent on a range of options at this stage.</p> <p>The third option for Cambridge East would be to include a policy for the site in the Local Plan allocated the land for a housing led development. The site specific impacts of an allocation have been considered in this appraisal. Cambridge East is on the edge of Cambridge, at the top of the Core Strategy search sequence.</p> <p>Development would include more than 20 hectares of existing agricultural land, mostly grade 2. The site lies within an area of search for waste recycling and recovery facilities. The AAP identifies potential sources of noise, but requires appropriate mitigation measures. It does not lie within an Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>The AAP identifies opportunities for improvement to landscape and townscape character, particularly along the frontage with Newmarket Road. It identifies that is crucial that the existing tree belt around the edge of the site is retained and enhanced as part of the development to provide strategic landscaping.</p> <p>The AAP includes a number of polices seeking high quality design, but this option is only considering the option to allocate. The site is located within flood zone 1, the lowest risk zone.</p> <p>Development would be required to include open space to meet needs, it is not clear at this stage whether there would be additional opportunities. On the edge of Cambridge and with access to high quality public transport there would be significant positive impacts from delivering residential development in the area, to achieving sustainable transport, access to services, and access to employment, so long as appropriate measures were included as part of any proposal. The AAP identifies a range of transport improvements that would be required from development north of Newmarket Road, including measures to support cycling and public transport.</p>
<p>Representations Received</p>	<p>i. Conclude that development cannot be relied upon and the site be treated in the same way as Cambridge Airport? (S: 7, O: 0, C:</p>

	<p>2) ii. Rely upon the policies of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan to determine any planning applications for development? (S: 0, O: 0, C: 2) iii. Include a new policy for the site in the Local Plan allocating the land for a housing-led development? (S: 6 (1PC), O: 0, C: 7) Please provide any comments. (S: 1, O: 0, C: 5)</p>
<p>Key Issues from Representations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marshalls of Cambridge – no changes have occurred since adoption of CEAAP to warrant reconsideration. Guidance and requirements of CEAAP are recent and remain relevant and accord with NPPF. • Cambridge City Council – whilst land within SCDC, given the functional relationship with the city, the Council wishes to work together on long-term future of this site. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – obvious site for development provided public transport along Newmarket Road can be improved. Green corridor opposite Teversham should be retained as Green Belt. • Almost certain to come forward before 2031 - need to take proactive approach. • Probably not appropriate to rely on CEAAP as assumes whole area would be developed, therefore some facilities designed to support this site could be accommodated on airfield site.
<p>Preferred Approach and Reasons</p>	<p>Address in policy, which will replace Cambridge East Area Action Plan Policies CE/3 and CE/35, identifying allocations north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton, and safeguarding the remainder of the airport site for potential longer term development if the airport becomes available and flying activities cease.</p> <p>The Cambridge East Area Action Plan provides an up to date policy framework for development of land north of Newmarket Road. The AAP allowed for development on this area, either as an early phase of the full Cambridge East development or as a stand alone new neighbourhood to Cambridge.</p> <p>Marshall is currently in pre-application discussions with the Council and intending to bring forward development and there is no need to include a policy in the new Local Plan, which could have the effect of delaying development of this site in a sustainable location on the edge of Cambridge and would not provide such a detailed policy framework for considering a planning application on this site.</p> <p>As the site is likely to deliver residential development during the plan period, it has been included in the Housing Trajectory.</p> <p>Annex B of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report includes a sustainability appraisal for land north of Newmarket Road and land north of Cherry Hinton in the 'Housing and Mixed Use – Sites</p>

	carried forward from the Local Development Framework' section.
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	Policy SS/3: Cambridge East
Policy SS/3: Cambridge East (paragraph 3.25)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 22 Support: 9 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 13 (including 1 from PC)
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity in the Water Recycling Centre, but some localised enhancement to network may be required to receive Foul Water. • Cambridge City Council – Support the approach taken in policy SS/3 which complements the equivalent policy in the City Local Plan. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Support safeguarding for future development. Teversham Green Corridor should be retained as Green Belt. Park and Ride should relocate east of Airport Way. If Park and Ride unsuitable for residential – possible site for stadium for CUFC. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Likely to require measures to mitigate transport impacts – explore in detail through Transport Assessment. • Marshall of Cambridge (site promoter) – Intend to bring forward North of Newmarket Road in plan period. Support safeguarding of remainder of site for longer-term. Figure 7 should show longer-term proposal to relocate Park and Ride. • Natural England – Support strategic sites policies - references to environmental and ecological issues. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support policy. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defence Infrastructure Organisation – Falls within statutory height safeguarding zone around Cambridge Airport. • Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards – Site outside IDB area but must be consulted (with Environment Agency) on surface water disposal proposals. • Highways Agency – Policy should be amended to include requirement for assessment of A14 junctions 34 & 35 in Transport Assessment, to safeguard strategic road network.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oakington and Westwick PC – New policy needed to guide development of Land North of Newmarket Road. • Teversham PC – Green Belt too narrow to perform functions - if Area Action Plan carried forward, should reduce size of SS/3(1) to provide larger gap with Teversham and remove southern section. Building up to Airport Way would have devastating impact on openness, character, urban sprawl. Gazelle Way/Yarrow Way should be limit of development. Traffic noise from Airport Way greater than airport – measures needed to alleviate. • Object to safeguarding land – not available for residential and uncertain availability in long-term - cannot be relied upon. • No mention of community facilities - include public house. • Land north of Newmarket Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Taken out of Green Belt on proviso airport relocated – should be put back as condition not met. ○ Roads cannot cope with extra traffic. Risk to pedestrian safety with rat running. ○ Infrastructure cannot cope – schools, nurseries. ○ Valuable agricultural land – actively farmed, should be protected. ○ Proximity to airport – previously rejected. Safety risk - adjacent to fire testing area. • Land north of Cherry Hinton: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Valuable agricultural land. ○ Roads round Cherry Hinton cannot cope with more traffic. Regular congestion. ○ Too near Teversham, increasing risk of coalescence. ○ Too near airport – potentially hazardous area.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>Land at Cambridge East was allocated for development and removed from the Green Belt by the Cambridge East AAP prepared jointly with Cambridge City Council and adopted in 2008. The AAP is being retained and will guide the development of two parcels of land which are to be developed within the plan period (land north of Newmarket Road and north of Cherry Hinton). Policy SS/3 in the Local Plan confirms the allocation of these two parcels in section 2 of the policy.</p> <p>Highways Agency concerns concerning the strategic road network are addressed by retained AAP policy CE/10 and especially through paragraph 6 of the policy which relates to Transport Assessments.</p> <p>The current Green Belt boundary was established by the AAP after a process of consultation and public examination which</p>

	<p>took account of impacts upon Teversham and the need to retain a green corridor to the village. No compelling reasons to change the boundary have been put forward.</p> <p>Regarding safeguarding, the site is a sustainable location on the edge of Cambridge and well suited to development with few constraints to development. It was identified for development through four planning processes / public examinations – the 2003 Structure Plan, the Cambridge Local Plan 2006, SCDC Core Strategy in 2007 and in the Cambridge East AAP in 2008. There is no requirement in the NPPF that safeguarded land must be deliverable, and as an allocated site can be considered to be developable within the terms of the NPPF. Its safeguarding is entirely appropriate given the intention of safeguarding to retain the potential of the site in meeting longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period which is more than 15 years in the future. If it becomes available, it will be for future reviews of the Local Plan to consider whether it remains appropriate to finally allocate the site for development.</p> <p>The airport site is not relied on to meet the development needs of the area in this plan period except as set out in policy SS/3. It is agreed that it is not certain at this time whether the site will become available for redevelopment in the longer term.</p> <p>Other detailed objections relate to matters that were considered at public examinations before the land was taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for development, and to matters addressed by the policies of the AAP.</p> <p>The AAP made clear that development could take place north of Newmarket Road with or without the airport coming forward and also that the potential of this land could be further explored as has been the case in the Local Plan.</p> <p>There is no need to show the Park & Ride site on figure 7. It is addressed by the AAP and shown on the AAP concept diagram. Figure 7 is not intended to show this level of detail.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Policy SS/4: Cambridge Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station

