

## Chapter 6: Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Historic Environment

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

**Policy NH/1: Conservation Area and Green Separation at Longstanton**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Chapter 13 – Conservation Area and Green Separation between Longstanton and Northstowe</b></p>	<p><b>Conservation Area and Green Separation between Longstanton and Northstowe</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>Site Specific Policies DPD: Policy SP/15 Conservation Area and Green Separation between Longstanton and Northstowe</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>The green separation between Longstanton village and the new town of Northstowe is designed to ensure the maintenance of the village character of Longstanton. Public access to this area of the countryside will be controlled to protect the conservation area. The area will contain only open land uses, such as playing fields, allotments and cemeteries, which will contribute towards effective separation between the two settlements. The open aspect of the fields affording views of All Saints Church will be maintained.</p> <p>This policy addresses the areas not covered by the Northstowe Area Action Plan.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> None. The policy should be carried forward into the new Local Plan and remain until the development of Northstowe has been completed. The current policy has been sustainability appraised and found sound at examination by an independent Planning Inspector.</p>
<p><b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b></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 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>

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

	<p>English Heritage are concerned that playing field uses would not be appropriate uses and could cause damage to historic elements of the land. However, the endorsed Development Framework Document for Northstowe does not indicate playing fields within this area. It would therefore not conflict with the ongoing work on Northstowe and therefore no change is proposed. The sports hub within the green separation between Longstanton and Northstowe is located further to the north within the approved Phase 1 area.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>No change</b></p>

**Policy NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 30</b></p>	<p><b>Landscape Character</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Landscape in New Developments Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2010</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD 2010</li> <li>• Natural England – National Character Areas</li> </ul>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD: NE/4 Landscape Character Areas</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>The European Landscape Convention requires the protection, management and planning of all European landscapes, rather than only the best areas. The importance of the landscape is reflected in national planning guidance; with the National Planning Policy Framework stating that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.</p> <p>The South Cambridgeshire landscape has several distinctive identified characters which reflect the underlying geology of the district. These have been identified by Natural England as five distinctive National Character Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Fens</li> <li>• South Suffolk and North Essex Claylands</li> <li>• East Anglian Chalk</li> <li>• Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands</li> <li>• Bedfordshire Greensand Ridge</li> </ul> <p>These ‘National Character Areas’ replace the former Landscape Character Areas which are described in detail in the Landscape in New Development SPD 2010 – this SPD will need to be amended to reflect this updated terminology.</p> <p>A key issue within South Cambridgeshire is that the distinctive character and quality of the district’s landscape has been eroded by changes made to the land as a result of agriculture or development. A policy could be included in the Local Plan to protect the landscape characters and should include consideration of the relevant National Character Area, and other available information including landscape character assessments. Further information could continue to be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (currently the Landscape SPD).</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> Due to international and national policy requirements, the Local Plan will need to address landscape character.</p>

	<p>The Local Plan could include a policy to require development proposals to reflect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the landscape. This should include consideration of the relevant National Character Area, and other available information including landscape character assessments. Further information could continue to be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (currently the Landscape SPD).</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<b>Question 30:</b> Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring development proposals to reflect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the landscape?
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	The district has a varied landscape character, identified by five different National Character Areas. A policy to ensure landscape character is addressed would have significant positive impact on landscape character objective, but related positive impacts on wider environmental objectives.
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 53, Object: 6, Comment: 11
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crucial if Vision is to be achieved</li> <li>• Support from 24 Parish Councils for policy</li> <li>• Retain character of area – this is why people chose to live here. Developments must add to landscape not detract from it.</li> <li>• Threat to landscape from development which planning has little control over – wind farms and new highways – difficult to blend into ancient landscape and development pressures resulting from buoyant Cambridge economy.</li> <li>• Best way to enhance landscape is NOT to build on it- use it for farming and woodland.</li> <li>• Countryside surrounding Cambridge vitally important to City residents.</li> <li>• Landscape around Denny Abbey vital to character of area – once destroyed gone forever.</li> <li>• Woodland Trust – need to protect existing assets like ancient woodlands and trees plus create new habitats which buffer and extend ancient areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a matter for design principles</li> <li>• Present appearance result of laissez faire over time. Heavy handed interference would not be good or enjoy public support.</li> <li>• Same results can be achieved by other regulations</li> <li>• Not all development can reflect and enhance character – should exempt renewable energy projects and especially wind energy</li> </ul>

	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge Past, Present and Future – Use Landscape East’s more detailed East of England Landscape Typology. Landscape Institute’s Guidance for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be followed for larger developments.</li> <li>• Plan must do better than hill created between Landbeach and Waterbeach where new recycling plant has been built which is not respectful of flat Fenland landscape.</li> <li>• Plan must balance need for development and landscape impact.</li> <li>• Must identify and protect distinctive features in each local area – features to be identified by Parish Council and SCDC. (Haslingfield PC)</li> <li>• Natural England supports policy but suggests need to set out criteria based policies for each landscape character areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>Include a policy requiring development proposals to reflect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the landscape as set out in the issue.</p> <p>Strong support for the policy and recognition that with good design new development can add to the character of an area. Objections from those who thought other design policies could achieve same results.</p> <p>In response to specific issues raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding right balance between protecting landscape character and development is considered by policies throughout the Local Plan. Some growth in the district is inevitable but will be planned for carefully.</li> <li>• Policy for protecting ancient woodlands and trees is to be included in this Plan.</li> <li>• Historic setting of Cambridge and surrounding area is protected by other policies in the Plan.</li> <li>• Landscape SPD to be revised to include new national character areas and to include more detailed descriptions of areas provided by Landscape East designations. SPD to have more detailed advice on how development can respect landscape character.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	<p>Policy NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character Policy NH/7: Ancient Woodlands and Veteran Trees</p>
<b>Policy NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character (and paragraphs 6.6 - 6.11)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 6 Support: 4 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 2 (including 1 from PC )</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Elsworth PC</b> – Character and distinctiveness of rural landscape in South Cambs important. New development must reflect and</li> </ul>

	<p>enhance character. Need to protect existing assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Policy protects intrinsic character of village and surroundings.</li> <li>• <b>Gamlingay PC</b> – Bedfordshire Greensand Ridge has particular impact on parish – specific character very noticeable.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – General support for all policies in environment chapter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> – Object to National Character Area assessments as too broad brush. Local authority should commission an up-to-date local Landscape Character assessment to replace current one dated 2003. Policy should specifically refer to historic landscape character.</li> <li>• <b>Great Shelford PC</b> – East Anglian Chalk local landscape character but waterways significant within parish – Hobson’s Brook. Would like to see policy for waterways.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The policy has been updated from a similar one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. Natural England has revised how it categorises natural landscapes and these revised definitions have been used in the new policy. Further details on the character areas are provided in related Supplementary Planning Documents which are to be revised in the lifetime of the plan to include the more detailed East of England Landscape Typology. This more detailed classification will ensure that the distinctive landscape characters within the district are protected and enhanced.</p> <p>Within the Local Plan there are policies relating to biodiversity, water quality, sustainable drainage, and green infrastructure that will protect the waterways in the district without the need for a specific policy.</p>
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<b>No change</b>

### Policy NH/3: Protecting Agricultural Land

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 31</b></p>	<p><b>Protecting high quality agricultural land</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD: NE17 Protecting High Quality Agricultural Land</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that Local Planning Authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, Local Planning Authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.</p> <p>South Cambridgeshire has a significant resource of good quality agricultural land. Agricultural land classification provides a uniform method for assessing the quality of farmland to enable informed choices to be made about its future use within the planning system. The most productive and flexible land falls into Grades 1 and 2 and Subgrade 3a and collectively comprises about one third of the agricultural land in England and Wales.</p> <p>Within the district there are significant areas of high quality agricultural land. Much of the best agricultural land lies around Cambridge and the larger settlements, which may be the most sustainable locations for future development. The need to identify and maintain a large supply of land for development means there is pressure for development of agricultural land.</p> <p>Existing policy seeks to protect the higher grade agricultural land from development unless it is allocated in the Local Development Framework or its sustainable location overrides the need to protect the land or the scheme does not involve much built development.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> The NPPF requires the benefits of agricultural land to be considered. The Local Plan could seek to protect the best agricultural land within the district from significant development unless sustainability considerations and the need for the development outweigh the need to protect the agricultural value of the land.</p>

<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<b>Question 31:</b> Should the Local Plan include a policy seeking to protect best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1,2, and 3a) from unplanned development?
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	Including a policy to protect agricultural land would have positive benefits to the land objective, however the scale of impact will depend on implementation, as the issue notes this has to be balanced with other sustainability considerations, which will include meeting development needs. Much of the district is made up of high grade agricultural land. Retaining agricultural land may have wider benefits to other objectives, such as habitats and species.
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 66, Object: 1, Comment: 12
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support protection of high grade viable farmland.</li> <li>• Support from 24 Parish Councils for policy.</li> <li>• Higher output per hectare on land in East Anglia than rest of Country therefore needs protection. Farming important part of South Cambs way of life, landscape and economy.</li> <li>• Protect over brown field sites.</li> <li>• Protecting high grade land should take priority over development of site in site allocation process.</li> <li>• Such areas define separation between villages/ enhance resident's lifestyles. Clear environmental benefits.</li> <li>• Support but need to protect wildlife-rich sites which may be on poorer soil (Cambridge Past, Present and Future).</li> <li>• Policy should include requirement for development to fully assess impacts and provide suitable mitigation/ compensation for impacts (Natural England).</li> <li>• Should recognise development can have major usually irreversible adverse impact on soils. Need careful soil management. (Natural England)</li> <li>• Support but should allow small developments on such land where local need is unable to be met in other ways (Little Abington PC and Great Abington PC).</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, lower grade agricultural land should be developed before brownfield sites where there is opportunity to enhance biodiversity.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3A should be taken more seriously.</li> <li>• Support policy so existing and new settlements cannot have new sites added on agricultural land adjoining settlement near end of Plan Period if pressure for more sites. (Cambourne PC)</li> <li>• Impossible to build on edge of Waterbeach or Cottenham without impinging on high value agricultural land.</li> <li>• Need to balance needs of a village – if by building on grade 2 land it protects other land that is need for employment uses and has flooding issues – eg in Sawston.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>Include a policy seeking to protect best and most versatile agricultural land (grade 1, 2 and 3a) from unplanned development.</p> <p>There was overwhelming support for policy and only comments were relating to need for protecting low grade land that may have value for wildlife.</p> <p>In response to specific issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is now recognition that agricultural land has a value for farming and for wildlife. The scope of the policy has now been broadened to include biodiversity values.</li> <li>• Some development on agricultural land is inevitable because the Local Plan has to plan for additional houses and jobs within the district.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy NH/3: Protecting Agricultural Land
<b>Policy NH/3: Protecting Agricultural Land (and paragraphs 6.12 - 6.14)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 22</p> <p>Support: 19 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC))</p> <p>Object: 3 (including 1 from PC)</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> - Recognise importance of using good quality agricultural land for food production rather than for development.</li> <li>• <b>Elsworth PC</b> – Essential for national food security. Should be robustly protected.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Protects intrinsic quality of village and surrounding area.</li> <li>• <b>Ickleton PC</b> – Support policy.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – General support for all policies in</li> </ul>

	<p>environment chapter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn PC</b> – Support policy but concerned that not following NPPF guidance because insufficient weight to economic value of agricultural land.</li> <li>• Small areas of grade 2 and 3a farmland are uneconomic and areas below 2 hectares should be exempt from policy. Introduce lower threshold limit of 2 hectares. to policy</li> <li>• Should never allocate high grade farmland for development.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The policy has been carried forward from the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. Representations are generally supportive of the policy. The need to identify and maintain an adequate supply of land for development to meet identified needs means there is pressure for development of agricultural land in such a rural district although the plan focuses development on brownfield land where appropriate. The NPPF states where it is necessary to use agricultural land for development local planning authorities should seek to use poorer quality land and in South Cambridgeshire this option has not been always possible.</p>
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<b>No change</b>

**Policy NH/4: Biodiversity**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 32</b></p>	<p><b>Biodiversity</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Biodiversity SPD 2009</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Control Policies DPD: NE/6 Biodiversity</li> <li>• Development Control Policies DPD: NE/7 Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance</li> </ul>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>South Cambridgeshire contains a range of important habitats and species. However, one of the main features in biodiversity conservation is the extent of fragmentation of this resource, primarily due to the impact of modern agriculture. The main exception to this pattern is along the river corridors, most notably the Great Ouse, which serves as a focus for some of the most significant protected sites.</p> <p>The Government has stated a commitment to improving the quality of the natural environment across England. The National Planning Policy Framework establishes that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;</li> <li>• recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;</li> <li>• minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.</li> </ul> <p>Local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged. When determining planning applications they should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity, if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.</p> <p>Existing policy establishes that development should aim to maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity, using opportunity for positive gain. Development that would have adverse significant impact should be refused, unless adequately mitigated or compensated for. Particular consideration should be given to priority species and habitats identified in the Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> <p>There are important sites protected at the European level, Eversden</p>

	<p>and Wimpole Woods Special Area of Conservation, and a number of other sites nearby. There are 39 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), designated as nationally important. There are also 113 County Wildlife sites and 7 Local Nature Reserves, non-statutory sites identified because they are rich in wildlife.</p> <p>Policy is needed to apply appropriate protection, where planning permission would not be given for proposals which would have an unacceptable adverse impact, either directly or indirectly, on a site of biodiversity of geological importance. This must take account of the status and designation of the site.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> None. Reflecting national and international policy, the plan needs to include appropriate policies seeking to ensure that development proposals minimise negative impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible, and to provide appropriate protection to designated sites and species.</p> <p>The Local Plan could require development to aim to maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity, and seek to reduce habitat loss and fragmentation. Priorities for habitat creation could reflect biodiversity action plan targets, and creation of areas that link habitats. Further guidance could continue to be provided in the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 32:</b> <b>A:</b> The Local Plan needs to protect and enhance biodiversity. Have we identified the right approaches? <b>B:</b> Do you think the Council should retain and update the Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document?</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	A policy would have significant positive impact on biodiversity objectives, but related positive impacts on wider environmental objectives.
<b>Representations Received</b>	<p><b>Question 32A:</b> Support: 51, Object: 0, Comment: 10 <b>Question 32B:</b> Support: 41, Object: 2, Comment: 3</p>
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>Question 32A</b> <b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensible approach supported by 18 Parish Councils and Natural England (NE). Essential for quality of life of current and future generations</li> <li>• Cambridgeshire County Council - should ensure that mapping of</li> </ul>

	<p>local ecological networks considers wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. Also should be recognition of importance of preserving brownfield sites for nature conservation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to include more detail. Need to specify places especially large-scale habitat creation schemes and management regimes and show how they will be funded.</li> <li>• Wildlife Trust - Reflect priorities in Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy</li> <li>• Woodland Trust – Extend approach to include ancient woods and individual trees of high biodiversity value.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not overlook value of private gardens as reservoir for wildlife.</li> <li>• Development causes loss of habitat. How can it then maintain/ enhance biodiversity?</li> <li>• Need to preserve and establish wildlife corridors</li> <li>• Should be stronger</li> <li>• Middle Level Commissioners - encourage principle of water level management/ flood defences that provide for creation of green infrastructure/ habitat. Maintenance must be considered. Care taken to ensure water level management/flood defence system does not suffer because of biodiversity 'green' issues. Board adopted Biodiversity Action Plan as policy.</li> <li>• Consideration of biodiversity can delay planning process. Policy must be appropriate to biodiversity value of site</li> <li>• Impact on loss of habitat and local biodiversity would present strong case against new town at Waterbeach.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 32B</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should retain and update regularly (every 5 years) – CPPF; CPRE; National Trust (NT)</li> <li>• Support from 14 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Nature enhancement areas need to be widened and base on detailed research of wildlife – CPPF.</li> <li>• Need to protect all wildlife not concentrate on few species</li> <li>• Need to enforce it.</li> <li>• May need to strengthen SPD to reflect changes in Planning System and reduced availability of funding. Local Plan may not be able to demonstrate sustainable development if do not strengthen wording. - NT</li> <li>• Council should work with parish councils and partner organisations</li> <li>• Conflict between maximising agricultural land and improving</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>biodiversity</p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from Litlington and Steeple Morden Parish Councils</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>Include a policy for biodiversity including all the approaches outlined in issue 32 and additionally including consideration of ancient woodlands and trees. The Local Plan should include the priorities set out in the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy and a map included within the chapter.</p> <p>The existing Biodiversity SPD should be retained and updated when appropriate.</p> <p>Overwhelming support for the policy and the need to update the SPD.</p> <p>In response to specific issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference made in policy to aiding delivery of Green Infrastructure Policy which identifies strategic green network including South Cambridgeshire. Map to be included in Plan.</li> <li>• Biodiversity SPD to include more details about biodiversity within district.</li> <li>• Policy to be included in Plan on protection of ancient woodlands.</li> <li>• Recognition within Plan that biodiversity is important but that it is one of a number of consideration to have when considering development proposals – drainage issues are considered by other policies in the Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	<p>Policy NH/4: Biodiversity</p> <p>Policy NH/5: Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance</p> <p>Policy NH/7: Ancient Woodlands and Veteran Trees</p>
<b>Policy NH/4: Biodiversity (and paragraphs 6.15 - 6.18)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 12</p> <p>Support: 7 (including 2 from Parish Council)</p> <p>Object: 5 (including 1 from PC)</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environment Agency</b> – Support policy – wholly compatible with requirements of EU Water Framework Directive.</li> <li>• <b>Elsworth PC</b> – Support and agree Biodiversity SPD should be updated.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Fully support.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – General support for all policies in environment chapter.</li> <li>• <b>The Wildlife Trust</b> – Support – pleased to see recognition of national guidance, specific mention of brownfield sites.</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> – Policy too weak. Suggest amending wording of policy to strengthen. Replace ‘clearly’ with ‘demonstrably and significantly’ so similar to wording in Policy NH/5.</li> <li>• <b>Dry Drayton PC</b> – Request recognition of Dry Drayton’s biodiversity survey in policy.</li> <li>• <b>The Wildlife Trust</b> – Support but suggest mention is made of the importance of wider ecological networks that need to be considered when planning the green infrastructure – will help species adapt to climate change.</li> <li>• Policy should not just protect protected species etc but also the ‘ordinary’ non-threatened biodiversity. Development should be refused where negative impact on biodiversity.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Assessment</b></p>	<p>The policy has been updated from a similar one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The updates are to reflect the new national guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>Representations are mainly supportive. General protection of the district’s biodiversity is provided by the policy. Specific detail about a local parish area is not appropriate for inclusion in the district wide plan. The policy allows for local evidence to be taken into account when planning applications are considered by the Council.</p> <p>Cambridge Past, Present and Future has suggested Policy NH/4 be amended so that it uses the same wording relating to the balance between allowing development and protecting biodiversity as Policy NH/5. However the NPPF uses the term ‘clearly’ and in order for both policies to comply with national guidance a minor change is proposed to Policy NH/5 so both policies use the same term.</p> <p>Agree to include an amendment suggested by the Wildlife Trust to recognise wider ecological networks.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Add to end of paragraph 6.16, ‘... <b><u>thereby contributing to wider ecological networks.</u></b>’</p> <p>Amend Policy NH/5 paragraph 1 to read:  ‘1. ...Exceptions will only be made where the benefits of the development <b>clearly</b> <del>demonstrably and significantly</del> outweigh any adverse impact.’</p>