Issues and Options 2012 Issue 110	Cambridge Northern Fringe East
Key evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment Land Review Update 2012 • South Cambridgeshire Economic Development Strategy 2010 • Cambridge Cluster at 50 • Cambridge Northern Fringe East Viability Study
Existing policies	Site Specific Policies DPD: SP/17 Rail Infrastructure
Analysis	<p>The Local development Framework safeguarded the Chesterton Sidings for the development of a railway station and interchange facility. The Secretary of State for Transport recently confirmed the decision that the proposed Chesterton Station will be developed, now to be known as Cambridge Science Park Station. The proposal will be taken into account in the forthcoming train operating franchises and the County Council have announced that they propose to borrow the necessary money to deliver the funding, with a proposed opening year of 2015. Repayment would be achieved through the franchises. The proposed railway station will be served by the guided busway from St.Ives.</p> <p>The possibility of relocating the Waste Water Treatment Works was explored through the 2006 Cambridge Local Plan, South Cambridgeshire's Site Specific Policies DPD and the County Council's Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework. Viability and options work undertaken by Roger Tym and Partners in 2008 concluded that comprehensive redevelopment of the site would not be viable and alternative mainly employment-led development options should be explored. This approach is also consistent with the findings of the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Employment Land Review (2008) and update (2011) and the Cambridge Cluster at 50 Study (2011).</p> <p>Rather than produce a separate Area Action Plan, it was agreed by the City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council in March 2011 that the future coordination and policy development for Cambridge Northern Fringe East should be incorporated within each Council's Local Plans.</p> <p>The location forms part of a wider opportunity area for development with land in the City of Cambridge in the Cowley Road area, and it is proposed in the Cambridge Local Plan Issues and Options Report for high density mixed employment led development including associated supporting uses to create a vibrant new employment centre. This area also forms an area of search for a Household Recycling Centre to serve the North of Cambridge, and as a location for inert waste recycling. Any</p>

	<p>proposals for these facilities would need to be explored alongside other uses in the area.</p> <p>Key principles for development could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regeneration of the wider area in a coherent and comprehensive manner; • Provision of high density mixed employment led development including associated supporting uses to create a successful new employment centre; • Development to achieve excellent standards of sustainability and design quality; • To secure delivery of a major new transport interchange to service Cambridge and the Sub-region based on high quality access for all modes; • Improvements to existing public transport access to and from Northern Fringe East, with extended and re-routed local bus routes as well as an interchange facility with the Guided Bus. • Improved access for cyclist and pedestrians. • Delivery of high quality, landmark buildings and architecture; and • To minimise the environmental impacts of the WWTW and to support greater environmental sustainability in the operation of the site. <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: Chesterton Sidings is the only part of the area within South Cambridgeshire. The Station forms part of the Local Transport Plan, and is a major element of the transport strategy for Cambridge.</p>
<p>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</p>	<p>Objective A: To support economic growth by supporting South Cambridgeshire's position as a world leader in research and technology based industries, research, and education; and supporting the rural economy.</p> <p>Objective B: To protect the character of South Cambridgeshire, including its built and natural heritage, as well as protecting the Cambridge Green Belt. New development should enhance the area, and protect and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Objective C: To provide land for housing in sustainable locations that meets local needs and aspirations, and gives choice about type, size, tenure and cost.</p> <p>Objective D: To deliver new developments that are high quality and well-designed with distinctive character that reflects their location, and which responds robustly to the challenges of climate change.</p> <p>Objective E: To ensure that all new development provides or has</p>

	<p>access to a range of services and facilities that support healthy lifestyles and well-being for everyone, including shops, schools, doctors, community buildings, cultural facilities, local open space, and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Objective F: To maximise potential for journeys to be undertaken by sustainable modes of transport including walking, cycling, bus and train.</p>
Final Issues and Options Approaches	<p>Question 110:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. What do you think are the key principles for the development of Cambridge Northern Fringe East? ii. Do you agree with our vision for the area? iii. Have we identified the right key principles for development? iv. What sites should be included in the boundary of the area?
Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary	<p>The option would contribute to addressing the wider needs of north east Cambridge. The option's focus on public transport led growth should have significant effects on reducing the reliance on the private car and help mitigate related transport emissions. Provision for an interchange between local buses and the Guided Bus as well as improved access for cyclist and pedestrians should also contribute significantly to transport objectives. The Option's identified key principles require high standards of sustainability and design quality which should help address key sustainability issues relating to the need for high standards of water efficiency, minimising landscape impacts and improving the quality of the built environment. It also primarily involves the redevelopment of previously developed land.</p>
Representations Received	<p>Question 110: Key principles for the development of Cambridge Northern Fringe East?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Do you agree the vision for the area of a high quality, high density, employment led redevelopment focussed on a new public transport interchange (guided bus and rail) at Chesterton Sidings? (S:21 (2 PC), O:1, C:6) ii. Have we identified the right principles for development? (S:7 (2 PC), O:2, C:8) iii. What sites should be included in the boundary of the area? (S:0 , O:0, C:7) <p>Comments: 6</p>
Key Issues from Representations	<p>What sites should be included in the boundary of the area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need consistent approach by City Council and South Cambridgeshire. • Sewage works (Cambridge City Council: explore down-sizing) • Include the area around Chesterton Fen Road; • Overall support for making the most of the railway/guided bus interchange • Last major redevelopment opportunity in/on edge of Cambridge

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a new road from Cowley Road area into Chesterton Fen (Milton PC & Fen Road residents association) • Don't build houses – too accessible for London commute • Include some housing as part of mix • Include marina/boat yard • Redevelopment should not prejudice operation of the sewage works (Anglia Water) • Concern on biodiversity impact • Car parking should be underground
Preferred Approach and Reasons	<p>Include a policy to enable the creation of a revitalised, employment focussed area centred on a new transport interchange, with a joint approach to planning with Cambridge City Council.</p> <p>There is general support for a high quality, employment-led redevelopment. A joint area action plan is now proposed to be prepared, to enable the effective regeneration of the area and provide a more comprehensive joint policy. Work is already underway with the City and County Councils and local stakeholders to develop an implementations plan.</p> <p>The proposed area does not include Chesterton Fen Road. The area contains a number of residential uses, in particular Gypsy and Traveller site provision. These uses are proposed to be safeguarded, so as to avoid displacement of this community.</p> <p>Include a policy safeguarding land at Chesterton Sidings for the development of a railway station and interchange facility in the Promoting and Delivering Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure Chapter.</p>
Policy included in the draft Local Plan?	<p>Policy SS/4: Cambridge Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station</p> <p>Policy TI/1: Chesterton Rail Station and Interchange</p> <p>Policy H/19: Provision for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</p>
Policy SS/4: Cambridge Northern Fringe East and land surrounding the proposed Cambridge Science Park Station (paragraphs 3.30 and 3.31)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	<p>Total: 21</p> <p>Support: 8 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC))</p> <p>Object: 13 (Including 1 from PC)</p>
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – Investment plan includes upgrades to water recycling centre by 2015 – provides capacity for growth to 2031. Should land become available, restrict uses to compatible, less sensitive development and not residential. Will advise on, but not fund, feasibility of works to reduce

	<p>odour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge City Council – Working together to produce complementary policies. Welcome continued joint working on production of an Area Action Plan (AAP). As landowner, support. Working closely with other landowners / stakeholders on AAP – important to bring forward development in phased manner to meet demand, enhance new station area and ensure appropriate infrastructure is in place. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Preparation of an Area Action Plan, in partnership, welcomed. Existing and proposed waste management and transport activities are essential infrastructure vital to sustainable development. • Oakington and Westwick PC- Support policy SS/4. • Support focus on high quality mixed-use employment-led development – appropriate given strategic location and function of site. Good fit with Waterbeach proposals in terms of balance of employment uses, availability of rail and bus-based public transport and additional labour new town offers. • New station and interchange will provide strategic infrastructure to facilitate growth. Logical to maximise employment in the area. Small scale residential development in Fen Ditton could be linked through high quality public transport, cycleways to new station, and employment area. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brookgate (site promoter) – Not consistent with NPPF or flexible to allow for changes in market conditions. No regard to necessary infrastructure or viability. Preparation of an AAP unnecessary and would slow delivery - agreed masterplan can guide development. Need a co-ordinated approach between City and SCDC. Seek inclusion of residential land uses. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future - Crucial development for future of Cambridge – must be employment-led and could create major new business district. Option for proposed CUFC community stadium. Masterplan urgently needed. Eastern boundary should be extended across railway line to the river. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Para 3.30 – last sentence should be deleted as ambiguous, it is not clear if it is suggesting any waste management or transport proposals need to be compatible with existing uses, or those yet to be proposed through Area Action Plan (AAP). Para 3.31 - proposals associated with aggregates railheads and ancillary uses cannot be made through AAP – must be addressed through County Council's Minerals and Waste Plan. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation – Land for B1, B2 and B8 uses falls within statutory height safeguarding zone. • Highways Agency – Appropriate to prepare Area Action Plan –
--	--

	<p>include reference to involving Highways Agency to ensure safe and efficient operation of A14 safeguarded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lafarge Tarmac - Minerals and waste related operations, rail sidings and land around station should be safeguarded to ensure current operations not impacted by proposals. Para 3.31 infers production of noise and dust from existing operations will be considered in terms of their long-term viability – viable operating area should be safeguarded. • Milton PC – Expect to be consulted on changes to A10/A14 junction - oppose loss of any recreation space. Infrastructure must be in place for any new development. • The Wildlife Trust – Omits mention of biodiversity, ecology and/or green infrastructure. Planning application for station identified site’s importance for biodiversity. Mitigation, compensation and enhancement needed. • Masterplan urgently needed with flexibility to overcome problem of odour from waste treatment works. • Extend Area Action Plan boundary - include land east of Milton interchange to help secure strategic highway improvements which may be needed to access site. • No evidence site will be delivered given history of non-delivery resulting from viability issues relating to relocation of waste water treatment works, odour issues, number of landowners and relocation of existing uses. Complex brownfield site.
Assessment	<p>Large areas of previously developed land are available for development on the northern fringe of Cambridge including land in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Located close to the Cambridge Science Park and the A14, the site will soon also have access to a new Science Park railway station and an interchange with the Cambridgeshire Guided Busway. Planning permission for the new railway station was granted in December 2013 and the new station will offer excellent links to London, Norwich and Kings Lynn, as well as to the Waterbeach New Town and Ely. Its facilities will include 450 car parking spaces and 1,000 cycle parking spaces. The station is planned to open in 2016.</p> <p>The area is suitable for many types of development and particularly for employment development and forms a key part of the sustainable development strategy for the Cambridge area. The nature of new development will need to take into account the presence of a major water recycling centre to the north of the area and an existing aggregates railhead and associated uses.</p> <p>Disagree that the proposed approach is inconsistent with the NPPF. Preparation of an AAP will allow all stakeholders to contribute to plan preparation. The policy is supported by the City Council both as a Local Planning Authority and as a key local</p>

	<p>landowner. Preparation of an AAP will not cause any substantive delays to delivery. No credible evidence has been presented regarding deliverable sites being held back. Redevelopment of the area has been included in adopted development plans for over 10 years including the 2003 Structure Plan, and the Cambridge Local Plan 2006 and the current SCDC Site Specific Policies DPD 2010).</p> <p>The importance of the site for employment development was highlighted by the Councils Employment Land Review. It provides a key opportunity to add to the employment cluster on the northern fringe of Cambridge, utilising the enhanced transport links the area will benefit from. The inclusion of a significant residential component would be inappropriate given the site's separation from other residential communities, schools, shops and services, and the unavoidable constraints imposed by odour from the water recycling centre, railway noise, and from the operation of minerals railheads and associated uses(subject to any mitigation measures identified through the AAP).</p> <p>It is unnecessary to include a reminder in the policy of the key role of the Highways Agency. Biodiversity and related matters are addressed by policy NH/4.</p> <p>It would be wrong to extend boundary of the area beyond the railway line as this could lead to the loss of a significant source of existing Gypsy & Traveller accommodation in the district. This accommodation is important to meet local needs and could not be met elsewhere in the District. Policy H/19 of the Local Plan safeguards existing Gypsy and Traveller sites from alternative forms of development.</p> <p>It is not necessary to include the Teardrop site in the AAP boundary to secure strategic highway improvements. This land is retained as Green Belt to provide separation to Milton.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>No change</p>

Figure 5: Illustration of Major Development Areas at West Cambridge, NIAB, North West Cambridge and Orchard Park

Figure 5: Illustration of Major Development Areas at West Cambridge, NIAB, North West Cambridge and Orchard Park	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 1 Support: 0 Object: 1
Main Issues	Object <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barratt and North West Cambridge Consortium – Amend 'NIAB' to 'Darwin Green'; Darwin Green Primary School should be notated with yellow star; northern boundary should be amended to reflect proposed allocation; red line around City area of major change should be completed.
Assessment	Agree that figure 5 should show the Primary School site located within Cambridge on the NIAB site that is currently missing. Agree that the red line should be extended to encompass the whole of the Area of Major Change in Cambridge. Disagree that it is necessary to replace the site description 'NIAB' with 'Darwin Green'. The former reflects historic land ownership and recent use whilst the later is a marketing name for the development. For consideration of the northern boundary change requested see the assessment of policy SS/2.
Approach in Submission Local Plan	Minor change Amend Figure 5 to include the missing primary School and correct the boundary of the Area of major Change in Cambridge.

Policy SS/5 Waterbeach New Town

Note: For the audit trail up to Proposed Submission Plan see the audit trail for Development Options within Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy

Policy SS/5 Waterbeach New Town (paragraphs 3.34, 3.35, 3.36, 3.37 and 3.39)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 473 Support: 42 Object: 431
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Farmland Museum and Denny Abbey – The Abbey and Museum provide an ideal place for community activities and events. • RLW Estates / Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) (promoters) – Support the designation of Waterbeach New Town. This is consistent with the Cambridge focussed spatial strategy and will enable housing delivery through the plan period and beyond. The project has significant sustainability advantages being partly PDL, located close to Cambridge, not in the Green Belt and with excellent opportunities for public and other non-car transport accessibility. The New Town proposal has significant advantages over the other options consulted on including the small new town, and the barracks only options. Development would provide a secure long-term future for the MOD landholding to secure new homes and jobs. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future - Support as a way of preserving the Cambridge Green Belt subject to dualling of the A10 with a bus lane to south, new railway station with good services to Cambridge and Science Park and a dedicated cycle route. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Support subject to mitigation of transport impacts requiring some or all of the following : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *A relocated Waterbeach station to serve the village and the new town, with platforms (capable of taking 12-carriage trains or 10-carriage InterCity Express trains. *A busway link from the station and town centre to north Cambridge including a fully segregated crossing of the A14 Trunk Road. *A Park & Ride site on the A10 to intercept traffic from the north of Waterbeach, served by the new busway link to Cambridge. *Direct, segregated high quality pedestrian and cycle links to north Cambridge including to Cambridge Science Park, to Milton, Cottenham, Histon and Impington, Landbeach, Horningsea, Fen Ditton, Chittering, Stretham and the Cambridge Research Park. *Additional capacity for general traffic between the northernmost

access to the new town and the Milton Interchange of the A10 with the A14 Trunk Road.

*Additional capacity at the Milton Interchange for movements between the A10 and A14, and the A14 and the A10.

*Delivery or funding of any measures required to mitigate the traffic impact of the new town on Horningsea, Fen Ditton, Milton and Landbeach.

*A Smarter Choices package including residential, school and workplace travel planning.

- **Natural England** - Support references to environmental issues in the policy.
- **Oakington and Westwick PC** – support.
- A large setting for Denny Abbey and Farmland Museum must be protected.
- Community facilities should be provided on a multi-use basis and be funded by the developer.
- The Bannold Road ‘gap’ must be protected as Green Belt.
- The Station must be easily accessible for village residents without needing a trip on the A10 as must the facilities and services of the new town.