## Policy NH/5: Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy NH/4: Biodiversity

Policy NH/5: Sites of Biodiversity or Geological Importance (and paragraphs 6.19 – 6.26)	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 9 Support: 6 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 3
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> – Support policy.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Support policy.</li> <li>• <b>Elsworth PC</b> – Support policy and should update Biodiversity SPD.</li> <li>• <b>Environment Agency</b> – Support policy – compatible with requirements of EU Water Framework Directive.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – General support for policies in environment chapter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)</b> – Support but recommend wording at 2a makes a clearer distinction between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, as set out in paragraph of 113 of NPPF.</li> <li>• <b>The Wildlife Trust</b> – Need to clarify wording in 2e since remaining features would not need to be recreated!</li> <li>• No development should be granted that impacts biodiversity therefore delete ‘not <b>normally</b> be permitted.’</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The policy has been updated from a similar one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, where it was found sound through the examination. The updates are to reflect the new national guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>A suggestion had been made to remove the term ‘<i>not normally be permitted</i>’ from the policy however this is the term used in the NPPF and therefore no change is proposed.</p> <p>A minor change to section 2a of the policy is proposed to meet the comments made by the RSPB to clarify that the hierarchy includes international sites within the district.</p> <p>A minor change to the policy clarifies the compensatory measures outlined in section 2e of the policy which is not clearly worded at</p>

	present
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Amend Policy NH/5 paragraph 2a to read: ‘The <b>international</b>, national or local status and designation of the site.’</p> <p>Amend Policy NH/5 2e to read: ‘The need for compensatory measures in order to re-create <b>on or off the site</b> remaining features or habitats <del>on or off the site</del>. <b>that would be lost to development</b>’</p> <p>See also change to NH/5 (1) arising at Policy NH/4.</p>

## River Cam and other waterways

No specific policy included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan for this issue.

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 41</b>	<b>River Cam and other waterways</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)
<b>Existing policies</b>	Development Control Policies DPD: SF/12 The River Cam
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>Rivers and streams are particularly important features of South Cambridgeshire. To the west and south are the chalk streams and tributaries of the River Cam, while to the north and east the River Great Ouse and the lower Cam form a natural boundary to the district at the fen edge. The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy recognises the importance of river corridors and floodplains as features in the landscape which are important as wildlife corridors. The River Cam is identified as a County Wildlife Site.</p> <p>The District Council recognises the importance of the river valley environments within South Cambridgeshire in contributing to the biodiversity of the District.</p> <p>In view of the specialist characteristics of river valley habitats and their importance to the biodiversity of the district as a whole, detailed guidance on the way in which development proposals should respect these habitats, natural features and species characteristics of the river valleys is included in the Council's Biodiversity Strategy Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>However, these waterways are also a major recreation and tourism resource, and careful management is required to preserve the special qualities that attract users.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> An issue to be considered in the Local Plan is whether a policy should be included for consideration of development proposals affecting the waterway networks in the district given their importance in providing wildlife corridors. This would need to be balanced between biodiversity, landscape, and the role for tourism and leisure, while also considering their crucial role for drainage.</p> <p>Alternatively the Local Plan could have no specific policy relating to waterways within the district, and rely on other policies within the Local Plan.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.

<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<b>Question 41:</b> Should a policy be developed for the consideration of development proposals affecting waterways, that seeks to maintain their crucial importance for drainage, whilst supporting their use as a recreation and biodiversity resource?
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	The option would support biodiversity and landscape objectives, whilst acknowledging wider role rivers play for recreation. As noted in the Scoping Report, the rivers play an important role in the district as wildlife corridors. The policy would need to consider the appropriate balance.
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 62 Object: 0 Comment: 12
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 23 Parish Councils support</li> <li>• Conservators of the River Cam, and Quarter to Six Project support</li> <li>• Build on success of Chalk Rivers project</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council supports but considers importance of River Cam needs greater acknowledgement. City Council is considering carrying out a water space study. Wish to work with SCDC in development of policies and any accompanying studies.</li> <li>• Excellent upgrading of river in Trumpington Meadows Country Park- expand work to Rhee.</li> <li>• Need for clearly written policy so cannot be argued with. Would have to be devised in consultation with such bodies as English Nature, the Environment Agency, the boating fraternity and the Cam Conservators. The potential for a clash of interests is high.</li> <li>• Cambridge Past, Present and Future supports – Need for detailed river/ waterspace strategy to protect and enhance river Cam and its corridor between Hauxton and Bait's Bite Lock. Need to establish design code to enhance setting of river and adjacent green spaces. Iconic views along and across river must be protected. Strategies too for smaller waterways – flood prevention; wildlife and amenity.</li> <li>• Old Chesterton Residents Association – need for holistic study of river corridor – like Bedford Waterspace study. River suffers from fragmented regulation. Need co-ordination and comprehensive strategy</li> <li>• Environment Agency happy to assist in production of policy</li> <li>• Maintaining waterways essential to prevent flooding – Vital function of waterways. Primary function.</li> <li>• Developments near rivers should not be allowed to destroy existing habitats and increase flooding downstream</li> <li>• Separate joined up policy that will increase protection of the River Cam and the conservation and recreational qualities of Cam and related water habitats/linked streams.</li> <li>• Bringing forward Broad Location 5 will help deliver recreation and biodiversity objectives.</li> <li>• Improve access to waterways for range of leisure purposes, including walking, non-motorised boating and kayak use and wild</li> </ul>

	<p>swimming. ( Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primary concern should be biodiversity (CPRE; Wildlife Trust)</li> <li>• Clear guidance on types of development permitted, sites and opportunities for biodiversity enhancement.</li> <li>• Policy will need to consider size and average flow / dry periods of the water courses selected.</li> <li>• Waterways are for quiet recreation –use of powered craft should be restricted. Upstream of Grantchester no right of way along Cam/Granta/Rhee.</li> <li>• Need to promote use of rivers for tourism</li> <li>• Proposals related to the new station on Chesterton Sidings identified in Cambridge City Local Plan as opening up opportunity for a flood relief channel which could be used to enhance the leisure and recreational values of Ditton meadows - The 'camToo' Project.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wish to avoid footbridge or cycle connections directly from Fen Ditton village or meadows across to Chesterton and the planned Cambridge Science Park station.</li> <li>• Meadows along River Cam are important green spaces - totally opposed to the concept described as "camToo".</li> <li>• Particular concerns for new developments near rivers and brooks. Waterbeach seems sustainable site but expansion should be limited and constructed to protect Cam as well as providing public space for enjoyment.</li> <li>• Rivers at Bourn and Melbourn should be protected. It is easy to focus on these possible developments because they have significant water courses.</li> <li>• Need to protect wildlife</li> <li>• National Trust wants to encourage provision of bridges and crossing points to enhance access to open space. E.g. At Waterbeach – if this site is developed need for new bridge as currently River Cam is barrier for access to Wicken Vision. Also need for upgrading of footpath network to serve local community.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>There was a range of general comments from different organisations depending on their interest area from the primary function of the river being to prevent flooding or for biodiversity or for leisure activities.</p> <p>It was considered that proposed policies including for biodiversity, water quality, sustainable drainage, and green infrastructure would cover these competing demands and that a specific policy for the River Cam was therefore not necessary for inclusion in the plan.</p>
<p><b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b></p>	<p>No policy.</p>

**Policy NH/6: Green Infrastructure**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 33</b></p>	<p><b>Green Infrastructure</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<p>Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)</p>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD: SF/10 Outdoor Play Space, Informal Open Space and New Development</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that Local planning authorities set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. This ‘green infrastructure’ refers to the network of multi-functional green-spaces and green-links, which can include country parks, wildlife habitats, rights of way, commons and greens, nature reserves, waterways and bodies of water bodies and other open spaces.</p> <p>In 2011 a partnership of local organisations including the Council, produced the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy. The strategy highlights the deficiencies in certain parts of the District regarding access to countryside open space. The level of growth planned for South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge will also put pressure on existing Green Infrastructure and will require proportionate investment to develop the Green Infrastructure network. Delivery of Green Infrastructure can contribute to improving strategic linkages and wildlife corridors, landscape character enhancement, protection and enhancement of biodiversity and habitat restoration, protection and enhancement of cultural heritage assets, climate change adaptation, and delivering public access to countryside open space.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy highlights that Green Infrastructure should be an integral part of growth sites in the district, mitigating the impacts of climate change, delivering a range of other objectives, and linking to the wider Green Infrastructure network. It therefore provides the strategic framework required by the NPPF.</p> <p>The Strategy has identified opportunities for long-term landscape and biodiversity improvements across Cambridgeshire, which the planning system can help to deliver.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Strategy draws on analysis carried by Natural England using Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt), to examine the level of publicly accessible natural</p>

	<p>greenspace provision in Cambridgeshire. It identified deficiencies in access in a number of areas to greenspace provision at various size thresholds</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Strategy identifies a range of opportunities for enhancement in and around the district, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Wicken Fen Vision</li> <li>○ West Cambridgeshire Hundreds Habitat Enhancement Project</li> <li>○ Wimpole Cycle Link</li> <li>○ Cambourne and Northstowe Large-scale public open space provision</li> <li>○ Coton Countryside Reserve</li> <li>○ Gog Magog Countryside Project</li> <li>○ North Cambridge Heritage Trail</li> <li>○ Cambridge Sport Lakes</li> <li>○ Trumpington Meadows Country Park</li> <li>○ Chalk Rivers project</li> <li>○ Fowlmere Nature Reserve extension and development of facilities</li> <li>○ Linear monuments</li> <li>○ Woodland linkage project</li> <li>○ Fens Waterways Link</li> <li>○ The Environment Agency Ouse Washes Habitat Creation Project</li> </ul> <p>There is an opportunity to enhance the role of gateway sites, such as the country parks at Milton and Wandlebury and Coton Countryside Reserve, which attract visitors and provide a way into the countryside, integrating them with the Green Infrastructure network and exploiting their collective value.</p> <p>The Local Plan could include a policy that expects all new development to contribute towards the provision of additional green infrastructure and the protection and enhancement of the district's existing green infrastructure. Specific opportunities may be identified in the Local Plan in relation to major development proposals.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b></p> <p>An option for the Local Plan could be that all new development should be expected to contribute towards the provision of additional green infrastructure and the protection and enhancement of the district's existing green infrastructure. Specific opportunities may be identified in the Local Plan in relation to major development proposals, subject to the viability of</p>
--	---

	the development and local opinion.
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	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.
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 33:</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring development to provide or contribute towards new or enhanced Green Infrastructure?</p> <p><b>B:</b> Are there other new Green Infrastructure projects that should be added?</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	Green Infrastructure can contribute to delivery of a range of sustainability objectives. The Green Infrastructure Strategy identifies a number of large scale projects, with potential for significant positive benefits for achievement of the biodiversity objectives, but also providing access to the countryside and promoting healthy communities. There is an uncertain impact on land objective, as impact depends whether Green Infrastructure projects require the loss of agricultural land. It could also increase cost of development, which could impact on housing objectives, although viability issues are addressed in the issue.
<b>Representations Received</b>	<p><b>Question 33A:</b> Support: 69, Object: 4, Comment: 9</p> <p><b>Question 33B:</b> Support: 6, Object: 2, Comment: 15</p>
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>Question 33A</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter to Six Quadrant vision document supports protection of natural and historic landscape</li> <li>• 24 Parish Councils and Cambridge City Council support policy.</li> <li>• Crucial to delivery of the Vision.</li> <li>• New development must be sympathetic and integrate into green environment and delivered in timely way</li> <li>• South Cambs is rural district. Development must include green infrastructure to make this best place to live. Countryside around Cambridge vital amenity.</li> <li>• Better recognition needed to large scale green spaces</li> <li>• Support from developers requiring them to contribute to Green Infrastructure when developing sites. Green infrastructure target areas must be in Local Plan and shown on appropriate map and listed as infrastructure eligible for CIL funding especially in absence of Government funds</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirement important aspect of sustainable development – addresses core principles of NPPF</li> <li>• Need for more trees as this is least wooded county in England.</li> <li>• Include footpaths and cycle ways to access open sites</li> <li>• Important function of green infrastructure is giving opportunity to access to open space.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not reasonable to require all new development to contribute to green infrastructure. District already benefits from network of green spaces. Some proposals will not have adverse impact on or create additional demand for green infrastructure.</li> <li>• Will make smaller and brownfield schemes unviable.</li> <li>• This favours applications on open land as it is easier to so called mitigation to be applied even though more damage to environment will occur.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarter to Six group suggest more recreational/leisure role for Green Belt on western edge of Cambridge.</li> <li>• No maps included in consultation setting out strategic green infrastructure. Hunts DC has chosen to map such areas. If these areas extend beyond boundaries into S Cambs need to co-operate.</li> <li>• Need for specific policy in Local Plan for Rights of Way (RoW).</li> <li>• How would this be implemented? Another tax on development?</li> <li>• Need to ensure that increased access to countryside does not adversely affect sites particularly ones protected for biodiversity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 33B</b></p> <p><b>SUGGESTED NEW GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Range of projects suggested from those related to new growth areas like NIAB2 to historic landscapes like Wandlebury</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Nature Partnership and GI Forum should be contacted to discuss potential new projects</li> <li>• Need for Blue Infrastructure Strategy for waterways in area.</li> <li>• The Local Plan needs to set out clearly how Local Authorities will work jointly where strategic green sites cross boundaries.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and</b>	Include a policy requiring development to provide or contribute towards new or enhanced Green Infrastructure. The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy should be identified

<b>Reasons</b>	<p>in the Local Plan in order to achieve the implementation of the proposals included in this strategy.</p> <p>Overwhelming support for policy and recognition that developers should contribute towards enhancing the green infrastructure of the district. The limited objections were concerned with the impact on the viability of developing sites if contributions were expected on all developments.</p> <p>In response to specific issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green infrastructure Strategy is referenced in the policy and this identifies target areas within the district which will provide more detail on specific projects including rights of way. This strategy is for whole county so indicates strategic areas that cross boundaries so will assist the local authorities in achieving co-ordinated green infrastructure networks.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy NH/6: Green Infrastructure
<b>Policy NH/6: Green Infrastructure (and paragraphs 6.27 - 6.31)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 73</p> <p>Support:6 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC))</p> <p>Object: 67 (including 2 from PCs)</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Support policy.</li> <li>• <b>Gamlingay PC</b> – Support targets identified in Strategy relating to West Cambridgeshire Woodlands.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – General support for all policies in environment chapter.</li> <li>• <b>Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)</b> – Support policy and Green Infrastructure Strategy.</li> <li>• <b>The Wildlife Trust</b> – Support policy.</li> <li>• Excellent partnership of different organisations. Strategy should not be allowed to languish.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambourne and Caldecote PCs</b> – Support policy but should include proposals for woodland creation to enhance countryside and help mitigate greenhouse emissions.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> – Support policy but would like more specific reference to role of River Cam and its corridor in Green Infrastructure Policy. Need for specific Cam</li> </ul>

	<p>Corridor enhancement guidance as SPD or specific policy for River Cam and corridor in plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Great Ouse AONB Working Group</b> – Should include whole of Great Ouse Valley which will be important area for quiet enjoyment in County in future.</li> <li>• <b>Shelford and District Bridleways Group; Swavesey and District Bridleways Association; Sawston Riding School; Brampton Bridleway Group</b> - Introduce an additional paragraph to Policy NH/6 which secures access for horse riders, pedestrians and cycles. Rights of way should be for all non motorised users. Need to update Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy to comply with NPPF which encourages providing opportunities for <u>all</u> to access open space – includes horse riders.</li> <li>• <b>The National Trust</b> – Lack of joined up thinking between Green Infrastructure and how people arrive at these sites via sustainable transport promoted in Policy TI/2. Wimpole Cycle route should be mentioned in paragraph 6.31 to enable it to be taken forward as scheme in Local Transport Plan.</li> <li>• <b>The Wildlife Trust</b> – Map should show locations of key ecological networks (Gog Magogs Countryside Area and West Cambridgeshire Hundreds) and target areas from Strategy mentioned in paragraph 6.31.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Assessment</b></p>	<p>New policy to assist in the implementation of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy.</p> <p>The term green infrastructure has a wide definition that could take into account the issues raised by objectors such as consideration of the rivers and bridleways through the district. A minor change to the supporting text is proposed to clarify this.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure Strategy includes a number of target areas and projects, which have been drawn together in the strategy. These projects include ones that encourage tree planting within the district. By addressing Green Infrastructure within the plan it is expected that this will assist project delivery.</p> <p>The National Trust is concerned about how the community will access the green spaces within the district. The Council in future planning for the strategic sites and other housing sites identified in the plan will be looking for opportunities for these new communities to link into green infrastructure within their areas. The County Council is preparing a Transport Strategy alongside the plan and in drafting this strategy is taking into account the policies in the plan which includes access to the wider green infrastructure of the district.</p>

	<p>The concerns of the AONB working group are already met as the Green Infrastructure Strategy already includes consideration of the Great Ouse Valley and therefore no change is proposed within the plan.</p> <p>A River Cam Corridor Strategy is being prepared by local stakeholders. This is an example of a Green Infrastructure project coming forward after the Green Infrastructure Strategy was completed, and this can be referenced in the supporting text.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Amend second sentence of paragraph 6.27 to read:  ‘... It includes a wide range of elements such as country parks, wildlife habitats, rights of way, <b><u>bridleways</u></b> commons and greens, nature reserves, waterways and bodies of water, and historic landscapes and monuments.’</p> <p>Add the following to end of paragraph 6.31:  <b><u>‘An example of a Green Infrastructure project coming forward is a River Cam Corridor Strategy which is being prepared by local stakeholders.’</u></b></p>

## Policy NH/7: Ancient Woodlands and Veteran Trees

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy NH/2: Protecting and Enhancing Landscape Character and Policy NH/4: Biodiversity.