Object

A high number of largely identical representations have been submitted as part of a local campaign opposed to the new town giving the following reasons:

- Objections concerning the railway station. Moving the railway station is unnecessary and a mistake. It is too far away to walk, and will generate extra traffic in the village and on the A10. Any new station needs good road access, car parking and lighting. Build a second station and keep the existing one open.
- Objections concerning the A10 and A14. Local roads are already inadequate and congested. It is not possible to widen them or provide bus lanes. Alternative routes would be harmful to the environment of Landbeach. Traffic on the roads already results in noise and pollution to Milton, these impacts need to be mitigated. Will worsen air quality. Traffic will increase in Waterbeach, need to avoid creating a rat run through the village.
- Objections concerning viability. The development will not be able to fund all the required infrastructure and remain viable.
- Objections concerning flood risk. Avoid building below the 5m contour. Will increase water runoff.
- Objections concerning employment. Inadequate provision for local employment. Will be a commuter town for Cambridge and London.
- Objections concerning impacts on the existing village. The

	<p>new town will dominate the existing village, the proposed separation measures will not work and are at risk of housing development. Landscape impacts. Biodiversity impacts. Local shops will close.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of agricultural land. <p>Other objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RLW Estates and DIO (promoters) – Setting study shows development boundary can be slightly larger without harm to Denny Abbey. Increase capacity to 9,000 to 10,000 homes. Allow earlier start and 3,500 in plan period • Milton PC – Will oppose any loss of local recreation space to improve the A10 and the A10/A14 junction. • The Farmland Museum and Denny Abbey - The policy needs to mention the Farmland Museum and recognise that access to some areas may need to be restricted. The old causeway track from the village to the Abbey should be used to allow access by bicycle and on foot. A better road access to the Abbey and Museum is required and a new and bigger car park. • The Wildlife Trust – Too large a scale of development to commit to before formal assessment of whether it can be accommodated without harm to ecology and biodiversity. • The National Trust - Policy should refer to the need to maximise the aims of the strategic green infrastructure allocation of the Wicken Vision. This should be explored in the AAP in consultation with the National Trust and other stakeholders. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Plan should ensure proper use of any excavated sand and gravel. Criteria h) should refer to a library. Secondary school capacity must be able to accommodate pupils from the existing village. Policy should refer to early years and post-16 provision. Operation of existing waste facility in area must not be compromised. • Environment Agency – Support allocation and phasing. However a flood risk assessment is needed of residual risks if flood defences on the River Cam fail. If defences are relied on the development should contribute to their upkeep. • English Heritage – The setting and significance of Denny Abbey must not be harmed. Any impacts on significance must be mitigated. A setting study is required. Policy must require archaeological evaluation of the site. Under p) add reference to WW2 structures. • Landbeach PC – Concerns about viability, transport, Denny Abbey, agricultural land, contamination, landscape impacts, village impacts, station and flooding.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water – Policy should refer to a foul drainage strategy. • Ely Group of IDB – A robust strategy for disposal of surface water is required. • Objections supporting a smaller scale of development. Rather than a large development allow a smaller scale of development on the barracks over the next few years to help support local shops and services that have suffered since the barracks closed. Develop the brownfield land first. • Objections concerning the adequacy of public transport. Public transport will not be able to cope so people will continue to use cars. • Development will also impact Landbeach and Milton. • No mention of needs of horse riders. No mention of River Cam and need to provide good links to it for benefit of the new town residents. • Objections concerning impact on Denny Abbey. • Barracks and airfield are contaminated and should not be allocated until level of contamination and costs/timescale of mitigation are understood. • Needs extra land outside of site boundary. • Site should be developed more quickly. • Site should not have been identified for development ahead of sites on the edge of Cambridge.
Assessment	<p>A new town north of Waterbeach is a key part of a sustainable development strategy for the wider Cambridge area. It provides an opportunity to deliver sustainable development to help meet the housing needs of the district. It can include an element of self-containment and high quality services and facilities to provide for the needs of its residents, alongside the opportunity to provide high quality sustainable transport links to Cambridge.</p> <p>The proposed AAP is the appropriate mechanism for addressing in more detail: the way that the new town will come forward, its dwelling capacity, the northern boundary of built development having regard to the setting of Denny Abbey, access to the Abbey and Museum, education, the location of the new station and its accessibility, mitigation of impacts on the existing village, ecology and biodiversity, and the relationship of the new town to key external green infrastructure such as the river and Wicken Fen whilst noting that policy NH/6 already addresses the provision of, and links to, Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Agree that it would be appropriate to mention the Farmland Museum in the supporting text and at section 6 ff).</p>

	<p>Foul drainage and flood risk assessments and are addressed by other Local Plan policies (policies CC/7 and CC/9). There is no evidence that the site is at risk of any significant flood risk. The Environment Agency who have a strategic responsibility for flood risk management from main rivers, and the County Council who are responsible for managing local flood risk from surface and groundwater, both support the allocation. Policy CC/9 requires that a flood risk assessment be prepared.</p> <p>Education matters are addressed by policy criteria j) of the policy and by policy TI/9, and library provision by policy SC/4.</p> <p>Regarding heritage, agree that it would be appropriate to include reference to WW2 structures at section 6p. Regarding archaeology the policy already requires the assessment, conservation and enhancement of other heritage assets at section 6p.</p> <p>Regarding viability, the development will generate significant value over a period extending well beyond 2031 but will also require significant infrastructure expenditure over the same period. The SCDC CIL and Local Plan Viability Study at paragraph 3.3.32 notes that it appears highly likely that an adaptable master planning, phasing and delivery approach will be needed to help deliver this infrastructure. This will be via a S106 agreement from the developer, together with significant external funding, which would include City Deal if that were to be agreed. This is an expected consequence of the preferred spatial strategy, which concluded that future strategic scale development in the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge was not justified. It was also concluded that new settlements are preferable to more dispersed development in the rural area that would not generate the equivalent s106 funding or attract City Deal. The infrastructure requirements of dispersed development would be difficult to quantify and provide for and would provide a less sustainable pattern of development.</p> <p>Regarding employment it is not intended that the new town match the number of jobs in the town to the number of residents although it will include substantial employment provision. Residents working elsewhere will support the economy of the wider Cambridge area and will benefit from excellent public transport links to the employment areas on the Cambridge northern fringe and in Cambridge. It adjoins an existing business park. Some residents will choose to work in London but will be able to do this by rail travel from the new station. However it is planned to meet the housing needs of South Cambridgeshire.</p>
--	---

Regarding traffic and transport the County Council Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire demonstrates that appropriate solutions to the transport impacts of the new town exist. These will be further developed in the AAP. Implementation will follow a grant of planning permission for development and would be supported by funding from the City Deal if this is agreed. The policy lists the transport measures sought by the County Council including all those in their representation.

The location of the new railway station will be agreed as part of the Area Action Plan. A location close to the existing village will be sought to best serve the existing village, and for parts of it the location will be closer than the existing station. Direct access by all modes from the existing village and good lighting and car and cycle parking are matters that can be addressed by the AAP. Regarding a second station the County Council (and Network Rail) consider that this would not be acceptable. Neither could the existing station alone provide for the new town. It has inadequate parking and this approach would mean traffic from the new town coming through the village.

Consideration was given to the merits of a smaller scale of development on the site during the Issues and Options stage of plan making. It was not included in the Local Plan given the greater benefits of a larger scale of development. The District Council is working with the community to seek to mitigate the immediate implications on village shops and other businesses caused by the closure of the barracks. Consideration can be given in the Area Action Plan to whether the development could include an early phase of development on the barracks site to increase demand in the village over the medium term.

Regarding impacts on the existing village these are considered to be capable of mitigation through careful Masterplanning and which will be secured through the Area Action Plan and subsequent planning applications. In time, the village will benefit from access to the services and facilities and open spaces of the new town. The Council is resisting proposals to develop for housing part of the green separation between the village and the new town that is proposed to be designated as Green Belt.