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

	guidance no change is proposed.
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<b>No change</b>

**Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining the Green Belt**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012</b> <b>Issue 34</b></p>	<p><b>Impact of Development in the Green Belt</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<p>Cambridge Green Belt Study – (Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002)</p>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GB/2 Mitigating the Impact of Development in the Green Belt</li> <li>• GB/3 Mitigating the Impact of Development Adjoining the Green Belt</li> </ul>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>The Government has recently confirmed the importance it attaches to Green Belts in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.</p> <p>As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>The area of Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire comprises 23,000 hectares covering over 25% of the District. This means much of the District is affected by Green Belt policies particularly those villages surrounding Cambridge. There are two existing policies relating to mitigation of development. One policy seeks to mitigate the impact of development within Green Belt land and a second relates to development on land adjoining Green Belt. These policies ensure that any development that is proposed in or near the Green Belt must be located and designed so that it does not have an adverse effect on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt. Landscaping conditions will be attached to developments within the Green Belt and it is required that the planting is maintained to ensure the impact on the Green Belt is mitigated. On development adjoining the Green Belt will also need careful landscaping and high quality design to protect the purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b></p>

	<p>In order to protect the qualities of the Green Belt the plan needs to ensure impacts are appropriately addressed.</p> <p>The Local Plan could require that where development takes place in or adjoining the Green Belt; it is designed and appropriately landscaped so that it minimises its impact on the rural character and openness of the Green Belt.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	<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 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>
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<b>Question 34:</b> Should the Local Plan include policies to ensure that development in and adjoining the Green Belt does not have an unacceptable impact on its rural character and openness?
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	The option would have a positive impact on achievement of landscape and townscape objectives, by seeking to mitigate impact of development of the Green Belt.
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 97, Object: 3, Comment: 11
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 23 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Any development <b>MUST</b> be required to mitigate its impact on rural character</li> <li>• The Quarter To Six Quadrant vision document fully supports the protection and development of landscape, agriculture, biodiversity, green infrastructure, green space, community orchards and woodland, the Cam, and heritage assets.</li> <li>• Need to clarify meaning of 'unacceptable impact' if it means anything more than a belt of planting along countryside frontages</li> <li>• Don't build on the green belt at all – CPRE</li> <li>• Mitigate impact of large buildings by early planting of shelter belts of native trees. – CPPF</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge City Council supports inclusion of policies but considered that explicit reference should be made to the purposes of Cambridge Green Belt. Insufficient account has</li> </ul>

	<p>been given to interface between urban and rural and setting of Cambridge and the South Cambs villages. Importance of landscape setting of the urban fringes not recognised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not support further development in Green Belt</li> <li>• No additional policy is needed –covered in design policies and NPPF</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Unacceptable’ difficult to define. Need for housing great therefore compromise must be reached</li> <li>• Planting a shelter belt would make development in green belt acceptable? Need design schemes that consider wider context rather than just hiding development. Cannot hide large developments</li> <li>• Development can take place up to the edge of the Green Belt. However, need sensitive measures to soften transition.</li> <li>• Local Plan should follow NPPF requirements and detailed guidance to ensure adverse effects on natural environs are minimized – Natural England</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>Include policies to ensure that development in and adjoining the Green Belt does not have an unacceptable impact on its rural character and openness.</p> <p>Wide support for policy although some questioned why any development should be allowed within the Green Belt.</p> <p>In response to specific issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design policy will ensure development that does not impact on the character of the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Additional policies will explain purpose of Green Belt.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining the Green Belt
<b>Policy NH/8: Mitigating the Impact of Development in and adjoining the Green Belt (and paragraph 6.34 – 6.35 )</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	<p>Total: 10</p> <p>Support: 3 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC))</p> <p>Object: 7 (including 1 from PC)</p>
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Support policy</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – General support for policies in environment chapter</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> – Object on basis that development in green belt is inappropriate unless can demonstrate exceptional circumstances according to NPPF.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Propose change of wording to strengthen policy.</li> <li>• <b>Great Shelford PC</b> – Landscaping could be used as excuse to permit development in green belt. Policy should include wording stating development is inappropriate unless exceptional circumstances.</li> <li>• No exceptional circumstances to warrant encroachment on Green Belt.</li> <li>• If exceptional circumstances proven then exceptional landscape enhancement must form part of development – area equal in size to area released from Green Belt must be added within same geographical zone.</li> <li>• Any development will conflict with wording of policy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Assessment</b></p>	<p>The policy has been updated from similar ones included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, which were found sound through the examination. Previous policies dealt separately with mitigation in and adjoining the Green Belt. The policy does comply with guidance in the NPPF however a minor change to the supporting text is proposed to spell out more clearly that the approach to Green Belt in the NPPF is the starting point for the policy as many representations sought this clarification. The NPPF test for development in the green belt is that there must be ‘very special circumstances’.....The ‘exceptional circumstances’ test relates specifically to whether the green belt should be reviewed through the plan making process.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Amend paragraphs 6.34 and 6.35 to read the following:</p> <p>‘6.34. The area of Green Belt in South Cambridgeshire comprises 23,000 hectares covering over 25% of the district. This means much of the district is affected by Green Belt policies particularly those villages surrounding Cambridge and <b><u>the NPPF gives strong protection to the Green Belt.</u></b>’</p> <p>‘6.35 Green Belt is a key designation in the district, designed to protect the setting and special character of Cambridge. <del>Even where exceptional circumstances warrant changes to the Green Belt or a</del> <b><u>Inappropriate development will not be approved except in very special circumstances. All</u></b> development proposals <del>is</del> <b><u>including those</u></b> considered appropriate <del>form of development</del> in the Green Belt, it will need to be designed and landscaped to ensure they do not have an adverse impact on wider rural character and openness.’</p>

**Policy NH/9: Redevelopment of Previously Developed Sites and Infilling in the Green Belt**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 35</b></p>	<p><b>Redevelopment in the Green Belt</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<p>Cambridge Green Belt Study – (Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002)</p>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>GB/4 Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>A number of ‘major development sites’ within the Cambridge Green Belt are currently identified within a policy where redevelopment and infill are permitted within the defined confines of these sites subject to there being no adverse impact on the purposes of the Green Belt. The sites are Babraham Hall; Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospital and Girton College.</p> <p>Within the National Planning Policy Framework there is amended wording relating to infill development that would be appropriate in the Green Belt. Previously it was only ‘major existing developed sites identified in adopted local plans’ where redevelopment would be allowed. The revised wording is ‘...limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.’</p> <p>This revised wording could therefore mean that there is no longer a need for the existing policy since the national Green Belt policy will cover this aspect of redevelopment of sites within the Green Belt.</p> <p>However the policy also includes limitations on the redevelopment relating to the floor area, footprint, height and degree of impact. Whilst the revised wording does re-emphasis that the openness and the purposes of the Green Belt should not make an impact greater than the existing development it does not specify a limitation on the scale of the new buildings.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b></p> <p>An issue for the Local Plan is whether to rely on this national guidance, or whether more detailed guidance should be included in the Local Plan, addressing issues such as floor area, footprint, height and degree of impact from development.</p>

<p><b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b></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 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><b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b></p>	<p><b>Question 35:</b> Regarding infilling on, or complete redevelopment of, previously developed sites in the Green Belt, should the Local Plan:</p> <p>i) Rely on National Planning Policy Framework guidance for determining planning applications; or</p> <p>ii) Include more detailed guidance regarding design, such as scale and height of development?</p>
<p><b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b></p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework addresses the issue of redevelopment in the Green Belt (option i), and its principles could be applied alongside other policies options proposed in this report, including those addressing high quality design, and landscape character. Providing more detailed design policy (option ii) could deliver extra protection for the qualities of the Green Belt, although the scale of the additional impact is unclear.</p>
<p><b>Representations Received</b></p>	<p><b>Question 35 i)</b> Support: 4, Object: 4, Comment: 1</p> <p><b>Question 35ii)</b> Support: 47, Object: 0, Comment: 5</p>
<p><b>Key Issues from Representations</b></p>	<p><b>Question 35 i)</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support – Cambridge University; Litlington Parish Council.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NPPF always the most wishy washy line – not local enough.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NPPF most appropriate.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 35ii)</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to include consultation with local community beforehand.</li> <li>• Local issues need local solutions.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 15 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Need to allow flexibility to allow innovative solutions for re-use of land</li> <li>• Need to ensure any development is of high quality</li> <li>• Could include guidance in Design Guide SPD</li> <li>• Guidance should encourage use of other sites</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to ensure developments are sympathetic. Need to protect Green Belt for future generations</li> <li>• Can only be approached on a site by site basis</li> <li>• Quarter-To-Six Quadrant vision document fully supports the protection and development of landscape, agriculture, biodiversity, green infrastructure, green space, community orchards and woodland, the Cam, and heritage assets, and makes recommendations as to how this could be implemented in the area around the four villages (Barton, Coton, Madingley and Grantchester)</li> <li>• Include more detailed guidance to ensure adverse effects on natural environment are minimized (Natural England)</li> <li>• Should have strong reference to the parish councils and residents associations which are currently often ignored.</li> <li>• Need corresponding relaxation of rural policies to allow conversion of existing buildings within green belt</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>Include a policy in the Local Plan that has detailed guidance addressing issues such as footprint, height and degree of impact from the development.</p> <p>Overwhelming support for having additional guidance and not to rely on the NPPF.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for consideration of local views when determining proposals that may impact Green Belt. The local community are given the opportunity to comment on all applications and their comments are valued.</li> <li>• Each proposal will be considered on a case by case basis to assess its impact on the Green Belt.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b></p>	<p>Policy NH/9: Redevelopment of Previously Developed Sites and Infilling in the Green Belt</p>
<p><b>Policy NH/9: Redevelopment of Previously Developed Sites and Infilling in the Green Belt (and paragraph 6.36)</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposed Submission</b></p>	<p>Total: 8 Support: 4 (including 1 Parish Council (PC))</p>

<b>Representations Received</b>	Object: 4
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> - Support</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – General support for policies in environment chapter.</li> <li>• Support for second part of policy as complies with NPPF.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> + other – NPPF (paragraph 89) allows ‘limited infilling in villages and limited affordable housing for local community needs...’ but no definition of ‘limited’. Policy should specify limit on number of homes that can be built. Suggest five homes as a maximum? Brownfield land to be used first. Detailed wording suggested for change to policy.</li> <li>• <b>Girton College</b> – seek amendments to policy and supporting text - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Policy to recognise special nature of site as established development site within Green Belt where development brief will be prepared.</li> <li>○ Criteria in part 1 of policy go beyond NPPF - should be removed.</li> <li>○ Amendment to paragraph 6.36 to comply with NPPF – The NPPF (para 89 last bullet point) refers to the 'partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites' whereas paragraph 6.36 only refers to 'complete redevelopment'.</li> <li>○ Remove phrase in 6.36 ‘to rural character’ of Green Belt as not consistent with NPPF.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The NPPF now enables limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt. This new guidance made an existing policy about specific identified major developed sites in the Green Belt out of date. This policy was in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD and identified four sites including Girton College within South Cambs. Policy NH/9 is new as it takes into account the changes found in the NPPF. Girton College no longer is to be treated as a special case. The college has requested that it be given a special designation. This is not considered to be necessary. Future development proposals by Girton College will be treated on their merits recognising the special nature of the site within the Green Belt. The Green Belt policies only allow such development if it does not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development . No amendment is therefore proposed to the policy.</p>

	<p>Minor changes are proposed to Policy NH/9 and to paragraph 6.36 so that they reflect more fully the wording within the NPPF regarding partial or complete redevelopment. Also the term rural character is to be removed from 6.36 and additional wording included to replicate the NPPF.</p> <p>A number of respondents including CPPF have found the wording of the infill section of the policy unclear, requesting the specific level of infilling that would be allowed should be stated in the policy. The Green Belt does not extend over whole villages within South Cambs but may cover groups of dwellings separate from the main nucleus of a settlement. As these areas are likely to be small only limited infilling could be allowed that would not cause harm to the open nature of the Green Belt. The policy also applies to large developed sites within the green belt where a large scale of infill may be appropriate. It is not appropriate to define the scale of infill development in the policy which will be best assessed on a case by case basis. There is a separate policy for exception sites (Policy H/10) where affordable housing could be allowed outside of a village framework and these sites could be within the Green Belt. Policy H/10 would be the relevant policy for considering the level of affordable housing that would be allowed in these circumstances. A minor change is proposed to make clear the meaning of section 2 of Policy NH/9 and its supporting text.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Amend part 1 of Policy NH/9 to read:  ‘The Council will seek to ensure that <b><u>the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt</u></b> will be limited to that which would not result in:…’</p> <p>Amend the first sentence of part 2 of Policy NH/9 to read:  ‘Infilling is defined as the filling of small gaps between built developments <b><u>development in the Green Belt.</u></b>’</p> <p>Amend paragraph 6.36 to read:  ‘The NPPF now enables limited infilling or <b><u>the partial or</u></b> complete redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt. Planning applications will be assessed to ensure that such infilling or redevelopment does not have <b><u>a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development.</u></b></p>

**Policy NH/10: Recreation in the Green Belt**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 36</b></p>	<p><b>Green Belt and Recreation Uses</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambridge Green Belt Study – (Landscape Design Associates for South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002)</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD: GB/5 Recreation in the Green Belt</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework states that once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land.</p> <p>The Cambridge Green Belt plays an important role in providing opportunities for access to the countryside for local people. This is recognised in the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy. The major urban extensions that are planned around Cambridge will create additional demands for access to Green Infrastructure at the same time as providing opportunities to deliver new areas of Green Infrastructure, both strategic and local. These areas of</p> <p>Green Infrastructure plays a key role in linking the urban area with the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>An existing policy provides encouraging proposals for use of Green Belt to increase or enhance access to the open countryside.</p> <p>The NPPF guidance on Green Belt continues to allow for the provision of ‘appropriate facilities’ for outdoor sport and recreation where it does not conflict with Green Belt purposes. With the growth proposed in the extensions around the City in the Cambridge Green Belt it is likely that land will become more intensively used, which could result in uses such as playing fields being relocated to, or specifically developed on, Green Belt land. It is important this is done in a way which protects the overall rural character of the Cambridge Green Belt, rather than creating a character more associated with the urban environment.</p>

	<p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b></p> <p>The Local Plan could continue to support recreation uses in the Green Belt, but require the cumulative impact of sports pitches and recreation development to be considered, to avoid the over-concentration of such sports grounds where it would be detrimental to the character and rural setting of Cambridge and the Green Belt villages.</p>
<p><b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b></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 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><b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b></p>	<p><b>Question 36:</b> Should the Local Plan include a policy requiring the cumulative impact of sports pitches and recreation development to be considered, to avoid the over-concentration of such sports grounds where it would be detrimental to the character and rural setting of Cambridge and Green Belt villages?</p>
<p><b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b></p>	<p>Avoiding over concentration of pitches could contribute to maintaining landscape character of the Green Belt, but it could impact on the delivery of pitches, or the delivery of housing numbers in development sites if those sites are constrained. The scale of such an impact would depend on site specific factors.</p>
<p><b>Representations Received</b></p>	<p>Support: 38 Object: 9 Comment: 8</p>
<p><b>Key Issues from Representations</b></p>	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 19 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Policy essential to ensure well- spread and easily accessible sports pitches.</li> <li>• Over-concentration of recreational activities will leads to urban rather than rural character – not normal ‘green’ landscape, impact on biodiversity and landscape</li> <li>• Each village should have its own pitches – more sustainable.</li> <li>• Quarter-To-Six Quadrant vision document fully supports the protection of green infrastructure.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sports grounds in Green Belt should be resisted unless they involve virtually no infrastructure. Unfortunately sports grounds tend to breed car parks, floodlights, astroturf, pavilions, fencing etc. Increased traffic and noise</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Danger of being too prescriptive to detriment of local opportunities</li> <li>• Objections to policy from two Parish Councils – Fen Ditton and Papworth Everard</li> <li>• Like other developments this should be considered on its merits and impact – not specific policy</li> <li>• There is a shortage within the district.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited sports facilities available in Cambridge area. No area has over-concentration of public sports facilities. Should restrict large commercial leisure centres and University owned facilities unless they share with local community</li> <li>• Review of Green Belt for high value areas and totally protect these.</li> <li>• NPPF sufficient to deal with issue?</li> <li>• More sustainable to co-locate sports facilities in one place rather than distribute them?</li> <li>• Wherever possible sports amenities and playing fields should be within housing developments</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>Include a policy in the Local Plan requiring cumulative impact of sports pitches and recreation development to be considered to avoid overconcentration of such sports grounds which it would be to detriment to purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>There was considerable support for including a policy.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy does not rule out the grouping of pitches, or the location of facilities in the Green Belt.</li> <li>• Provision of new recreation grounds within new development areas is considered in policies in the Plan as is the protection of existing facilities so that they are not lost to the community.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b></p>	<p>Policy NH/10: Recreation in the Green Belt</p>

<b>Policy NH/10: Recreation in the Green Belt ( and paragraphs 6.37 – 6.38)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 7 Support: 4 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC)) Object: 3
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fulbourn PC</b> – Support policy for providing sport and recreation in villages within Green Belt such as Fulbourn.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – Support general policies in environment chapter.</li> <li>• <b>Trumpington Residents Association</b> – Support increased access to green belt but concerned at development of sports pitches.</li> <li>• Green Belt is an asset for benefit of local community – should allow for improved public access. Council should promote schemes such as those promoted in Quarter to Six Quadrant document. Green Infrastructure Strategy provides framework to implement.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grosvenor Development and <b>Anglian Ruskin University</b> – NPPF para 81 states local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance beneficial use of Green Belt – opportunities to provide access to outdoor sports and recreation. NPPF identifies outdoor sport as appropriate green belt use. Suggest change of wording to paragraph 6.38 to say plan will seek to positively bring forward land in green belt for outdoor sport.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Support intention of policy but has sought provision of school playing fields outside development footprints including in Green Belt as means of supporting overall development viability. Will need balance in application of this policy. Should allow for scope to expand schools to provide additional education provision as required.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The first section of this policy has been carried forward from one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, which was found sound through the examination.</p> <p>The policy conforms to the NPPF as it encourages access to the Green Belt for outdoor sport and recreation. However with the proposed growth around Cambridge it is likely that land will become more intensively used, which could result in uses such as</p>

	<p>playing fields being relocated to, or developed on, Green Belt land. The design of these areas must protect the rural character of the Cambridge Green Belt. The NPPF allows for the provision of ‘appropriate facilities’ for outdoor sport and recreation where it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with Green Belt purposes. The intention of the second part of the policy is to clarify what would be considered appropriate in the Cambridge Green Belt.</p> <p>The policy cannot be amended to imply where exceptions will be made to Green Belt policy as has been requested by the County Council. Each such proposal needs to be looked at on its merits and taking cumulative impacts into account. Factors to consider will include the nature of such facilities and the impact of a concentration of recreation uses on the openness of the Green Belt.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>No change</b></p>

## Policy NH/11: Protected Village Amenity Areas

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012</b> Issues 37 and 38</p> <p><b>Issues and Options 2013</b> (Part 2) Issues 12 and 13</p>	<p><b>Protected Village Amenity Areas and Local Green Spaces</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)</li> <li>• Adopted Proposals Map</li> </ul>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD: CH/6 Protected Village Amenity Areas</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework has introduced a new designation for inclusion in local and neighbourhood plans. Local communities can identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>The Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy recognises that within South Cambridgeshire there are many villages that feature small fields and paddocks and remnants of early enclosure, which provide a local landscape setting and opportunity for people to experience biodiversity and enjoy open spaces and other benefits. These should be considered to be an important part of local Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Within the District there are areas that are considered important to the amenity and character of villages which have been designated as Protected Village Amenity Areas (PVAA). As a result of the increasing pressure for development within villages it has been recognised that some open land needs to be protected to retain the character of these villages otherwise the blend of buildings and open space will be lost as a result of all the open spaces being developed. Some of the PVAA's have important functions for the village such as allotments, recreation grounds and playing fields whilst others have an important amenity role. Not all PVAA's have public access as some undeveloped areas which are important may be private gardens.</p> <p>The NPPF provides a clear indication of when the designation of</p>

	<p>LGS should be used and it is apparent that there are similarities between PVAAs and the new Local Green Spaces (LGSs). PVAAs are located within villages and it is suggested a LGS should only be designated in 'reasonably close proximity to the community it serves'. Some existing PVAAs could be described as 'green areas which are local in character' and others as 'green areas that hold a particular local significance because of their beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of their wildlife'. Also PVAAs do not cover extensive tracts of land.</p> <p>However there are some differences between PVAAs and LGSs. The NPPF has stated that the local policy for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with policy for Green Belts. The existing policy for PVAAs does not permit development within or adjacent to such areas if it would impact on the character, amenity, tranquillity or function of the village. The policy managing development within Green Belt areas in South Cambridgeshire has slightly different restrictions since although it looks to protect the rural character of the land it does not include specific consideration of the amenity, tranquillity or function of the village. Also the policy mentions retaining the openness of Green Belt land. Whilst some existing PVAAs would have this characteristic of openness and can be seen from viewpoints within a village others are enclosed or semi-enclosed areas.</p> <p>Also within the PVAA policy there are no exceptions to the development that are considered inappropriate whereas there are exceptions for Green Belt areas that are listed in the NPPF. A policy for LGS if it is to be consistent with Green Belt would therefore need to include such exceptions. For example limited infilling and affordable housing in villages could be permitted as could outdoor sports facilities or buildings for agriculture and forestry. Whilst some PVAAs are already recreation grounds it would alter the character of others allocated for their tranquil character if a sports pitch were to be permitted development. Such development could alter the character of a PVAA and therefore an LGS designation performs a different role to that of some PVAAs.</p> <p>Given the close link between some existing PVAAs and the new designation consideration should be given as to whether to re-designate some PVAAs as LGSs.</p> <p>The NPPF indicates that LGSs should be on green areas of particular importance to the local communities and therefore the communities within the District should be given the opportunity to put forward green areas as candidates for LGSs. It should be noted that the NPPF also says that the LGS designation will not be appropriate</p>
--	--

	<p>for most green areas or open space. A LGS is seen as being an allocation of land that will extend beyond the period of a local plan – so like a Green Belt designation have a long lifetime of protection and not one that can be reviewed regularly.</p> <p>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives: The Local Plan could retain the approach to Protected Village Amenity Areas, in order to protect the character, amenity, tranquillity or function of valued open spaces in villages. The plan making process can offer the opportunity to review the sites included, or for new ones to be suggested.</p> <p>The Local Plan could identify Local Green Space sites, which could include some existing PVAA.</p>
<p><b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b></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 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><b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b></p>	<p><b>Question 37:</b> <b>A:</b> Should the existing policy for Protected Village Amenity Areas be retained in the Local Plan?</p> <p><b>B:</b> Please provide any comments, including if there are any existing PVAAAs in villages (as shown on the Proposals Map) that you think should be removed or any new ones that should be identified.</p> <p><b>Question 38:</b> Should the Local Plan identify any open spaces as Local Green Space and if so, what areas should be identified, including areas that may already be identified as Protected Village Amenity Areas?</p>
<p><b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b></p>	<p>PVAA policy is a constraint to development which could harm settlement amenity. The scoping report identifies that a wide range of sites, of varying character have been identified using this designation. It would therefore have positive impacts on landscape and townscape character objective and other objectives which benefit from the protection of open spaces.</p> <p>The local green space designation offers protection to valuable open spaces, in some ways similar to the Protected Village Amenity policy. It could therefore have similar positive impacts, although the scale is currently uncertain, as it would depend on which sites were identified.</p>

<b>Representations Received</b>	<b>Question 37A:</b> Support: 99, Object: 2, Comment: 7 <b>Question 37B:</b> Support: 15, Object: 1, Comment: 46 <b>Question 38:</b> Support: 65, Object: 3, Comment: 35
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<b>Question 37A</b>  <b>SUPPORT:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting retention of policy including from 26 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Green rural feel of villages needs to be retained.</li> <li>• Shortage of open space in villages.</li> <li>• Best villages are those that have retained green space within village</li> <li>• Once lost PVAA cannot be replaced. Losing ‘family silver’.</li> <li>• New sites should be considered especially in villages that are growing to create new spaces for local people to enjoy.</li> <li>• Need to be able to designate new sites which come to light through localism agenda.</li> <li>• Village greens, orchards, recreation grounds, footpaths and bridleways should be automatically protected.</li> <li>• Need clarification in policy as to what development is considered acceptable within PVAA.</li> <li>• Policy should allow for very limited development.</li> <li>• Criteria should be clear so village knows what protected amenities are. If village does Neighbourhood Plan can conform to Local Plan.</li> </ul> <b>OBJECTIONS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PVAA is superfluous designation not supported by NPPF.</li> </ul> <b>COMMENTS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove PVAA policy. Policy restricts development opportunities in settlements particularly windfall sites.</li> <li>• If policy to be retained must review all existing PVAAs since some lost reason for original designation and new sites should be designated.</li> <li>• Having both PVAAs and Local Green Space could lead to overly complicated, onerous Local Plan.</li> <li>• Policy should not exclude community development if no other site can be found e.g. village hall.</li> </ul> <b>Question 37B</b>  <b>SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL NEW PVAAs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A large number of sites were suggested.</li> </ul> <b>SUGGESTED REMOVAL OF EXISTING PVAAs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Duxford – Remove land at end of Manger’s Lane</li> <li>• Guilden Morden – Dubbs Knoll Road –land needs to be taken out of PVAA</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Abington – Remove PVAA on meadow and Bancroft Farm.</li> <li>• Over - land to the rear of The Lanes should be removed from PVAA.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Owners and developers will want to develop land to make money, not to benefit community. Must not be allowed. Takes value from everyone else.</li> <li>• Changes in Comberton should be derived from a Village Plan</li> <li>• Need to consult local people if designating PVAAs. Landowners should be warned and consulted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Question 38</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to preserve local green space close to local community. Valued by locals and vulnerable to development</li> <li>• 20 Parish Council support idea</li> <li>• Policy should include important flood plains as identified by village communities and ‘greenways’ between villages.</li> <li>• Should include both large and small spaces and sites in private ownership that can contribute to setting of village (CPPF).</li> <li>• Large areas such as country parks and nature reserves should be listed with robust criteria and clear policy for LGS</li> <li>• Areas of historic importance which are privately owned fields, such as ridge and furrow fields should be protected from development</li> <li>• Cambridge City Council suggests that it is important to work together with SCDC on LGS designation</li> <li>• When LGS are designated need to consult with local people including land owner for each village</li> <li>• Changes to the current Comberton LGS should be from Village Plan.</li> <li>• Should be no net loss in green spaces</li> <li>• Important to protect green area around edge of village envelope and also sports pitches.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LGS should be a matter determined by each community locally, and not be for the Local Plan to identify these.</li> <li>• Object to LGS being alongside existing PVAA policy – unnecessary duplication. Local Plan should align with NPPF</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unnecessary outside planning frameworks because there is no presumption in favour of development in those places</li> <li>• Should not include private open space as LGS</li> <li>• Each site should be thoroughly assessed.</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Trust interested in working with local communities to achieve LGS where they are close to Wicken Vision area.</li> </ul> <p><b>SUGGESTED AREAS TO BE IDENTIFIED AS LGS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A large number of sites were suggested as LGS.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons following Issues and Options 1</b></p>	<p>To continue to include a policy in the plan protecting village amenity areas and also to include a policy for Local Green Space(LGS).</p> <p>Overwhelming support for retaining the policy for Protected Village Amenity Areas (PVAA) and new sites were suggested during the consultation which have been assessed and included in further consultation.</p> <p>Also support for having a new policy for LGS and a large number of sites were suggested, assessed and involved in further consultation. Parish councils have had an extended opportunity to suggest sites since it was recognised that some had not put forward sites during the summer 2012 consultation.</p> <p>In response to specific issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestions that only one policy be used to protect green space in villages. However some PVAA's have an important role in protecting the character of a village but may not pass the tests for to be designated as a LGS since the area may not be valued by the local community. It was therefore considered relevant to retain the existing PVAA policy.</li> <li>The Council in considering including a policy for LGS has asked the local community for suggestions for sites and therefore the Local Plan process has not imposed sites on the local community. LGS is an appropriate designation to be included in the Local Plan</li> <li>The guidance used by the Council to assess all the LGS suggestions was that which is included in the NPPF. It could be assumed that the same criteria would be used to assess green space when adjoining councils have sites to consider.</li> <li>Landowners of any sites suggested as LGS will have the opportunity to comment on the designations during the consultations carried out on the draft Local Plan as will the local community.</li> <li>Large sites such as country parks would not in the Council's opinion meet the criteria for LGS since they are likely to be extensive tracts of land.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Analysis and initial Issues and Options 2 Approaches</b></p>	<p>As a result of the consultation in 2012 the Council has a large number of sites to assess. Issues and Options 2 included the criteria used for assessing all these sites which followed the guidance from the NPPF. The assessments of these sites was included in Appendix 12 of the Initial Sustainability Report 2013. Each site was assessed as to whether it could meet the criteria for</p>

	<p>both PVAA and LGS – the key difference for PVAAs is the need to be within a village framework.</p> <p>60 sites were included in the 2013 consultation for consideration as LGS. A further 9 were identified as Parish Council proposed important green spaces as these sites submitted by the Parish Councils did not meet the criteria tests for LGS.</p>
<p><b>Representations Received to Issues and Options 2</b></p>	<p><b>Question 12:</b> Which of the potential Green Spaces do you support or object to and why?</p> <p>G1 - Bassingbourn - Play area and open space in Elbourn Way South of the road Support: 4; Object: 0; Comment: 1</p> <p>G2 - Bassingbourn - Play area and open space owned by the Parish Council in Fortune Way Support: 6; Object: 0</p> <p>G3 - Bassingbourn - The Rouses Support: 15; Object: 1; Comment: 1</p> <p>G4 - Bassingbourn - The play area and open space in Elbourn Way North of the road Support: 4; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G5 - Caldecote - Recreation sports field off Furlong Way Support: 3; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G6 - Cambourne - Land north of Jeavons Lane, north of Monkfield Way Support: 7; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G7 - Cambourne - Land south of Jeavons Wood Primary School Support: 7; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G8 - Cambourne - Cambourne Recreation Ground, Back Lane (2) Support: 6; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G9 - Cambourne - land east of Sterling Way Support: 6; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G10 - Cambourne - Land east of Sterling Way, north of Brace Dein Support: 4; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G11 - Cambourne - Land north of School Lane, west of Woodfield Lane Support: 6; Object: 0; Comment: 1</p>

	<p>G12 - Cambourne - Land east of Greenbank Support: 5; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G13 - Cambourne - Land north of School Lane, west of Broad Street Support: 7; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G14 - Cambourne - Cambourne Recreation Ground, Back Lane (1) Support: 6; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G15 - Cambourne - Land north of Green Common Farm, west of Broadway Support: 6; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G16 - Cambourne - Landscaped areas within village and around edge of village Support: 8; Object: 0; Comment: 6</p> <p>G17 - Cottenham - All Saints Church Support: 4; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G18 - Cottenham - Moat Support: 4; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G19 - Cottenham - Broad Lane - High Street Junction Support: 4; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G20 - Cottenham - Land at Victory Way Support: 4; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G21 - Cottenham - Cemetery , Lamb Lane Support: 4; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G22 - Cottenham - Orchard Close Support: 3; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G23 - Cottenham - Coolidge Gardens Support: 3; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G24 - Cottenham - South of Brenda Gautry Way Support: 3; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G25 - Cottenham - Dunstall Field Support: 3; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G26 - Cottenham - West of Sovereign Way Support: 3; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G27 - Cottenham - Old Recreation Ground</p>
--	---