Regarding the needs of horse riders agree that the Local Plan should include appropriate references. The existing Development Control DPD requires such provision. It is proposed that appropriate references are included in policy HQ/1 'Design Principles' at part f), where they would apply to all scales of

	<p>housing development.</p> <p>Land outside the development boundary is needed for the relocation of the waste water treatment works. This land is in the control of the promoters. The site for the new facility could be included as a proposal for consultation in a future update of the County Council's Minerals and Waste Plan or addressed through a planning application.</p> <p>Further consideration is given to Green Belt issues in relation to policy S/4, and to the development strategy to 2031 regarding the phasing of development and alternative development options on the edge of Cambridge in policy S/6.</p> <p>A minor change regarding the needs of horse riders is proposed to policy HQ/1: Design Principles.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Add reference to the Farmland Museum in criterion 6ff: “ff. Review the access arrangements to Denny Abbey <u>and the Farmland Museum</u>”.</p> <p>Add the words <u>Farmland Museum</u> to the 5th line of paragraph 3.36: “.....new town and a substantial green setting for the new town, Denny Abbey <u>and Farmland Museum</u>, and Waterbeach village.”</p> <p>Add a reference to WW2 structures to criterion 6p as follows: “p. Assessment, conservation and enhancement of other heritage assets as appropriate to their significance, including non-designated assets such as Car Dyke, <u>World War 2 structures</u>, and the Soldiers Hill Earthworks”.</p> <p>Include provision for horse riders in policy HQ/1 at criterion f) as follows: “...conveniently accessible streets <u>routes</u> both within the development...delivering attractive and safe opportunities for walking, cycling, <u>horse riding</u> and public transport;”</p>

Policy SS/6: New village at Bourn Airfield

Note: For the audit trail up to Proposed Submission Plan see the audit trail for Development Options within Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy.

Policy SS/6: New village at Bourn Airfield	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 1839 Support: 22 Object: 1817
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swavesey PC – Support statements regarding foul drainage and sewage disposal. Increased flood risk to Swavesey must be avoided. • Cambridgeshire County Council – Support subject to significant measures to mitigate transport impacts. • Cambridge Past Present and Future – Support subject to landscaping and public transport improvements. • Natural England - Support references to environmental issues in the policy. • The Taylor Family and Countryside Properties (the promoters) – The site is deliverable and viable, as demonstrated by their concept masterplan. Bourn Airfield will not give rise to any significant landscape and visual impacts and will enhance landscape character, restoring lost landscape features. • Brownfield land, will bring infrastructure improvements, better public transport, much needed housing, and better services and facilities. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • StopBAD - Planning applications have been previously considered and rejected - grounds are still valid. Insufficient local employment. Major employment centres are located in Cambridge and to north and south. Limited transport links. Site is too small to accommodate 3,500 houses at density compatible with Council policies. Bourn Airfield together with West Cambourne would create a urban swathe of development stretching nearly 5 miles along A428. Preparation of the Local Plan deviated from Government good practice for SHLAA. Plan has not given sufficient weight to NPPF sustainability requirements. <p>A high number of largely identical representations have been</p>

	<p>submitted as part of a local campaign opposed to the new village giving the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Plan will effectively create a town by stealth by coalescing villages together- new town will stretch from West Cambourne to Hardwick. ○ Bourn Airfield and West Cambourne developments will create new traffic that local infrastructure can't support. ○ Plan proposes too many houses in small space, which will inevitably compromise aspects such as community facilities and separation from existing settlements, and result in higher densities. ○ Plan is unsustainable- lack of local employment opportunities and sustainable transport links. ○ Consultation carried out by the Council was flawed. The opinions of local people have not been listened to, and the plans presented were misleading/ incorrect. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● North Hertfordshire District Council – Could have traffic impacts at Royston from commuters using the train station. ● The Wildlife Trust - Point m. should read "Provide a high degree of connectivity to existing corridors and ecological networks." ● Cambridgeshire County Council – A Household Waste Recycling Centre is needed in the BA/Cambourne area. Reference to library provision needed. Policy references to secondary education are positive, but it is critical that there is sufficient flexibility within the planning of this to ensure that the new school compliments existing secondary school provision in the local area. Policy should refer to all phases of education provision. ● Environment Agency – Allocation mostly justified, but a surface water attenuation strategy is needed. ● Anglian Water - Policy should refer to a foul drainage strategy. ● English Heritage - English Heritage has no objection in principle to this proposal. However, we would wish to see provision made for archaeological evaluation. ● Parish Council objections from Bourn, Caldecote, Cambourne, Caxton, Elsworth, Hardwick, Toft, Madingley, Kingston – Concerns regarding traffic, flooding, impacts on surrounding villages and rural character, creation of ribbon development, pressure on services, too close to Cambourne to provide a viable centre, relies on delivery of infrastructure and past experience has shown it is not always delivered, significant costs may make it unviable, relies on west Cambourne to support and enable development, not enough space to deliver housing and openspace, flawed consultation, poor access to railway at St Neots, no reference made to site
--	--

	<p>governance, better alternatives have not been explored.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barton PC – Support all housing proposals. Better link to the M11 required. • Great and Little Eversden PC – Should not be considered until Northstowe fully developed. • The Taylor Family and Countryside properties (Promoters) – An AAP is not needed, a Supplementary Planning Document would be sufficient. No Major Development Area should be defined by the Local Plan. A north west access using the Broadway can be achieved with careful design. • Gestamp–Tallent (Owner of part of employment area on site) - Support inclusion of site as employment allocation; enable redevelopment to modern standards. Should not be restricted to B1 uses; approach in keeping with policy E/12, which provides for B1, B2 and B8 uses in scale with location. Recognise role in providing employment for new village and integration with new village and associated green separation proposals can be considered through Area Action Plan process. Site also has shorter term role in providing employment opportunities to meet district requirements and support local economy generally and can be developed successfully independently. Development of site should not be delayed or phased to follow proposed phasing of the Major Development Area. • MCA Developments (Cambourne developer) – No vehicular access including for public transport possible from Cambourne to the Broadway and Bourn Airfield. Unsustainable and not viable. Ribbon development, landscape impacts. • Martin Grant Homes and Harcourt Developments – Development north of the A428 (Harbourne) should be preferred. • Road improvements required as well as public transport improvements. Public transport proposals inadequate. New rail link required or guided bus link. Air quality impacts. Growth at St Neots also affects the route to Cambridge. A428 to St Neots is already inadequate and at capacity. Too far to cycle to Cambridge. Rat running through villages. Impossible to put a bus lane in on the A1303 due to houses and the American Cemetery. • Include a bus link pass just to the north of Caldecote to serve that village better. • Objections concerning flood risk. Bourn WWTW should not be expanded. • Objections concerning landscape impacts. Village separation will not be effective. Impact on the Broadway. Loss of biodiversity and nature.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections concerning impacts on surrounding villages • Destruction of archaeology • Inadequate provision for schools and other services. Must include a new supermarket. Will impact on Cambourne • Put the development at Northstowe, Waterbeach, Hanley Grange, on edge of Cambridge, at Six Mile Bottom, at existing villages. Too much development in Cambourne area over last 15 years. • Develop the airfield for employment use. • Loss of agricultural land • Add references to making provision for horse riders to the policy at sections m, v and w • Loss of an airfield and associated use. Historic airfield. Petition with 99 signatures. • Noisy industry on site will reduce residential area and capacity • A north west access must affect the Broadway • P&R site will reduce housing capacity • No provision of affordable housing for local people • Site has been considered for development in the past and rejected.
<p>Assessment</p>	<p>A range of issues raised in representations on the Bourn Airfield site address strategic issues, which have been considered in the spatial strategy chapter (Policy S/6). A range of alternative sites and development strategies were considered through the plan making process, and on balance the opportunities provided by Bourn Airfield, in combination with other developments on the A428 corridor was identified as an appropriate element of the strategy for the wider Cambridge area.</p> <p>A new village at Bourn Airfield provides an opportunity to provide for sustainable development, with an element of self-containment and high quality services and facilities to provide for the needs of its residents. It is recognised that the new village will provide for the development needs of the District and there will also be residents travelling to jobs and services elsewhere. Bourn Airfield gives the opportunity to provide high quality sustainable transport links to Cambridge.</p> <p>Whilst the site has been rejected previously, sites must be considered on their merits and their potential to meet the needs of the District at the time of the plan review. The results of the plan making process now demonstrate that it should form part of the strategy for the wider Cambridge area moving forward.</p> <p>The proposed Area Action Plan (AAP) is the appropriate mechanism for exploring in more detail the way that the new</p>

village will come forward, its relationship with nearby settlements, the mix of land uses, and other issues about how the site will develop as a place. The landowners are concerned that this will delay delivery of the site, but an AAP focusing on key issues can be prepared relatively quickly.