	<p>Support: 2; Object: 0; Comment: 1</p> <p>G28 - Cottenham - Recreation Ground and Playing Fields Support: 3; Object: 0; Comment: 1</p> <p>G29 - Cottenham - Playing Fields Support: 2; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G30 - Foxton - Foxton Recreation ground Support: 2; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G31 - Foxton - The Green Support: 2; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G32 - Foxton - The Dovecote meadow Support: 2; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G33 - Fulbourn - Small parcel of land between the Townley Hall at the Fulbourn Centre and the access road to the same, and fronting Home End Support: 48; Object: 1; Comment: 1</p> <p>G34 – Fulbourn - The field between Cox's Drove, Cow Lane and the railway line - as well as the associated low-lying area on Cow Lane adjacent to the Horse Pond. Support: 60; Object: 2; Comment: 1</p> <p>G35 - Great Shelford - Land between Rectory Farm and 26 Church Street Support: 6; Object: 1; Comment: 0</p> <p>G36 - Guilden Morden - 36 Dubbs Knoll Road Support: 1; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G37 - Haslingfield - Recreation Ground Support: 1; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G38 - Ickleton - Village green - opposite the Church Support: 2; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G39 - Litlington - Village Green Support: 0; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G40 - Litlington - St Peter's Hill Support: 0; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G41 - Litlington - Recreation Ground, Support: 0; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p>
--	---

	<p>G42 - Little Abington - Scout Campsite, Church Lane Support: 1; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G43 - Little Abington - Bowling Green, High Street Support: 1; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G44 - Over - Station Road/Turn Lane Support: 0; Object: 7; Comment: 0</p> <p>G45 - Over - Willingham Road/west of Mill Road Support: 1; Object: 1; Comment: 1</p> <p>G46 - Pampisford - The Spinney adjacent to 81 Brewery Road. Support: 1; Object: 2; Comment: 0</p> <p>G47 - Papworth Everard - Wood behind Pendragon Hill Support: 0; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G48 - Papworth Everard - Jubilee Green Support: 0; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G49 - Papworth Everard - Baron's Way Wood Support: 0; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G50 - Papworth Everard - Rectory Woods Support: 0; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G51 - Papworth Everard - Meadow at west end of Church Lane Support: 0; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G52 - Sawston - Challis Garden, Mill Lane Support: 44; Object: 0; Comment: 7</p> <p>G53 - Sawston - Spike Playing Field - open space at end of South Terrace Support: 40; Object: 2; Comment: 7</p> <p>G54 - Steeple Morden - The Ransom Strip, Craft Way Support: 1; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G55 - Steeple Morden - The Recreation Ground, Hay Street Support: 1; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G56 - Steeple Morden - The Cowslip Meadow Support: 1; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G57 - Steeple Morden - Whiteponds Wood</p>
--	--

	<p>Support: 1; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G58 - Toft - Land adjacent to 6 High Street Support: 2; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G59 -Toft - The Recreation Ground Support: 2; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>G60 - Toft - Home Meadow, Support: 1; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p><b>Question 13:</b> Which of the Parish Council proposed important green spaces do you support or object to and why?</p> <p>Parish Council Proposed Important Green Spaces Support: 18; Object: 0; Comment: 5</p> <p>PC14 - Bassingbourn - 75 and 90 Spring Lane; and the junction with the by-way at Ashwell Street. Support: 5; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>PC15 - Foxton - The green area on Station Road in front of, and beside, the Press cottages Support: 2; Object: 1; Comment: 0</p> <p>PC16 - Gamlingay - Dennis Green, The Cinques, Mill Hill, Little Heath, The Heath Support: 2; Object: 1; Comment: 0</p> <p>PC17 - Great Shelford - Grange field in Church Street; Support: 6; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>PC18 - Great Shelford - Field to the east of the railway line on the southern side of Granhams Road Support: 5; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>PC19 - Haslingfield - Byron's Pool Support: 2; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>PC20 - Milton - Field opposite Tesco beside Jane Coston Bridge Support: 1; Object: 2; Comment: 0</p> <p>PC21 - Papworth Everard - Summer's Hills open space Support: 1; Object: 0; Comment: 0</p> <p>PC22 - Steeple Morden - Tween Town Wood Support: 0; Object: 1; Comment: 0</p>
--	---

	<p>Rejected LGS sites (Appendix 12 of Supplementary Initial Sustainability Appraisal) Support: 0; Object: 13; Comment: 0</p> <p>Sites suggested by Parish Councils and individuals:</p> <p><b>Bar Hill Parish</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land north of Almond Grove, Bar Hill</li> <li>2. Land east of Acorn Avenue, Bar Hill</li> <li>3. Land north of Appletrees, Bar Hill</li> <li>4. Village Green, Bar Hill</li> <li>5. Recreation Ground, Bar Hill</li> <li>6. Land north of Little Meadow, Bar Hill</li> <li>7. Land south of Viking Way, Bar Hill</li> <li>8. Allotments, south of Saxon Way, Bar Hill</li> <li>9. Land south of Saxon Way, Bar Hill</li> <li>10. Golf Course, Bar Hill</li> <li>11. Green areas bordering each side of the perimeter road, Bar Hill</li> </ol> <p><b>Barton Parish</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Leys, an area of common land running from the High Street to Wimpole Road, including the Recreation Ground</li> <li>2. Church Close Nature Reserve, an area between Allens Close and the Churchyard</li> <li>3. The green space fronting the houses of Hines Close, towards Comberton Road.</li> <li>4. The green space forming the central part of Roman Hill.</li> </ol> <p><b>Bassingbourn Parish</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ford Wood</li> </ul> <p><b>Bourn Parish</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hall Close playground</li> <li>2. Hall Close green</li> <li>3. Jubilee Recreation Ground</li> <li>4. Camping Close</li> <li>5. Access to Camping Close</li> <li>6. Site F – West of High Street /Gills Hill to south of village</li> </ol> <p><b>Caxton Parish</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Old Market Place, Ermine Street</li> </ul> <p><b>Cambourne Parish</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend G16 to include Honeysuckle Close and Hazel Lane green space</li> </ul> <p><b>Comberton Parish</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The green verges of Green End and Branch Road in</li> </ol>
--	--

	<p>Comberton</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Green lung through village – north and south of Barton Road.</li> <li>3. Allotment site in South Street</li> <li>4. Allotment site in Long Road</li> <li>5. Watts Wood</li> </ol> <p>Cottenham Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Watts Wood</li> <li>2. Fen Reeves Wood</li> <li>3. Les King Wood</li> <li>4. Green verges along High Street</li> <li>5. Significant trees, groups of trees and hedgerows</li> <li>6. Village Green</li> <li>7. Raughton Road – Cottenham Lock???</li> <li>8. Church Lane – Long Drove</li> </ol> <p>Dry Drayton Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Park (with ponds) TL382619</li> <li>2. Village green (both sides of road)</li> <li>3. The Plantation TL384628</li> <li>4. Dry Drayton School Field</li> </ol> <p>Duxford Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greenacres</li> </ul> <p>Elsworth</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allotments</li> <li>2. Fardells Lane Nature Reserve - Existing PVAA.</li> <li>3. Field next to Dears Farm - Existing PVAA</li> <li>4. Glebe Field - Existing PVAA.</li> <li>5. Grass Close –Existing PVAA</li> <li>6. Avenue Meadow</li> <li>7. Avenue Farmhouse Paddock - formerly part of Avenue Meadow</li> <li>8. Grounds of Low Farm - existing PVAA</li> <li>9. The bed and banks of the brook, Brook Street</li> <li>10. Field between Brockley Road and Brook Street</li> <li>11. Land at South end of Brook Street</li> <li>12. Copse - Wildlife haven.</li> <li>13. Business Park Drive, associated with sites 6 &amp; 7.</li> <li>14. Wood - Wildlife haven.</li> <li>15. Land at Fardell's Lane between designated 'important view' and nearby conservation line</li> <li>16. County Wildlife Area, south end of the village?</li> <li>17. Elsworth Wood (SSSI)</li> </ol> <p>Eltisley Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Village green</li> <li>2. Allotments for Labouring Poor</li> </ol>
--	---

	<p>3. Pocket Park</p> <p>Fen Ditton Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Paddock at north eastern corner of Ditton Lane at the junction with High Ditch</li> <li>2. Village green on south west side of Horningsea Road</li> <li>3. Field opposite war memorial -south of the junction of Church Street and High Street</li> <li>4. Land between the High Street and the Parish cut of the River Cam; Ditton Meadow</li> <li>5. Ossier Holt - north east side of Green End and small area on opposite side</li> <li>6. Land between Nos. 12 and 28 Horningsea Road</li> <li>7. Area around the disused railway line crossed by High Ditch Road</li> </ol> <p>Fowlmere Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retaining wide ancient live-stock droving grass verges of B1368 passing into Fowlmere and out.</li> </ul> <p>Fulbourn Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fulbourn bounded by Apthorpe Street / Station Rd and Church Lane. Southern half of Site Option 28</li> <li>2. Victorian garden, associated with and beside the Old Pumping Station</li> <li>3. Extending recreation ground within village - There are only two fields which abut existing Recreation Ground. They are east of the present Rec, south of Stonebridge Lane and North of Barnsfield - Jeeves Acre.</li> <li>4. Land to the West of Station Road, Fulbourn</li> </ol> <p>Gamlingay Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lupin field</li> <li>2. The green lung separating Cinques from Gamlingay</li> <li>3. Land at Wren Park</li> </ol> <p>Great and Little Chishill Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bull Meadow</li> <li>2. Playing Field north of Hall Lane</li> </ol> <p>Guilden Morden Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The recreation ground in Fox Hill road</li> <li>2. The Craft which is opposite the end of New Road</li> <li>3. Church Meadow - the area to the rear of The Craft.</li> <li>4. The Vineyard</li> <li>5. Ruddyery Pit.</li> <li>6. The Green in Cannons Close</li> <li>7. Land between Swan Lane and Pound green</li> </ol>
--	---

	<p>8. Town Farm Meadow at the junction of Church Street and High Street</p> <p>9. Fox Corner</p> <p>10. The field which lies behind the cemetery in New Road</p> <p>11. Little Green</p> <p>12. Pound Green</p> <p>13. Field on right of village at end of High Street junction with Ashwell Road</p> <p>14. Thompsons Meadow public open space</p> <p>Hardwick Parish</p> <p>1. Play area adjacent to the Church</p> <p>2. Recreation ground in Egremont Road</p> <p>Harston Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orchard &amp; Recreation Ground</li> </ul> <p>Hauxton Parish</p> <p>1. Willow Way recreation ground (PVAA?)</p> <p>2. Village allotments to north of High Street</p> <p>3. Church Meadows</p> <p>Ickleton Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drivers Meadow</li> </ul> <p>Kingston Parish</p> <p>1. Village Green</p> <p>2. Field Road Green</p> <p>3. Village orchard</p> <p>4. Playground</p> <p>Linton</p> <p>1. Recreation Ground</p> <p>2. Village Green (Camping Close)</p> <p>3. Glebe Land</p> <p>4. Linton Village College playing fields</p> <p>5. Flemings Field - opposite side of the river to Pocket Park</p> <p>6. Grip Meadows</p> <p>Little Gransden</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites proposed for changes to village framework</li> </ul> <p>Little Shelford Parish</p> <p>1. Camping Close</p> <p>2. Triangle field between Whittlesford Road and High Street</p> <p>3. Hermitage</p> <p>4. Water Meadows</p>
--	---

	<p>Little Wilbraham Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recreation Ground</li> <li>2. The Pits</li> <li>3. Church Green</li> </ol> <p>Lolworth Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allotments to south of village</li> </ul> <p>Melbourn Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site A - Allotments, The Moor</li> <li>2. Site B New Recreation Ground and Millennium Copse, The Moor</li> <li>3. Site C - Old Recreation Ground, The Moor</li> <li>4. Site D - Recreational Green, Armingford Crescent</li> <li>5. Site E Recreational Green x 2, Russet Way</li> <li>6. Site F - Recreational Green and wood, Worcester Way</li> <li>7. Site G - The Cross, High Street</li> <li>8. Site H - Stockbridge Meadows, Dolphin Lane</li> <li>9. Site I - Recreational Green, Clear Crescent</li> <li>10. Site J - Play Park, Clear Crescent</li> <li>11. Site K - Recreational Green, Elm Way</li> <li>12. Site L - Recreational Green, Beechwood Avenue</li> <li>13. Site M - Recreational Green, Greengage Rise</li> <li>14. Site N - Recreational Green, Chalkhill Barrow</li> <li>15. Site O - Wood area running parallel with London Way and Royston Road</li> <li>16. Site 1 - Land alongside the Allotments, The Moor</li> <li>17. Site 2 - Land alongside the Allotments, The Moor</li> <li>18. Site 3 - Wooded area, The Moor</li> <li>19. Site 4 - Playing Field, MVC, The Moor</li> <li>20. Site 5 - Open Field, Station Road</li> <li>21. Site 6 - Playing Field, MVC, The Moor</li> <li>22. Site 7 - Land between Worcester Way and Armingford Crescent</li> <li>23. Site 8 - Primary School Fields, Mortlock Street</li> <li>24. Site 9 - Wooded area to the rear of Stockbridge Meadows</li> <li>25. Site 10 - The Bury</li> <li>26. Site 11 - Land off Victoria Way</li> <li>27. Site 12 - Old Orchard off New Road</li> <li>28. Site 13 - Orchard off New Road</li> </ol> <p>Meldreth Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recreation ground</li> <li>2. Land behind the Jephson's development along Whitecroft</li> <li>3. Melwood</li> <li>4. Melmeadow</li> <li>5. Flambards Green</li> <li>6. The grass verge at Bell Close/High Street</li> </ol>
--	---

	<p>Oakington and Westwick Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The green separation between Oakington and Northstowe</li> </ul> <p>Orwell Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chapel Orchard</li> <li>2. Allotments on the north side of Fisher's Lane</li> <li>3. Chapel Orchard Allotments including projected southerly allotment extension.</li> <li>4. Clunch pit car park and its access from High Street.</li> <li>5. Clunch Pit?</li> <li>6. Victoria Woods?</li> <li>7. Glebe Field, this is the steep hillside field behind St Andrews Church</li> <li>8. Recreation Ground at south end of Town Green Road</li> </ol> <p>Rampton Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Giants Hill</li> </ul> <p>Sawston Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Spicers Sports Field</li> <li>2. Lynton Way Recreation Ground:</li> <li>3. Orchard Park</li> <li>4. Deal Grove</li> <li>5. Green area in front of the old John Faulknes School</li> <li>6. Copse</li> </ol> <p>Stapleford Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land east of Bar Lane, Stapleford and west of the access road to Green Hedge Farm</li> </ul> <p>Thriplow Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Village Green</li> <li>2. Cricket Pitch</li> <li>3. Recreation Ground</li> <li>4. Pegs Close</li> <li>5. School Lane Meadow &amp; Orchid Meadow</li> <li>6. School Lane Meadow</li> <li>7. The Baulk Footpath</li> <li>8. The View Footpath</li> <li>9. The Spinney</li> <li>10. Open Land Church Street</li> <li>11. Dower House Woodland Area</li> </ol> <p>Toft Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Small green area immediately to west of G58</li> <li>2. Allotments</li> </ol> <p>Waterbeach Parish</p>
--	---

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bannold Road – area identified for housing</li> <li>2. Village Green</li> <li>3. The Gault</li> <li>4. Recreation Ground</li> <li>5. Millennium wood</li> <li>6. Old Pond Site</li> <li>7. Back Stiles</li> <li>8. Barracks Frontage</li> <li>9. Car Dyke</li> <li>10. Old Burial Ground</li> <li>11. Camlocks</li> <li>12. Coronation Close/Cambridge Road</li> <li>13. Abbey Ruins</li> <li>14. Town Holt</li> <li>15. School frontage</li> </ol> <p>Whaddon Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recreation Ground/ play area</li> <li>2. Golf course/driving range</li> <li>3. Whaddon Green</li> </ol> <p>Whittlesford Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Newton Road Play Area</li> <li>2. The Lawn</li> </ol>
<p><b>. Key Issues from representations</b></p>	<p><b>Main Views Received</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 51 respondents supported all the important green spaces included in the consultation</li> <li>• 36 Parish Councils and 15 individuals or local organisations submitted additional sites for consideration as Local Green Space (LGS).</li> <li>• 8 objections were received from the owners of land being proposed as LGS.</li> <li>• Over 200 sites have been assessed as a result of the 2013 consultation.</li> <li>• Of the 10 sites that were consulted upon as Parish Council proposals 8 Parish Councils wished the green space within their parish to be re-considered as LGS to be included in the local plan.</li> <li>• Other sites rejected during the 2012 assessment process and therefore not included as specific options in the Issues and Options 2 consultation were commented on by some respondents asking the Council to reconsider their assessment. These sites have been re-assessed.</li> </ul> <p><b>G1 – Bassingbourn - Play area and open space in Elbourn Way South of the road</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council confirms its support for Green Space G1</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important play area for local children. Simple green space play area whilst another part is equipped with swings and other play features. Given the proximity of this area to housing there may be a future temptation to allow development on part of area and it is important to prevent this at this stage.</li> </ul> <p><b>G2 - Bassingbourn - Play area and open space owned by the Parish Council in Fortune Way</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council confirms its support.</li> <li>• Has in past been proposed for development. Needs protecting as important play area owned by Parish Council.</li> </ul> <p><b>G3 - Bassingbourn - The Rouses</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lived in Bassingbourn all life and this is valuable open space valued by community. It has unique ambience and is very important to life of the community and engendering a sense of community spirit in the young</li> <li>• Enclosed area between Village Recreation Ground and Ford wood (an SSI wood), used by walkers and dog walkers, as a free open space and connects areas together, it is a safe quiet space and children use this as a route to school</li> <li>• Important to character of village. Special place</li> <li>• Has footpaths across it. Key part of green network around village</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from Cambridgeshire County Council to site being designated as LGS. Does not meet all the tests. Agricultural field – not special to community. Site is highly sustainable for future development.</li> </ul> <p><b>G4 - Bassingbourn - The play area and open space in Elbourn Way North of the road</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council confirms its support.</li> <li>• Unique and important area of open space</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p><b>G5 - Caldecote - Recreation sports field off Furlong Way</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major recreational area for village and needs on going protection. It is owned by Parish Council, has sports facilities built and is not available for other development.</li> <li>• Caldecote Parish Council supports</li> </ul> <p><b>G5 - Caldecote - Recreation sports field off Furlong Way</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major recreational area for village and needs on going protection. It is owned by Parish Council, has sports facilities built and is not available for other development.</li> <li>• Caldecote Parish Council supports</li> </ul> <p><b>G6 - Cambourne - Land north of Jeavons Lane, north of Monkfield Way</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambourne Parish Council supports</li> <li>• Consistent with Cambourne Master Plan</li> <li>• Keep green space</li> </ul> <p><b>G7 - Cambourne - Land south of Jeavons Wood Primary School</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambourne Parish Council supports</li> <li>• Consistent with Cambourne Master Plan</li> <li>• Keep green space</li> </ul> <p><b>G8 - Cambourne - Cambourne Recreation Ground, Back Lane (2)</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambourne Parish Council supports</li> <li>• Consistent with Cambourne Master Plan</li> <li>• Keep green space</li> </ul> <p><b>G9 - Cambourne- Cambourne, land east of Sterling Way</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambourne Parish Council supports</li> <li>• Consistent with Cambourne Master Plan</li> <li>• Keep green space</li> </ul> <p><b>G10 – Cambourne - Land east of Sterling Way, north of Brace</b></p>
--	---