The Local Plan identifies the major development site, which will accommodate the built development on the new village, with a wider area included in the area to be addressed by the Area Action Plan. A similar approach has been taken with previous Area Action Plans within the adopted Local Development Framework.

Landscape impacts are capable of mitigation including avoiding creating the appearance of a ribbon of development south of the A428, and ensuring effective landscaped separation from Highfields Caldecote, Bourn, and Cambourne. This will require substantial landscape buffers between the settlements and a carefully designed structural landscape for the new development, that also addresses how it is viewed in the wider landscape.

Capacity of the site was explored in the SHLAA, and there is capacity to accommodate the scale of development anticipated. Densities will vary across the whole site with scope for higher densities in the settlement centre and lower densities around the settlement edge. Average net densities across the site with a range of 30dph to 40dph have been explored. Delivering the planned level of housing would require towards the lower end of the range. The August 2013 SHLAA technical assessment demonstrates that a capacity of 3,500 homes can be achieved on 40% of the wider AAP area of 282 hectares at a density of between 30 dph and 35 dph. The promoters alternative land budget methodology confirms that densities will be in this vicinity on average across the site as a whole. The actual capacity at Bourn Airfield will be arrived at following a design led approach and confirmed in the required AAP.

Viability has been explored in evidence prepared to accompany the plan. The biggest issue for this site is likely to be the delivery of transport infrastructure. As well as the value generated by the development (in the form of CIL or S106), there are other sources of funding that will help deliver the development strategy, in particular the City Deal if approved.

The transport impacts of this site and the Local Plan have been explored through transport modelling. A range of transport measures are detailed in the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, produced by the County Council to

accompany the plans. This includes significant public transport improvements along the A428 corridor. There are a number of options for addressing bus priority on the A1303. The arrangement of Cambourne West and Bourn airfield, in combination with the existing Cambourne site will provide a particular opportunity to deliver a high quality public transport route. The Council will continue to work with the transport authority and surrounding authorities to address transport issues.

The Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Transport Strategy includes provision of additional park and ride on the A428 corridor. It does not specify that this must be on the Bourn Airfield site, and options are being explored. The Transport Strategy also identifies capacity improvements for the A428 between Caxton Gibbet and Black Cat in the medium to long-term, and the Highways Agency is also exploring measures to improve the A428 corridor through a Route Based Strategy.

Detailed options for the north west access will need to be explored through the AAP, but the plan requires no direct road access onto the Broadway.

Development will support focused delivery of new infrastructure to support the new village, including a new secondary school, retail and other services and facilities commensurate with a Rural Centre, whilst complementing and not competing with Cambridge or Cambourne Village Centre.

The new settlement will include employment opportunities, including the redevelopment on the adjoining employment areas. Whilst not every resident is likely to be employed in the village, people working in or close to Cambridge will have the opportunity to live in the village, served by high quality public transport links with the city.

Planning permission has been granted for the redevelopment of the former TKA Tallent site, for B2, supported by B1 and B8 uses. Policy paragraph c already includes sufficient flexibility to accommodate these uses in suitable locations compatible with the wider new village. On the Policies Map the site is included within Policy SS/6 should be coloured the same as the rest of the new village allocation, rather than the employment colour. It is not addressed in a separate employment policy. A minor change is proposed to this effect.

The Council has carried out appropriate consultation through the plan making process. It was identified as an option through the

issues an options consultation in 2012, prior to its inclusion in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Issues are addressed further in the response to representations on chapter 1 Introduction.

It became apparent during the Proposed Submission consultation that a number of technical updates were needed to the SHLAA document. The SHLAA was updated and the consultation period was extended to provide a full six week period from the date the update was published to ensure full opportunity for comments to be made in light of these. Representors and stakeholders were advised of this. Diagrams in consultation material illustrating the site location were accurate, and the plan includes detailed maps of the site location.

Flood risk is capable of being appropriately managed, and evidence indicates that there are likely to be opportunities to reduce flood risk downstream by managing and reducing run-off from the site (consultants reports submitted by the promoters indicate potential for 60% reductions against current run off). There may also be opportunities to improve Bourn Brook, by better managing flows. The policy includes a requirement for sustainable surface water drainage measures, and it should be read alongside the policies on water quality and sustainable drainage in the Climate Change chapter, so additional detail does not need to be added to the Bourn Airfield policy which is already covered elsewhere in the plan.

The Council has worked with Anglian Water and the Environment Agency, who have confirmed that the site is capable of being appropriately served for foul drainage. The policy requires arrangements to be made for foul drainage and sewage disposal. Anglian Water has requested this be demonstrated through a Foul Drainage Strategy. A minor change is proposed to reflect this.

The County Council indicate a Household Waste Recycling Centre may be needed in this area. They are currently reviewing their position on provision across the whole county which may clarify its position. The Council will continue to work with the County Council in their role as waste planning authority.

Impacts on the County Wildlife Site can be appropriately addressed, and the site will provide opportunities for biodiversity mitigation and enhancement, and the delivery of Green Infrastructure. Green Infrastructure connectivity is not purely about ecology, therefore the change proposed by the Wildlife Trust is not supported.

	<p>Appropriate archaeological assessment is required by the National Planning Policy Framework, and is addressed elsewhere in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Governance of the site has been raised as an issue by Parish Councils. The site falls primarily in the Bourn Parish, and partly in the Caldecote Parish. Like other recent major developments, arrangements for future governance of the new settlement would need to be considered as the site is progressed in close consultation with the Parish Councils, in parallel with the planning process but separate from it. This may take the form of a new Parish. It is an important issue for the implementation of the new village but this is not a matter for the Local Plan.</p> <p>The majority of the site is agricultural land, but there are some significant areas of previously developed land, in particular the runways. The development of agricultural land is inevitable in a rural area like South Cambridgeshire in order to meet the needs of the district, but the airfields sites provide an opportunity to utilise large sites which include significant previously developed elements.</p> <p>It will be important to provide connectivity, through existing and enhanced right of way networks, and this should include consideration of bridleways. A minor change is proposed to reflect this.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Change the order of policies in the Local Plan so the policy for Northstowe (SS/7), is before Waterbeach New Town (Policy SS/5), and Bourn Airfield (SS/6) comes after so that policies for the A428 corridor are grouped together.</p> <p>Add to end of policy SS/6 paragraph m – ‘Provide a high degree of connectivity to existing corridors and networks, <u>including through an enhanced network of footpaths and bridleways.</u>’</p> <p>Move paragraph ‘t’ to be under heading of Significant Public Transport Improvements rather than Measures to promote cycling and walking (previously highlighted in errata).</p> <p>Add to end of policy SS/6 paragraph dd – ‘ Arrangements for foul drainage and sewage disposal, <u>to be explored and identified through a Foul Drainage Strategy</u>’</p> <p>Correct the Policies Map to colour the former Thyssen Krupp site as major development site, rather than the employment allocation colour.</p>

Policy SS/7: Northstowe Extension

Note: For the audit trail up to Proposed Submission Plan see the audit trail for Development Options within Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy.

Policy SS/7: Northstowe Extension (paragraph 3.49)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 12 Support: 4 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 7
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth. • Gallagher Estates (site promoter) – Contribution to growth reaffirmed through SHLAA and SA. Endorsed Northstowe Development Framework Document refreshes masterplan and includes extension - comprehensive approach to planning and delivery. • Oakington and Westwick PC – Support policy SS/7. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ely Group of Internal Drainage Boards – Must continue discussions with IDB and Environment Agency through Technical Liaison Group to cover any extension. • English Heritage – Need for archaeological evaluation should be identified in policy or text. • Homes and Communities Agency (site promoter) – Change 9,500 to 10,000 homes for consistency with Northstowe Area Action Plan. The Northstowe Development Framework Masterplan and Core Strategy - refers to “up to 10,000” dwellings. • Identified as reserve land in Area Action Plan. Delays with delivery mean not required in plan period - no need to allocate within Local Plan. Remain longer-term strategic reserve site. • Site should not have been identified ahead of suitable sites on edge of Cambridge which can promote sustainable patterns of development and transport consistent with NPPF. • 3,500 houses should be added to Northstowe to the north of the guided busway, so infrastructure costs can be aggregated in one location and maximized to create a more sustainable and viable development. • Whole Northstowe plan should be rescinded as the local area, including travel infrastructure, cannot sustain excessive growth. Damage to countryside and destroying ecology.

<p>Assessment</p>	<p>Agree that the Local Plan should be consistent with the adopted AAP for Northstowe with regard to dwelling capacity. The AAP was adopted following testing through examination.</p> <p>Development of the Northstowe Extension is required to enable delivery of the allocated site and may come forward for development before the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Consideration of the most appropriate development strategy for the district is given in regard to policy S/6: Development Strategy to 2031.</p> <p>The proposed development of homes to the north of the guided busway was considered through the SHLAA and found not potentially capable of providing residential development taking account of site factors and constraints including townscape and landscape impacts and the difficulties arising from developing beyond the busway.</p> <p>Policy NH/14:Heritage Assets, requires that appropriate consideration be given to archaeology.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Correct the factual inaccuracy in line 3 of the policy by deleting 9,500 and replacing it with <u>10,000</u>.</p>

Policy SS/8: Cambourne West

Note: For the audit trail up to Proposed Submission Plan see the audit trail for Development Options within Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy.

Policy SS/8: Cambourne West (paragraphs 3.51, 3.55, 3.56, 3.60)	
Proposed Submission Representations Received	Total: 566 Support: 18 Object: 548
Main Issues	<p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridgeshire County Council - Development at Bourn Airfield and Cambourne West is likely to require significant measures to be provided in mitigation of their transport impacts. • Natural England - Support references to environmental issues in the policy. • Anglian Water - Section 14. It is recommended the following is added: 'A foul drainage strategy should be prepared in liaison with statutory sewerage undertaker'. • Swavesey PC - Support statements regarding foul drainage and sewage disposal. Increased flood risk to Swavesey must be avoided. • Papworth Everard PC – Support section c) of the policy. To include a cycle and pedestrian bridge over the A428. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Support subject to preparation of a masterplan demonstrating integration with rest of Cambourne, the Business Park and the Village College. A landscape enhancement plan is required. • Cycle and pedestrian links are essential. The A1198 junction must be improved before development as it is a major barrier to cyclists and delays car journeys. • Landscaped soil bunds to control traffic noise are a prerequisite and must be planned in advance. <p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MCA Developments Ltd (Site promoter) – Support principle. but site should extend to Caxton Gibbet for 2,200 homes with extensive green corridors and open space. Object to inclusion of the Business Park in Cambourne West. It is not under control of MCA which would constrain delivery, but could be developed independently, delete paragraph 6. Object to employment requirements as not based on evidence of need. Object to transport requirements in section 11 as inflexible and unjustified and implying that they are the sole responsibility of

	<p>the Cambourne West promoters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Securities (Business Park owner) – Support allocation but object to policy requiring that residential development only comes forward after the employment development is secured in Cambourne West as this is unnecessary and unreasonable. Land south of the access road should be allowed to come forward quickly. Concerns about using the Business Park road as a main access to Cambourne West. • Cambridgeshire County Council - A HWRC is needed in the BA/Cambourne area. • North Hertfordshire District Council – Could have traffic impacts at Royston from commuters using the train station. • The Wildlife Trust – Include policy text: "Provide a high degree of connectivity to existing corridors and ecological networks." • Objections from Parish Councils, Cambourne, Caxton, Caldecote, Bourn, Elsworth – Transport impacts including rat running through villages, inadequate infrastructure, relies on BA to enable required transport infrastructure, poor public transport, distant from railway stations, impact on Cambourne, ribbon development and village coalescence, loss of rural character, unsustainable location far from jobs, better alternatives exist that have not been tested, loss of Business Park (should be retained in its current location even if site remains in the plan), broken promises. No reference to governance even though land is within Caxton. Need for youth provision. Inadequate open space. • Environment Agency - Needs phasing with waste water infrastructure and policy to reflect this - need to be sure that it is deliverable within Water Framework Directive limits. Need surface water strategy. • English Heritage – The need for archaeological evaluation of site should be included in the policy. <p>A high number of largely identical representations have been submitted as part of a local campaign opposed to the site giving the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Plan will effectively create a town by stealth by coalescing villages together- new town will stretch from West Cambourne to Hardwick. ○ Bourn Airfield and West Cambourne developments will create new traffic that local infrastructure can't support. ○ Plan proposes too many houses in small space, which will inevitably compromise aspects such as community facilities and separation from existing settlements.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Plan is unsustainable- lack of local employment opportunities and sustainable transport links. ○ Consultation carried out by the Council was flawed. The opinions of local people have not been listened to, and the plans presented were misleading/ incorrect. ● Objections concerning impacts on traffic and local roads and congestion. Road to St Neots will not be able to cope. Roundabout at the junction of the A1198 and the A428 inadequate. Inadequate public transport. 4,000 homes planned at St Neots. ● Swansley Wood Farm indents the boundary of the allocation. Site owner objects and requests that the farm should be included in the development boundary for residential. ● Objections concerning the Business Park. Keep employment together in one location. Loss of land for employment. ● Objections that the location is unsustainable. Poor access to jobs. Inadequate retail provision. Poor access to railway stations. ● Objections that the infrastructure and services and facilities in Cambourne will not cope. That Cambourne will become a town. That development will be too dense and so compromise delivery of community facilities. Cannot be integrated into the rest of the village properly. Departs from original concept. ● Impact on landscape and setting. ● Impact on surrounding villages. Site is located within Caxton Parish. ● Any east–west rail link from Bedford to Cambridge must service Cambourne and Bourn Airfield with one or more new stations ● Policy should include provision for bridleways in points 6, 11c and 11i. ● Consider alternatives such as Hanley Grange, Six Mile Bottom, Northstowe, on the edge of Cambridge, in the villages. ● Will increase flood risk to local villages. ● Will not be viable, relies on Bourn Airfield for transport improvements. ● Loss of agricultural land.
Assessment	<p>A number of issues raised in representations on the Cambourne West site raise strategic issues, which have been considered in the spatial strategy chapter (policy S/6). A range of alternative sites and development strategies were considered through the plan making process, and on balance the opportunities provided by Cambourne West, in combination with other developments on the A428 corridor, is an appropriate part of the strategy for the wider Cambridge area.</p>

	<p>The development of a fourth linked village to the west of Cambourne is a key part of a sustainable development strategy for the wider Cambridge area. It provides an opportunity to provide for sustainable development, with an element of self-containment and high quality services and facilities to provide for the needs of its residents. It is recognised that the new village will provide for the development needs of the District and there will also be residents travelling to jobs and services elsewhere. It will also give the opportunity to provide high quality sustainable transport links to Cambridge.</p> <p>The site is capable of being effectively integrated with Cambourne particularly by making use of the access road to the Business Park and development will make the location of Cambourne Village College more central to the overall village, and make best use of access to this key local facility. Residential on the current remaining land in the business park would help integrate the new village with displaced employment replaced in the northern part of the new site, providing scope for a wider range of employment, an issue identified in the Cambourne Retail and Employment Study. The policy requires new employment to be secured in advance of the development of the business park for housing, in order to ensure that employment opportunities are not lost.</p> <p>Currently the site indents around the Swansley Wood Farm house and buildings. A representation now confirms that the land is available for development, and seeks its inclusion within the site. As a logical rounding off of the site, that simply incorporates existing built uses into the site, a minor change is proposed to include this land within the site boundary.</p> <p>The transport impacts of this site and the Local Plan have been explored through transport modelling. A range of transport measures are detailed in the Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, produced by the County Council to accompany the plans. It includes consideration of other growth on the corridor, including at St.Neots. Significant public transport improvements along the A428 corridor are proposed. There are a number of options for addressing bus priority on the A1303. The arrangement of Cambourne West and Bourn airfield, in combination with the existing Cambourne site will provide a particular opportunity to deliver a high quality public transport route along this corridor to Cambridge.</p> <p>The policy establishes that the development will provide for the additional travel demands generated. A coordinated strategy for improvements on the A428 corridor will be required, with</p>
--	--

appropriate contributions from this site. The policy establishes measures that will be required to be addressed. The biggest issue for this site is likely to be the delivery of transport infrastructure. Viability has been explored in evidence prepared to accompany the plan. As well as the value generated by the development (in the form of CIL or S106), there are other sources of funding that will help deliver the development strategy, in particular the City Deal if approved.