	<p><b>Dein</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with Cambourne Master Plan</li> <li>• Keep green space</li> <li>• Cambourne Parish Council supports</li> </ul> <p><b>G11 - Cambourne - Land north of School Lane, west of Woodfield Lane</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambourne Parish Council supports</li> <li>• Consistent with Cambourne Master Plan</li> <li>• Keep green space</li> <li>• Important recreational area for village</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If play area could be incorporated into cricket pitch, land released could be used to provide a village green pub</li> </ul> <p><b>G12 - Cambourne - Land east of Greenbank</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambourne Parish Council supports</li> <li>• Consistent with Cambourne Master Plan</li> <li>• Keep green space</li> <li>• Allotments provide exercise opportunities for plot holders and their families, are educational for children and provide habitat and food for wildlife</li> </ul> <p><b>G13 - Cambourne - Land north of School Lane, west of Broad Street</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambourne Parish Council supports</li> <li>• Consistent with Cambourne Master Plan</li> <li>• Keep green space</li> <li>• Introduction of trim trail provides exercise opportunities</li> </ul> <p><b>G14 - Cambourne - Cambourne Recreation Ground, Back Lane (1)</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambourne Parish Council supports</li> <li>• Consistent with Cambourne Master Plan</li> <li>• Keep green space</li> </ul> <p><b>G15 - Cambourne - Land north of Green Common Farm, west of</b></p>
--	--

	<p><b>Broadway</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambourne Parish Council supports</li> <li>• Consistent with Cambourne Master Plan</li> <li>• Keep green space</li> </ul> <p><b>G16 - Cambourne - Landscaped areas within village and around edge of village</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cambourne Parish Council supports</li> <li>• Consistent with Cambourne Master Plan</li> <li>• Keep green space</li> <li>• Bourne Parish Council note that these perimeter areas provide valuable walking routes</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion to include an additional area to this LGS – green between Honeysuckle Close and Hazel Lane</li> <li>• Wildlife Trust manage boundary green area in Cambourne as part of Section 106 agreement. Boundary of G16 slightly different so suggest amending area so same as their management area.</li> </ul> <p><b>G17 - Cottenham - All Saints Church</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support, subject to being agreeable to Parish Church, and local residents. Particularly value the trees, and well-maintained remembrance gardens.</li> <li>• Support all green spaces in Cottenham</li> <li>• Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites.</li> <li>• Cottenham Parish Council support</li> <li>• Cottenham Village Design Group support</li> <li>• Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support</li> </ul> <p><b>G18 - Cottenham - Moat</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support all green spaces in Cottenham</li> <li>• Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites</li> <li>• Cottenham Parish Council support</li> <li>• Cottenham Village Design Group support</li> <li>• Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support</li> <li>• The moat is valuable site for great crested newts, and is also</li> </ul>
--	---

ancient monument scheduled by English Heritage

**G19 - Cottenham - Broad Lane - High Street Junction**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support all green spaces in Cottenham
- Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites
- Cottenham Parish Council support
- Oakington and Westwick Parish Council does not support
- Cottenham Village Design Group support
- Provides welcome green space along a very long and built up high street

**G20 - Cottenham - Land at Victory Way**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support all green spaces in Cottenham
- Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites
- Cottenham Parish Council support
- Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support
- Cottenham Village Design Group support

**G21 - Cottenham - Cemetery, Lamb Lane**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support all green spaces in Cottenham
- Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites
- Cottenham Parish Council support
- Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support
- Cottenham Village Design Group support

**G22 - Cottenham - Orchard Close**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support all green spaces in Cottenham
- Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites
- Cottenham Parish Council support
- Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support
- Cottenham Village Design Group support

**G23 - Cottenham - Coolidge Gardens**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support all green spaces in Cottenham

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites.</li> <li>• Cottenham Parish Council support</li> <li>• Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support</li> <li>• Cottenham Village Design Group support</li> </ul> <p><b>G24 - Cottenham - South of Brenda Gautry Way</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support all green spaces in Cottenham</li> <li>• Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites</li> <li>• Cottenham Parish Council support</li> <li>• Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support</li> <li>• Cottenham Village Design Group support</li> <li>• Space could provide future bicycle and foot access to the High Street for possible future developments to east of this site</li> </ul> <p><b>G25 - Cottenham - Dunstall Field</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support all green spaces in Cottenham</li> <li>• Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites</li> <li>• Cottenham Parish Council support</li> <li>• Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support</li> <li>• Cottenham Village Design Group support</li> <li>• This can provide future bicycle and foot traffic route to secondary school - must be kept as a green space</li> </ul> <p><b>G26 - Cottenham - West of Sovereign Way</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support all green spaces in Cottenham</li> <li>• Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites</li> <li>• Cottenham Parish Council support</li> <li>• Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support</li> <li>• Cottenham Village Design Group support</li> <li>• This land could provide future bicycle and foot traffic route from possible future development in east to Checkers</li> </ul> <p><b>G27 - Cottenham - Old Recreation Ground</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support all green spaces in Cottenham</li> <li>• Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites</li> </ul>
--	--

- Cottenham Village Design Group support
- Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support
- Historic amenity for village, is outstanding for its riverside setting and variety of wildlife habitat, and provides an important access point into wider countryside.

**COMMENTS:**

- Cottenham Parish Council ask that site is split into two parts – Part A is Broad Lane balancing pond which will remain protected; Part B (northern part) being the old Northend Playing fields. Parish Council reserve option to erect at future date sports or play-area facilities including possibly changing room. (Rep 53536)

**G28 - Cottenham - Recreation Ground and Playing Fields**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support all green spaces in Cottenham
- Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites
- Cottenham Village Design Group support
- Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support

**COMMENTS:**

- Cottenham Parish Council points out potential to swap with Cambridgeshire County Council the northern pink of the recreation ground with the southern blue of PC2, leaving two rectangles as opposed to jigsaw shapes. ( Rep no 53539)

**G29 - Cottenham - Playing Fields**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Support all green spaces in Cottenham
- Support from Cottenham Environment Audit Group and Fen Edge Footpath Group for all Cottenham sites
- Oakington and Westwick Parish Council support
- Cottenham Village Design Group support

**G30 - Foxton - Foxton Recreation ground**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Foxton Parish Council support

**G31 - Foxton - The Green**

**ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:**

- Foxton Parish Council support

	<p><b>G32 - Foxton - The Dovecote meadow</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foxton Parish Council support</li> </ul> <p><b>G33 - Fulbourn - Small parcel of land between the Townley Hall at the Fulbourn Centre and the access road to the same, and fronting Home End</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support designation</li> <li>• Fulbourn Parish Council supports this as the Parish Plan calls for village's setting and best landscapes and views to be preserved</li> <li>• Linked to recreation ground at rear, this area of pasture is of particular local significance as it provides an open, green setting for Townley Hall, while bringing a piece of countryside right into village.</li> <li>• Hedgerow onto Home End is as important in Conservation Area as nearby brick and flint walls.</li> <li>• Natural, visually tranquil site. Has potential for enhancement of its wildlife biodiversity. A natural "intervention" in streetscape it is an important space, a local characteristic that helps maintain rural feel of Fulbourn.</li> <li>• Village has expanded in recent years – need to protect remaining green spaces.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object to designation as LGS from landowner – Trustees of late K G Moss. (Rep 51543). No public access to land, not notable beauty, not rich in wildlife. Consider site suitable for housing development.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would oppose development of the site</li> </ul> <p><b>G35 - Great Shelford - Land between Rectory Farm and 26 Church Street</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for designation of site- adds to visual amenity of area being close to church and school.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection by Bidwells on behalf of Jesus College to designation of site since it is already land protected under other policies such as Green Belt. (Rep 51884)</li> </ul> <p><b>G36 - Guilden Morden - 36 Dubbs Knoll Road</b></p>
--	---

	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guilden Morden Parish Council support revision of boundary of PVAA</li> </ul> <p><b>G37 - Haslingfield Recreation Ground</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Haslingfield Parish Council support. Recreation ground is well used. Village hall is on site - widely used. Belt of trees on northern boundary provides nesting habitat for birds. Village Environment Group working with PC, has planted more trees, and is creating a 'wild area' which will attract wildlife. Site awarded Queen Elizabeth II Field status in 2012 and will therefore remain open space in perpetuity. Should be brought inside Village Framework, if this would help protect it.</li> </ul> <p><b>G38 - Ickleton - Village green - opposite the Church</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ickleton Parish Council support – heart of village; close to community; vital to setting of church and listed buildings; war memorial on green; tranquil; vital part of conservation area.</li> </ul> <p><b>G39 - Litlington - Village Green</b>  <b>G40 - Litlington - St Peter's Hill</b>  <b>G41 - Litlington - Recreation Ground</b>  No representations</p> <p><b>G42 - Little Abington - Scout Campsite, Church Lane</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Abington Parish Council supports maintaining the Scout Camp site as a green space</li> </ul> <p><b>G43 - Little Abington - Bowling Green, High Street</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Abington Parish Council supports maintaining Bowling Green as a Green Space</li> </ul> <p><b>G44 - Over - Station Road/Turn Lane</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to land being considered as PVAA. No public access to site and no views of church. Does not meet criteria for PVAA or LGS. Agreed by Inspector of Site Specific DPD in Sept 2009 (Rep 50810)</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from landowners.</li> <li>• Confused with adjacent site which is laid mainly to grass and does have views to church.</li> <li>• This site does not contribute to amenity and character of this part of village. As it stands it is of no value to village – overgrown.</li> <li>• Development of site best option for village to provide for affordable housing.</li> </ul> <p><b>G45 – Over - Willingham Road/west of Mill Road</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protects rural character of village</li> <li>• Used for dog walking and fruit pickers</li> <li>• Link to part – should be developed as community orchard.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to designation from Bloor Homes Eastern since land only agricultural field with no value – does not meet criteria. Deliverable for housing since in one ownership.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion that site should stay as a field or be community orchard.</li> </ul> <p><b>G46 - Pampisford - The Spinney adjacent to 81 Brewery Road.</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support green space</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landowner of Spinney objects to designation of site. Private land and owner has allowed permissive access.</li> <li>• Pampisford Parish Council after discussions with landowner wishes to withdraw support for designation.</li> </ul> <p><b>G47 - Papworth Everard - Wood behind Pendragon Hill</b>  <b>G48 - Papworth Everard - Jubilee Green</b>  <b>G49 - Papworth Everard - Baron’s Way Wood</b>  <b>G50 - Papworth Everard - Rectory Woods</b>  <b>G51 - Papworth Everard - Meadow at west end of Church Lane</b>  No representations</p> <p><b>G52 - Sawston - Challis Garden, Mill Lane</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vital to character of village</li> <li>• Protect this green space – well used by community</li> <li>• Sawston is lacking green space for size of village</li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sawston Parish Council - This area, now in control of Challis Memorial Trust and available for public access forms a natural extension of current Mill Lane PVAA and PVAA policies should be extended to it</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why are these areas so important? Unclear. If they have something special ie protected species of plants or animals, then I support this. If not, I do not see why only these areas should be protected over others, so I would object.</li> </ul> <p><b>G53 - Sawston - Spike Playing Field – open space at end of South Terrace</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sawston Parish Council - This area, once used as a playing field, forms an important green space for residents at southern end of Sawston</li> <li>• Need to protect remaining green space in village</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections to designation because site does not have access for public and could provide land for housing.</li> <li>• Just waste land.</li> <li>• The Spike serves no purpose, is removed from the village and is only used by dog walkers. Ideal for housing.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be used for development since not been used as recreational area</li> <li>• Why are these areas so important? Unclear. If they have something special ie protected species of plants or animals, then I support this. If not, I do not see why only these areas should be protected over others, so I would object.</li> </ul> <p><b>G54 - Steeple Morden - The Ransom Strip, Craft Way</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steeple Morden Parish Council support</li> </ul> <p><b>G55 - Steeple Morden - The Recreation Ground, Hay Street</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steeple Morden Parish Council support</li> </ul> <p><b>G56 - Steeple Morden - The Cowslip Meadow</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steeple Morden Parish Council support</li> </ul> <p><b>G57 - Steeple Morden - Whiteponds Wood</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steeple Morden Parish Council support</li> </ul> <p><b>G58 - Toft - Land adjacent to 6 High Street</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toft Parish Council support</li> </ul> <p><b>G59 - Toft - The Recreation Ground</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only piece of formal recreational ground available for children of village, and has recently had new play equipment installed partly funded by SCDC grant. Should be protected for posterity.</li> <li>• Toft Parish Council support</li> </ul> <p><b>G60 - Toft - Home Meadow,</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toft Parish Council support</li> </ul> <p><b>PC14 – Bassingbourn - 75 and 90 Spring Lane; and the junction with the by-way at Ashwell Street.</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site may not be considered to be much by SCDC, however it is used extensively by village as it joins the village to The Stret. This is the old roman road and is part of the conservation area. It is a great asset to the village and it's status should be protected.</li> <li>• Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council confirms its support.</li> </ul> <p><b>PC15 - Foxtton - The green area on Station Road in front of, and beside, the Press cottages</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foxtton Parish Council support proposal. All residents in this neighbourhood have been consulted. 96% were in favour of retaining this area as a green space. It adds character to this area of the village and is a very important element in the setting of two listed buildings. In addition, a recent planning application (S/0836/12/FL) was refused on the grounds that this open green space was an important part of the village.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from Endurance Estates Limited - Status that such protected green spaces would have is unclear. Issue 13 description sets out that such designation are not consistent with NPPF or the Council's approach.</li> <li>• Designation of PC15 is not supported. It is unclear what special quality land to be designated.</li> <li>• The Proposals Map designations should not try to plan for the minutiae of the District. To add an extra level of protection that is not consistent with NPPF</li> </ul> <p><b>PC16 - Gamlingay - Dennis Green, The Cinques, Mill Hill, Little Heath, The Heath</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish Council has identified three areas that should be identified as LGS – Lupin field; Green lung separating Cinques from Gamlingay and Land at Wren Park.</li> <li>• Gamlingay Environmental Action Group – suggest Heath Road and Green Acres, Gamlingay Cinques, and Wren Park, should be LGS. Adds to local character of village.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection from D H Barford &amp; Co Limited acting for various landowners in the vicinity of the area referred to. In the absence of a plan identifying the extent of the suggested designation we are unable to offer any detailed comments. However, we do not consider the area generally is appropriate for such a designation and this would be contrary to national planning guidance. Moreover it is inappropriate and unnecessary given the area is already protected by the prevailing open countryside policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>PC17 - Great Shelford - Grange field in Church Street</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC 17 is same site as site option R3 – Support the approach that gives the most protection to this site. Should be protected as open space</li> <li>• Adjacent to existing recreation ground. Has river and tree belt along its boundary. Limited views of village but worthy of protection</li> </ul> <p><b>PC18 - Great Shelford - Field to the east of the railway line on the southern side of Granhams Road</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for all LGS from 51 respondents.</li> <li>• PC 18 is same site as site option R2 – Support the approach that</li> </ul>
--	--