The development will provide or contribute to the improvement of facilities to meet the needs generated, and will support the continued development of the village as a Rural Centre. A new Local Centre will be needed for Cambourne West itself.

The County Council indicate a Household Waste Recycling Centre may be needed in this area. They are currently reviewing their position on provision across the whole county which may clarify its position. The Council will continue to work with the County Council in their role as waste planning authority.

Flood risk is capable of being appropriately managed. The policy includes a requirement for sustainable surface water drainage measures, and it should be read alongside the policies on water quality and sustainable drainage in the Climate Change chapter. The policy requires arrangements to be made for foul drainage and sewage disposal. Anglian Water has requested this be demonstrated through a Foul Drainage Strategy. A minor change is proposed to reflect this.

Appropriate archaeological assessment is required by the National Planning Policy Framework, and is addressed elsewhere in the Local Plan.

Governance of the site has been raised as an issue by Parish Councils. The site falls primarily in the Caxton Parish, and partly in the Cambourne Parish. Like other recent major developments, arrangements for future governance of the new settlement would need to be considered as the site is progressed in close consultation with the Parish Councils, in parallel with the planning process but separate from it. It is an important issue for the implementation of the site but this is not a matter for the Local Plan.

The site does comprise agricultural land. The development of agricultural land is inevitable in a rural area like South Cambridgeshire in order to meet the needs of the district, given the limited previously developed land available. The Local Plan does

	<p>utilise previously developed land in a number of other major developments.</p> <p>The Local Plan will require delivery of openspace, and Green Infrastructure, to meet the needs of the new development and enhance Cambourne's Green Infrastructure network. It will be important to provide connectivity, through existing and enhanced right of way networks, and this should include consideration of bridleways. A minor modification is proposed to reflect this. Green Infrastructure connectivity is not purely about ecology, therefore the change proposed by the Wildlife Trust is not supported.</p> <p>The Council has carried out appropriate consultation through the plan making process. It was identified as an option through the issues an options consultation in 2012, prior to its inclusion in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Issues are addressed further in the response to representations on chapter 1 Introduction.</p> <p>It became apparent during the Proposed Submission consultation that a number of technical updates were needed to the SHLAA document. The SHLAA was updated and the consultation period was extended to provide a full six week period from the date the update was published to ensure full opportunity for comments to be made in light of these. Representors and stakeholders were advised of this.</p> <p>A larger site extending all the way to the A1198 and Caxton Gibbet roundabout was considered through the plan making process but rejected. This was to address wider landscape impacts and reflects the topography of the site. The boundary will ensure that the fourth linked village is of a scale that relates well to the three other villages of Cambourne, and it also ensures that it will sit comfortably in its setting and retains a green foreground and long views across the open area which will remain to the west of Cambourne between the A1198 and A428. The importance of keeping land open in this locality was previously identified by the inspector who dismissed an appeal for one of the new village options considered in the run up to the approval of the original Cambourne outline planning permission. This took account of its prominence in the wider landscape.</p> <p>The local character of the 'western claylands' of South Cambridgeshire is of gently undulating arable farmland, the topography of which is divided by broad, shallow valleys. Within this area settlements are either located on the sides of small valleys, along spring lines, or on slightly elevated ground within broad valleys (District Design Guide: High Quality and Sustainable Development in south Cambridgeshire, Adopted March 2010).</p>
--	---

	<p>The settlements are primarily viewed at a distance, across fields, on the lower land on the valley sides.</p> <p>The importance of keeping land open in this locality was previously identified by the inspector who recommended refusal of a 'called in' application for one of the new settlement options considered in the run up to the approval of the original Cambourne outline planning permission because of its prominence in the wider landscape. The Inspector's recommendation was accepted by the Secretary of State.</p> <p>South of Caxton Gibbet the land falls southwards towards Caxton. A shallow valley runs north east to south west in the vicinity of Swansley Wood Farm and towards the Caxton roundabout. From that valley the land rises to a ridge of the higher land to the east. The buildings associated with Swansley Wood Farm, viewed from the A428 and A1198, reflects the character of local settlements viewed across agricultural fields. Any proposed development in this area would be more characteristic of the local context if it was restricted to the east side of the valley, where it would appear to be on the side of the valley slope, with distance views across open fields towards the new village. The impact of new development can be further softened with screen planting on the edge. Visually development should not extend further west than Swansley Wood Farm.</p> <p>Between the western edge of Cambourne and Oak Tree Cottage (one of a small group of buildings south of the A428) the A428 is at the same level as the adjacent fields proposed for development, and in places higher, making any development to its south far more visible and closer than local settlement characteristics. To the west of Oak Tree Cottage the proposed development site is partially screened by the planting alongside the old alignment of the A428. At Cambourne itself the A428 is in a cutting at a lower level than the development, in which context the screen mounding and planting there appears as an extension of the cutting embankment. To the west of Cambourne, any landscape mounding to screen the proposed development would be large and obviously an artificial device, uncharacteristic of the wider area to the west. The buildings associated with Swansley Wood Farm, viewed from the A428, resemble the appearance of local settlements viewed across agricultural fields, suggesting that visually any new development should not be closer to the A428 than Swansley Wood Farm.</p> <p>A limited extension of the Cambourne Business Park westwards would be acceptable to the west of the business park and north-east of the secondary school. This area is screened from the A428 to the east by the existing peripheral planting for</p>
--	--

	<p>Cambourne, reducing the visual impact of any potential development there. However from the west this area is visible and presents the opportunity to create a built edge to Cambourne which steps down to the west creating a settlement edge that is more characteristic in scale and mass to the local settlement pattern. To prevent uncharacteristic visual intrusion into the landscape any larger units should be located away from the northern and western boundaries, with smaller units on the new village edge.</p> <p>Along the north side of the A1198 Caxton Bypass to the west of the roundabout at the southern entrance to Cambourne, there is a landscaped buffer strip providing visual containment to the existing village. This could be extended westwards along the rest of the northern side of the A1198 up to the roundabout to the north of Caxton. Here the A1198 is in shallow cutting and any additional screen mounding and planting would not be incongruous.</p>
<p>Approach in Submission Local Plan</p>	<p>Minor change</p> <p>Amend the boundary shown on the Proposed Submission Policies Map to include the Swansley Wood Farm buildings within the major development site boundary.</p> <p>Add to end of policy SS/8 paragraph 14 – ‘Satisfactory arrangements being made for foul drainage and sewage disposal, <u>to be explored and identified through a Foul Drainage Strategy</u>’</p> <p>Add to end of policy SS/8 paragraph 2 – ‘This setting will provide part of the publicly accessible green infrastructure of the settlement, and be well connected to Cambourne’s existing green network and the wider countryside, <u>including through an enhanced network of footpaths and bridleways.</u>’</p> <p>Amend paragraph 3.50 last sentence – ‘The Development must also ensure that it will remain physically separate from Caxton <u>village (the majority of the site falls within Caxton Parish).</u>’</p>