	<p>gives the most protection to this site. Should be protected as open space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect in the way proposed here should ensure that this area continues to make a contribution to the village's general appearance.</li> </ul> <p><b>PC19 - Haslingfield - Byron's Pool</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from Shepreth Parish Council.</li> <li>• Haslingfield PC – although site is a distance from village it is close to edge of Trumpington Meadows. Should be jointly protected by S Cambs and Cambridge City Councils and further access footpath added.</li> </ul> <p><b>PC20 - Milton - Field opposite Tesco beside Jane Coston Bridge</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important barrier green space between City and village.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turnstone Estates object to site being identified Site is outside village framework of Milton and does not perform a function as an Important Green Space as defined by the NPPF, which requires that such space be reasonably close to the community it serves. The site fails to sustain a functional 'break' between Cambridge and Milton, and should have no status as 'Important Green Space'</li> <li>• Milton Parish Council oppose PC20 being rejected as a 'local green space'. This is a crucial part of the green belt and serves as a true 'green space' to preserve the character and separation of Milton from Cambridge. Refusal notice by S Cambs DC recognises its importance as valuable green break.</li> </ul> <p><b>PC21 - Papworth Everard - Summer's Hills open space</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Papworth Everard Parish Council Planning Committee:</b> Integral part of development of 365 dwellings, makes it more sustainable, well related to village and new development, valuable recreation area for village and new development.</li> </ul> <p><b>PC22 - Steeple Morden - Tween Town Wood</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steeple Morden Parish Council object to rejection of Tween Town Wood as a LGS. Strongly believe that wood should be</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>designated because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Village contributed to purchase of woodland along with Guilden Morden</li> <li>2. Name means between towns so not surprising it is not near village. Well used by village community</li> <li>3. Site owned by Woodland Trust and other wood has been included as LGS.</li> </ol> <p><b>Rejected LGS sites (Appendix 12 of Supplementary Initial Sustainability Appraisal 2013)</b></p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Eversden – Undeveloped field which fronts Church St, Great Eversden and sits between the Village Hall, Walnut Tree Cottage and The Homestead.</li> <li>• Meets criteria set out in NPPF</li> <li>• Concern that not enough residents know about proposal to reject.</li> </ul> <p><b>Comments to Question 12 and 13</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teversham Parish Council support LGS.</li> <li>• Support any proposal if it has parish council support</li> <li>• Support all the proposals if the majority of the local population in the respective parishes agree.</li> <li>• Natural England welcomes identification of Local Green Space Designations. These designations should include sites that are noted due to their beauty, tranquillity and/or wildlife or biodiversity value and those which can make a positive contribution to the local environment</li> <li>• Support for particular villages - Support sites in Fulbourn and Shelford</li> <li>• Development plans put forward by you protect village character and Cottenham far more than proposals made by Parish Council.</li> <li>• Support sites in Cottenham by 6 individuals</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PVAA – Mangers Lane, Duxford. Remove site as PVAA and also remove PVAA designation.(Rep no 55120 + SA Rep 55121)</li> <li>• Whaddon Golf Centre - Object to Parish Council putting forward site as local green space (Rep 56259)</li> <li>• Object to fact that entire process of allocation is flawed without a proper Sustainability Appraisal of each site. (Rep 51915)</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better to protect what there was rather than coming up with this</li> </ul>
--	---

	<p>silly proposal - wholly inadequate to replace green belt land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need many more open spaces and access to countryside so these should be on a larger scale and more contiguous.</li> <li>• Most should be 'semi wild' not just urban parks.</li> <li>• Provision of green spaces, however small, helps to improve quality of people's surroundings.</li> <li>• Green spaces within villages often small so CCC obviously leave them alone, developers want more than half acre!</li> <li>• Important to have green spaces for children to play</li> <li>• Criteria for selecting green spaces should be that they are the best option for preserving the character of the village</li> <li>• A sixth criteria should be included requiring that any area being considered for allocation should be able to be delivered for the purposes for which the allocation is being sought. (Rep - 51908)</li> <li>• Little Gransden village framework proposals - Nearly all of infill plots within village framework have been developed. Some 'small green spaces' that some see as obvious sites for further housing development but those same small green spaces are important in maintaining a mosaic of habitats, views and environments that are essential to overall character of village which might justify their protection as Local Green Spaces. Rep 51352</li> <li>• Not clear that there are other sites brought forward in phase 1 of the consultation by other than parish councils which do not appear in this table and table 8.2 but which can be commented on by making representations within the Interim Sustainability Appraisal report, Appendix 12. Each proposal should be equally accessible for comment irrespective of identity of proposer. (Rep 51199)</li> <li>• Insufficient consultation on this subject. All residents should have had an opportunity to submit sites to Parish Council and for them to pass on to Council. Not wide enough publicity. (Rep 55026)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Final Preferred Approach and Reasons following Issues and options 2 consultation</b></p>	<p>A policy has been included in the draft local plan for both Protected Village Amenity Areas and for Local Green Space. All the sites submitted during both the Issues and Options 1 and 2 consultations have been assessed and the results of this assessment have been included in an evidence document along with an explanation of the criteria used to assess the sites - Appendix 5.</p>
<p><b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b></p>	<p>PVAA policy is a constraint to development which could harm settlement amenity. The scoping report identifies that a wide range of sites, of varying character have been identified using this designation. It would therefore have positive impacts on landscape and townscape character objective and other objectives which benefit from the protection of open spaces.</p> <p>The local green space designation offers protection to valuable open spaces, in some ways similar to the Protected Village Amenity policy. It could therefore have similar positive impacts, although the</p>

	scale is currently uncertain, as it would depend on which sites were identified.
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy NH/11: Protected Village Amenity Areas Policy NH/12: Local Green Space
<b>Policy NH/11: Protected Village Amenity Areas</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 12 Support: 7 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC)) Object: 5
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn PC</b> – Support retention as allows protection of areas that would not qualify for Local Green Space.</li> <li>• <b>Fowlmere and Fulbourn PCs</b> – Support policy.</li> <li>• <b>Natural England</b> – general support all policies within environment chapter.</li> </ul> <p><b>Objection</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Need to allow greater flexibility in policy to allow schools to be able to provide new buildings on existing playing fields. Should allow re-provision of open space as integral part of overall development.</li> <li>• Objection to having both PVAA and LGS designations within plan - two similar designations. If PVAA's are to remain in plan should review each designated site to reflect changed circumstances.</li> <li>• Residents should have more say in which green spaces to protect – parish councils should consult local community and forward to district council.</li> </ul> <p><b>Representations relating to village sites</b> (Note: same 2 sites registered against Policy NH/12: Local Green Space.)</p> <p><b>Great Shelford</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Land south of 26 Church St and Rectory Farm</i> Jesus College objecting to designation as PVAA. Area covered by range of designations which offer protection and prevent inappropriate development. PVAA not required.</li> </ul> <p><b>Little Abington</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meadow surrounded by residential development and Bancroft Farm</i> Committee for Abington Housing object to former farm site being</li> </ul>

	<p>protected as green space. Adjacent meadow is rightly designated but this site is brownfield land with no public access, derelict farm buildings - does not meet criteria for PVAA.</p>
<p><b>Assessment</b></p>	<p>The policy has been carried forward from one included in the Adopted Development Control Policies DPD, which was found sound through the examination. It was recognised during the drafting of the plan that this policy and the new one for Local Green Space (LGS) introduced in the NPPF would have similarities. It was not considered appropriate to simply reallocate PVAAs as LGS given there are some differences between the designations.. The draft plan has therefore included policies for both PVAAs and LGSs. It is the intention of the Council to consider whether the PVAA policy should be merged with the new LGS policy and the implications for individual sites when next the Local Plan is reviewed.</p> <p>The Council during the summer 2012 Issues and Options 1 consultation did ask if any PVAAs should be considered against the tests for LGS and as a result some designations were changed. Any new sites were consulted upon in January 2013 in the Issues and Options 2 consultation and during the Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation in summer 2013. Parish Councils have been specifically asked to suggest suitable sites within their parish for consideration as LGS. Through these consultations the local community have been made aware of the opportunity to not only suggest new sites but to support ones proposed within the draft plan.</p> <p>PVAAs are identified on some school playing fields where these sites have a role fulfilling the criteria for PVAAs. In very special circumstances development could be allowed on PVAAs in order to provide for room for expansion of a school if demonstrated to be necessary for educational purposes. The needs of the community would have to be weighed between the value of the PVAA to that of the proposed development. This has been achieved under the existing policy.</p> <p>There are two existing PVAA sites carried forward from the adopted plans that have been objected to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Shelford - Land south of 26 Church St and Rectory Farm The objection to this site was not raised earlier in the consultation on the plan and therefore has not been recently assessed. The Council considers that the PVAA designation remains appropriate to protect the character of this entrance to the village and setting of the listed buildings that are located within the PVAA.</li> <li>• Little Abington - Meadow surrounded by residential development</li> </ul>

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

## Policy NH/12: Local Green Space

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy NH/11: Protected Village Amenity Areas. Also see audit trail within Chapter 2: Spatial Strategy – Issue 7 Localism and Relationship with Neighbourhood Development Plans relating to proposals from Parish Council

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

## Submission Local Plan

### Bassingbourn

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

### Duxford

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

### Fulbourn

- **Fulbourn PC** – support LGS policy as it protects intrinsic character of village and surrounding countryside.
- Field between Cox's Drove, Cow Lane and railway line + area adjacent to Horse Pond.  
Support designation from Fulbourn Forum for Community Action and 24 individuals. Haven for local wildlife. Important green space for village. Field enhances setting and appearance of this part of village – brings countryside into heart of village. Contributes to retaining rural character. As village has expanded in recent years important to preserve

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

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

	<p><b>Little Abington</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Scout campsite, Church Lane</u> Support from <b>Little Abington PC</b> and others. Recognises importance of site.</li> <li>• <u>Bowling Green</u> Support for LGS designation.</li> <li>• <u>Meadow surrounded by residential development and Bancroft Farm</u> Bancroft Farm, Church Lane (SHLAA site 28) - Objection from both <b>Great and Little Abington PCs</b> and Committee for Abington Housing. Wrong designation of brownfield land and LGS should only apply to meadow. Old derelict farmyard previously not designated for protection. Reclassification would enable sensitive development within conservation area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Little Shelford</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for all LGS in village.</li> </ul> <p><b>Melbourn</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Greengages Rise play area</u> Support from 2 respondents for this LGS. Used as area for informal recreation. Recent planning application to develop area dismissed at appeal as open space covered by plan policy protecting existing recreational areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Newton</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for all LGS in village.</li> </ul> <p><b>Orwell</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Chapel Orchard by Methodist Church</u> Request from <b>Orwell PC</b> to amend boundary as LGS extends over farmland / private land. Landowner of this land erroneously included in LGS has objected to designation – request for amendment of boundary.</li> </ul> <p><b>Over</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Land to rear of The Lanes</u> Objection to LGS by individual as does not meet criteria for designation. Site bounded by 2m high fence. Limited views / overgrown private land. No public access. No more tranquil than other nearby areas in village. No uncommon wildlife.</li> </ul> <p><u>Station Road/ Turn Lane</u> Objection to LGS from individual. Must be demonstrably</p>
--	--

	<p>special. Afforded more weight as submitted by Parish Council. Rejected by inspector in 2006 – little changed. PC not justified why site special. Site fails assessment. Long term protection important but not at expense of potential future growth of village and development that could result in better management of site.</p> <p><b>Pampisford</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for all LGS in village.</li> </ul> <p><b>Papworth Everard</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Papworth Everard PC</b> strongly supports policy and its application to village. Valued by parishioners. Village characterised by housing separated by relatively large green spaces.</li> <li>• <u>New site</u> <b>Papworth Everard PC</b> request that consideration be given to designating wider landscape stripes within housing development in NW of village – valued by local community – well used.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sawston</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for all LGS in village.</li> </ul> <p><b>Stapleford</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for all LGS in village.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) introduced a new designation – Local Green Space (LGS) which is for green areas of particular importance to local communities which once designated can prevent new development. During the consultations carried out on the plan there was much support for including a policy for LGS in the new plan and sites submitted to the Council have been assessed using guidance in the NPPF.</p> <p>The Environment Agency supports the designations of all the sites but considers an additional advantage to having such open green spaces within a village is that it provides areas that can flood with minimal damage to properties within a village. Whilst recognising that this could be a reason for retaining green within a settlement this should not be a primary reason for allocating sites.</p> <p>The County Council’s suggestion that the policy would not allow for them to redevelop school sites has missed the fact that under the Council’s methodology LGS has not been allocated on school playing fields within the district.</p>

Bourn PC has requested that the policy be more explicit about what changes of land uses would be allowed on LGS. The policy has been worded to only allow development in exceptional circumstances and then in discussion with the local community. As LGS have a variety of existing uses and are located within and on the edge of settlements it would be inappropriate for the policy to include a detailed list of suitable land uses. The main aim of the policy is to retain the character and particular local significance placed on such green spaces that made them suitable candidates for LGS. The Council consider the existing wording to only allow changes for exceptional reasons is sufficient.

The Council during the summer 2012 Issues and Options 1 consultation asked for suggestions for sites to be considered as LGS. Those put forward were tested against criteria included in the NPPF for LGS. Any new sites were consulted upon in January 2013 in the Issues and Options 2 consultation and during the Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation this summer. Parish Councils have been specifically asked to suggest suitable sites within their parish for consideration as LGS and were given an extended deadline to submit sites to the Council at the start of 2013. Through these consultations the local community have been made aware of the opportunity to not only suggest new sites but to support ones proposed within the draft plan. The NPPF states that LGS can only be proposed when a local plan is being reviewed and therefore it would not be appropriate to allow parish councils to conduct their own consultations regarding LGS. This process must be carried out as part of the local plan preparation.

During the consultation there was support for LGS being allocated in many villages, notably in Bassingbourn - The Rouses.

Two other sites had many representations submitted about them. These included objections from the landowners to the designation as well as lots of support from local residents -

- Fulbourn - Field between Cox's Drove, Cow Lane and railway line; and
- Gamlingay - Lupin Field.

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

have an interest in the plan could have the opportunity to make comments in respect of the draft plan.

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

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

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

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

An objection was made to a site in Great Shelford being a LGS. However the site is not identified as a LGS – it does however form part of a larger PVAA and has therefore been considered at Policy NH/11.

	<p>Two new sites have been proposed. One is in Fulbourn which was previously assessed and not identified as a LGS because it is in the Green Belt. The other new site is a large area within Papworth Everard which has not been proposed before. It is an extensive area and for this reason is unlikely to meet the test as being a suitable candidate as LGS.</p> <p>Following the summer consultation 2013 the landowners of a site identified as LGS in Orwell brought to the Council's attention that the site was incorrectly shown on the Policies Map. The allotments north of Fishers Lane are to the south of the site currently shown. A minor change is proposed to the Policies Map to show the correct boundaries of the allotments.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Minor change</b> Amend the boundaries on the Policies Map of two LGS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orwell – Chapel Orchard by the Methodist Church</li> <li>• Orwell – Fishers Lane allotments</li> <li>• Harston – Recreation Ground and orchard.</li> </ul> <p><b>Major modification</b> Delete Bancroft Farm Church Lane Little Abington from a larger Local Green Space (see maps attached to the schedule of major modifications).</p>

**Policy NH/13: Important Countryside Frontages**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 39</b></p> <p><b>Issues and Options 2013 Issues 14 and 15</b></p>	<p><b>Important Countryside Frontages</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<p>Green Infrastructure Strategy (Cambridgeshire Horizons 2011)</p>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD: CH/7 Important Countryside Frontages</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>In South Cambridgeshire there are many villages where land with a strong countryside character penetrates into the village or separates two parts of the built up area. Such land enhances the setting, character and appearance of the village by retaining a sense of a rural connection within a village. The frontage where this interface occurs has been identified to show that the frontage and the open countryside beyond should be kept open and free from development. Planning permission for development would be refused if it would compromise these purposes.</p> <p>The protection of important countryside frontages within villages is a policy that should be retained within the Local Plan if it is considered that retaining this rural interface within a village is of importance.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> The Local Plan could continue to protect important countryside frontages, because such land enhances the setting, character and appearance of the village by retaining a sense of a rural connection within a village.</p> <p>The plan making process also offers the opportunity for people to comment on the frontages currently identified, or suggest new ones that warrant protection.</p>
<p><b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b></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><b>Final Issues and Options 1 Approaches</b></p>	<p><b>Question 39:</b> Should the existing policy for Important Countryside Frontages be retained in the Local Plan?</p> <p>Please provide any comments, including if there are any existing</p>

	Important Countryside Frontages in villages that you think should be removed or any new ones that should be identified.
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	Important Countryside Frontages aim to protected settlement character where the link to the open countryside is an important element. It therefore contributes primarily to the achievement of the landscape and townscape character objective.
<b>Representations Received</b>	Support: 90, Object: 1, Comment: 8
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support existing policy including from 21 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Subjective benefits to the views and tranquillity are hard to measure</li> <li>• ICF contributes to variety of perceived landscape. Contribute to feel of village. Vital to quality of life to have frontages giving essential rural character to village</li> <li>• Need for policy setting out clear criteria for identification of ICF</li> <li>• Need to be kept under constant review because landowner can plant trees behind frontage which would destroy amenity trying to protect.</li> <li>• Needs to be matched with a similar policy from the city for villages on the district/city boundary.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For villages to retain their character cannot butt up to another estate. Need space between.</li> <li>• Frontages stop infill development which would destroy village setting.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS TO EXISTING FRONTAGES:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fowlmere - Object to current ICF of east boundary of land west of High Street.</li> <li>• Longstanton – Remove ICF due to presence of Northstowe proposal</li> </ul> <p><b>SUGGESTED NEW FRONTAGES:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of frontages were suggested across the district.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>Retain the existing policy for Important Countryside Frontages in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Overwhelming support for the policy recognising its role in retaining the rural character of villages in the district.</p>
<b>Final Issues</b>	<b>Question 14:</b> Which of the proposed important countryside

<p><b>and Options 2 Approaches</b></p>	<p>frontages do you support or object to and why?</p> <p><b>Question 15:</b> Which of the Parish Council Proposals for Important Countryside Frontages do you support or object to and why?</p>
<p><b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b></p>	<p>Important Countryside Frontages aim to protected settlement character where the link to the open countryside is an important element. It therefore contributes primarily to the achievement of the landscape and townscape character objective.</p>
<p><b>Representations Received</b></p>	<p>F1 - South side of Church Street / Wimpole Road Great Eversden</p> <p>Support: 7; Object: 0; Comment: 1</p> <p>F2 - Suggest the open views of the countryside that extend north-west from Dubbs Knoll Road, Guilden Morden (north of 33 Dubbs Knoll Road)</p> <p>Support: 2; Object: 0</p> <p>F3 - Area opposite 38-44 Dubbs Knoll Road (south of 33 Dubbs Knoll Road)</p> <p>Support: 2; Object: 1</p> <p>Question 14 - Comments including Suggested new Important Countryside Frontages</p> <p>Support: 1; Object: 1; Comment: 14</p> <p>Suggested new sites by Parish Councils</p> <p>Guilden Morden Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extend F3 to both sides of track.</li> </ul> <p>Linton Parish</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land either side of footpath to Lt Linton via Clapper stile</li> <li>2. Borley Wood area to Roman Road - Heath Farm area</li> <li>3. Land from the A1307 to Catley Park</li> <li>4. Rivey Hill</li> <li>5. Fields off Balsham Road leading to Water Tower</li> </ol> <p>Great and Little Chishill Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents and Parish Council keen to protect vistas that befit 'The Village on the Hill'. If do not conform to current criteria for ICF's, we would wish to seek protection via community led approach.</li> </ul>

	<p>Haslingfield Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chalk ridge running east – west.</li> </ul> <p>Little Gransden Parish</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area between Main Road and the bottom of Primrose Hill known as the Pyckle</li> <li>•</li> </ul> <p>PC24 - Western and part of southern edge of Lower Cambourne</p> <p>Support: 4; Object: 0; Comment: 1</p> <p>PC25 - Southern edge of Greater Cambourne</p> <p>Support: 4; Object: 0</p> <p>PC26 - Southern edge of Upper Cambourne</p> <p>Support: 4; Object: 0</p> <p>PC27 - Outlying hamlets Dennis Green, The Cinques, and the Heath, Gamlingay</p> <p>Support: 0; Object: 1</p> <p>PC28 - Southern side of Granhams Road Hill</p> <p>Support: 5; Object: 0</p> <p>PC29 - Longstanton Road, Over</p> <p>No representations</p> <p>PC30 - New Road / Station Road , Over</p> <p>Support: 0; Object: 1</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>Support: 1; Object: 0; Comment: 1</p>
<p><b>Key Issues from Representations</b></p>	<p><b>SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for new frontages suggested</li> <li>• Support for Parish Council frontages included in Cambourne</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to designation of frontage from landowner in Guilden Morden who considers land protected is suitable for affordable housing.</li> </ul> <p><b>NEW FRONTAGES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of parish councils suggested new frontages within</li> </ul>

	their areas
<b>Final Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	A policy for Important Countryside Frontages to be included in the draft local plan. All the new ICFs suggested in both the Issues and Options 1 and 2 consultations have been assessed and these assessments are included in an evidence document - Appendix 6.
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy NH/13: Important Countryside Frontages
<b>Policy NH/13: Important Countryside Frontages</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 30 Support: 24 Object: 6 (including 3 from Parish Councils (PC))
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Representations on village frontages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fowlmere</b> Objection from individual to remove frontage from B1368 London Road / High Street along east boundary of SHLAA site 107. Does not meet tests for ICF. Designation outside conservation area and is not PVAA – land not considered to have any specific importance to setting of village.</li> <li>• <b>Foxton</b> <b>Fowlmere PC</b> – suggest new frontage south of Foxton primary school – behind southern boundary of recreation area and school.</li> <li>• <b>Fulbourn</b> <u>Home End</u> Support for frontage adjacent to the Fulbourn Centre (between Townley Hall and the Scout Hut) - from 17 respondents. Penetration of countryside into Home End – helps retain strong rural village character in Conservation Area – lost if developed.</li> </ul> <p>Objection to frontage – not justified in this location. No assessment in draft plan that policy is appropriate and whether specific sites should be included within policy. Suitable location for development to meet objectively assessed development needs.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Great and Little Abington</b> General support for frontages.</li>   <li>• <b>Great and Little Chishill</b> <b>Great and Little Chishill PC</b> – Five new frontages suggested: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. B1069 leading from Barley Road, past windmill - this sweeps up to built-up area.</li> <li>2. May Street - this sweeps up to built-up area.</li> <li>3. New Road - this sweeps up to built-up area.</li> <li>4. Heydon Road - provides an important rural break from Heydon Village.</li> <li>5. Hall - this sweeps up to built-up area.</li> </ol> </li>   <li>• <b>Great and Little Shelford</b> General support for frontages.</li>   <li>• <b>Guilden Morden</b> <u>Frontage to land south of 33 Dubbs Knoll Road</u> Objection from landowners to frontage. Objection to frontage as unsound, not compliant with NPPF. Land not previously designated – is bordered either side, opposite and to NE by existing housing. Countryside to west not visible through mature hedge and trees. Development of land for affordable housing would not significantly alter character of land – greater benefit to village.</li>   <li>• <b>Harston</b> General support for frontages.</li>   <li>• <b>Hauxton</b> General support for frontages.</li>   <li>• <b>Heydon</b> <b>Heydon PC</b> – suggesting an additional frontage – vista from Fowlmere Road looking up the avenue to Heydon.</li>   <li>• <b>Hinxton</b> General support for frontages.</li>   <li>• <b>Newton</b> General support for frontages.</li>   <li>• <b>Pampisford</b> General support for frontages.</li> </ul>
--	--

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

**Policy NH/14: Heritage Assets**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 42</b></p>	<p><b>Heritage Assets</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD 2010</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD 2010</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Listed Building SPD 2009</li> </ul>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CH/1 Historic Landscapes</li> <li>• CH/2 Archaeological Sites</li> <li>• CH/3 Listed buildings</li> <li>• CH/4 Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building</li> <li>• CH/5 Conservation Areas</li> </ul>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises that one of the roles of the planning system is to contribute to protecting and enhancing the historic environment. Historic environment conservation and enhancement is a key part of sustainable A core planning principle listed in the NPPF is to ‘conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations’.</p> <p>‘Heritage assets’ is an all-embracing term used to describe a building, monument, site, place, area or landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of its heritage interest.</p> <p>The NPPF states local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats</p> <p>Within South Cambridgeshire there is a wide range of heritage assets. The existing planning policies in the District consider historic landscapes; archaeological sites; listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas as separate policies</p> <p>Many of the heritage assets within South Cambridgeshire have statutory designations such as Scheduled Monuments, listed buildings and registered Parks and Gardens of Special Interest. Non- designated heritage assets are also of importance, such as other archaeological sites.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives</b></p>

	<p>The Local Plan needs to include policies to provide appropriate protection and enhancement of the historic environment, having regard to the importance of these sites.</p> <p>Existing planning policies in the district consider historic landscapes; archaeological sites; listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas as separate policies.</p> <p>An alternative option for the Local Plan is to follow the lead provided by the NPPF and cover all types of heritage assets in a single policy.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	<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 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>
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 42:</b> Taking account of the importance of the heritage asset, should the Local Plan include:</p> <p>i) Individual policies addressing historic landscapes; archaeological sites; listed buildings and their settings and Conservation Areas; or</p> <p>ii) A single policy regarding the protection of all heritage assets</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	<p>This option has a direct link to achieving the historic environment objective. Due to the volume of historic assets present in the district, including listed buildings, scheduled monuments, and many other undesignated assets, a policy ensuring impacts are properly assessed could have a significant positive impact. There would be wider impacts on achieving the landscape and townscape objective. It is not possible to differentiate between the impacts of having a single policy, and the benefits of individual topic related policies.</p>
<b>Representations Received</b>	<p>Option i: Support: 33; Object: 2; Comment: 3</p> <p>Option ii: Support:14; Object: 4; Comment: 5</p> <p>Other comments: 16</p>
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>Option i - Individual Policies</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each issue is different and a blanket policy would not accord with Central Government advice, and would be less robust.</li> <li>• Support from 10 Parish Councils</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vital to have separate policies (CPRE)</li> <li>• NPPF requires that historic environment should be addressed in strategic policies (paragraph 156) and these strategic policies will also be relevant to guiding neighbourhood plans. This does not replace the need for a suite of policies for development management. – English Heritage English Heritage would hope to see both generic and specific issues addressed, including heritage at risk.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single policy better</li> <li>• National Trust wants Council to consider policies to protect the setting of heritage assets, including Registered Parks and Gardens through the identification of a settings policy specific to a property. <b>COMMENTS:</b></li> <li>• Imperial War Museum at Duxford supports this option. Will help preserve specific character and importance of sites, such as the IWM Duxford Conservation Area, on a focused and case by case basis. Approach adopted should acknowledge desirability of sustaining and enhancing significance of each heritage asset. Finding viable uses, as advocated in paragraph 131 of the NPPF, for example, requires careful consideration and control. Given the high number and wide range of heritage assets within the District, this is more likely to be facilitated by individual policies.</li> </ul> <p><b>Option ii – Single Policy</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b> <b>These issues should</b> be brought together in a single policy to reduce complexity and aid clarity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support from 5 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Blanket policy is simplest given the manpower restriction on detailing individual sites - but long term that is desirable.</li> <li>• Need for very detailed policy to be able to consider all heritage assets</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex , difficult to write and have compromises</li> <li>• Support single policy but this option fails to fully reflect NPPF specifically its aspiration to both conserve and enhance historic environment. Redevelopment that improves heritage asset should be looked on favourably.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan should be concise. Single policy for issues although recognise heritage assets challenging for one policy</li> <li>• Consistent with NPPF. Single policy provides more certainty to property owners as avoids planning policy contradictions</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ok as long as policy does not weaken protection of heritage assets</li> </ul> <p><b>Other Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both, there should be an overarching policy regarding the protection of all heritage assets, with each asset having a sub policy that addresses its individual requirements.</li> <li>• One policy that could be added to as necessary</li> <li>• Single policy to conform to NPPF but include all existing policies as is within it.</li> <li>• Many bodies – official and unofficial concerned with protection of heritage asset and their concerns do not always coincide. Need single all-embracing policy to reconcile their respective concerns</li> <li>• English Heritage would like to see historic environment integrated into all relevant parts of the plan as well as in stand-alone policies. Further guidance in the ' Heritage in Local Plans' on English Heritage's website</li> <li>• Current planning procedures cause serious difficulties to individuals needing to maintain heritage sites or buildings e.g. Sawston Hall empty for 10yrs because of planning issues</li> <li>• The Woodland Trust believes that both ancient woodland and ancient trees should be recorded as heritage assets in either a single policy that protects all heritage assets or an individual policy that identifies, protects and encourages expansion/buffering of this irreplaceable asset.</li> <li>• Reasons against possible new town at Waterbeach - need to protect historic assets like Denny Abbey, Waterbeach Abbey and Car Dyke.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b></p>	<p>Include an overarching policy regarding the protection of all heritage assets should be included in the Local Plan to comply with the NPPF.</p> <p>On balance it is not considered that a suite of policies is needed to achieve appropriate protection for historic assets. The setting of historic assets has been specifically referenced in the policy to ensure appropriate protection.</p> <p>Responding to specific issues made in representations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not considered that listing individual assets in the district in the policy is necessary. Additional more detailed guidance can be included in a number of Supplementary Planning Documents that specialise in different parts of the historic environment – these include a Listed Building SPD; Development in Conservation Area SPD; and Design Guide SPD.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historic environment issues have also been integrated with a number of other policies in the Local Plan, in particular securing high quality design, and mitigating and adapting to climate change.</li> <li>• The protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees has been addressed in a separate policy.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy NH/14: Heritage Assets
<b>Policy NH/14: Heritage Assets (and paragraphs 6.43 – 6.58)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 6 Support: 1 Object: 5 (including 1 from Parish Council (PC))
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Support as accords with NPPF.</li> <li>• <b>Gamlingay PC</b> – Support policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Bourn PC</b> - Polices Map does not show extent of boundary of Conservation area in village.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> - Support policy but would like to see strengthening of wording relating to ‘non-designated assets’ in policy so developers are clear policy not just referring to designated assets.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - Suggest change of wording to paragraph 6.56 and 6.57 to explain the County’s role with heritage assets and their Historic Environment Records.</li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> – Strong support for policy but suggest some changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NPPF paragraph 126 states local planning authorities should set out positive strategy for historic environment in local plan. Recognise that plan policies refer to historic environment. Generic policy for historic environment provides opportunity to provide distinctive, positive framework and address issues relevant to overview. Consider how plan is underpinned in a positive strategy for historic environment – could be done in form of supporting SPD – include conservation area appraisals and management plans.</li> <li>○ Need to consider how joint work with Cambridge City can be consolidated and updated e.g. Cambridge Green Belt Study (LDA 2002) significant evidence base used in plan – parts</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

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

	<p>according to the NPPF – for example archaeological sites and scheduled monuments. No changes are therefore to be made to the policy wording. A minor change is proposed to the wording of the supporting text on this issue (paragraph 6.49) as suggested by English Heritage to clarify.</p> <p>The policy is inclusive to all features and landscapes that contribute to creating the historic environment of the district. This also includes local assets. The suggestion has been made for the Council with the assistance of parish councils to keep a register of heritage assets of local importance. Resources to create and maintain such a register are limited. The protection of local assets will be considered as development proposals come forward that may impact them.</p> <p>English Heritage suggested extending scope of policy by adding about development not prejudicing future maintenance or beneficial use of asset. However within the policy there is recognition of the need to look after such assets into the future by ‘sustaining and enhancing’ them and such sustaining would look after assets at risk. It is proposed that amendments to the supporting text to the policy (paragraph 6.51) could further emphasis this issue.</p> <p>The IWM Duxford has suggested including specific mention of Heritage Partnership Agreements. The plan already highlights the need for a flexible approach to secure the future of heritage assets. A Conservation Area was designated at Duxford Airfield in 2007 and an appraisal document produced of the area which would assist future planning. The Council does not consider that it is appropriate / necessary to mention specific legal agreements in the plan.</p> <p>Boundary of Bourn Conservation Area is correctly shown on the Policies Map.</p> <p>Some minor changes have been suggested by Cambridgeshire County Council to clarify the role of the County in keeping records of heritage assets. English Heritage has suggested changes to highlight the use of traditional materials in vernacular buildings and the need to replace the term historic asset with heritage. It is proposed by the Council to modify the supporting text to clarify these issues.</p>
<p><b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b></p>	<p><b>Minor change</b></p> <p>Replace word in section 2(d) in Policy NH/14:  ‘Undesignated heritage asset’ replaced with ‘<u><b>non-designated</b></u>’</p>

**heritage asset'**

Amend the last sentence of paragraph 6.48 to read:

A full understanding of the historic environment, **including traditional materials as used in vernacular buildings**, is needed to inform plans...'

Replace the last two sentences para 6.49 with the following:

**'The NPPF states harm to heritage assets should be avoided, but where proposals would result in wider public benefits then those benefits need to be weighed against the harm to significance'.**

Add to end of paragraph 6.51:

**'The Council is committed to ensuring the future viable uses of assets within the district.'**

Amend the first sentence of paragraph 6.56 to read:

'The Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record, held by **maintained by** the County Council ~~gives information on archaeological sites and monuments~~ **provides information on heritage assets, including non-designated and designated heritage assets with archaeological interest.**'

Replace paragraph 6.57 with the following:

**'Where development resulting in the loss of a heritage asset is permitted, the developer will be required to record and advance the understanding of the heritage asset to be lost. The results of assessments and investigations which are required and collected as part of development management are of public interest and will be made accessible, normally through the County's Historic Environment Record.'**

## Assets of local importance

Note: For audit trail up to Proposed Submission Local Plan see Policy NH/14: Heritage Assets

<b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 43</b>	<b>Assets of local importance</b>
<b>Key evidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD 2010</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD 2010</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Listed Building SPD 2009</li> </ul>
<b>Existing policies</b>	<p>Development Control Policies DPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CH/1 Historic Landscapes</li> <li>• CH/2 Archaeological Sites</li> <li>• CH/3 Listed buildings</li> <li>• CH/4 Development Within the Curtilage or Setting of a Listed Building</li> <li>• CH/5 Conservation Areas</li> </ul>
<b>Analysis</b>	<p>Others heritage assets in the District which are not designated are still of significant local historic importance and need to be protected- such as locally distinctive buildings that make a contribution to the townscape of a village. These may include assets that are important to a local community and contribute to the local character of a village but would not be of national significance. An issue for the plan is to consider developing a policy for such local assets and whether a formal list of these undesignated heritage assets should be created and published as a formal record. This record could include those assets that a local community consider to be of value within their area which may be identified as a result of neighbourhood planning. The policy could provide protection to these undesignated heritage assets when development proposals may impact on them Further guidance on these assets could be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> An option for the Local Plan is to consider protecting undesignated heritage assets to support appropriate consideration of their contribution to the local environment. This could include assets identified in Neighbourhood or Community Led Plans identified as locally important.</p> <p>A list of these assets and further guidance on their consideration could be provided in a Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
<b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b>	<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>

	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.
<b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b>	<p><b>Question 43:</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> Do you consider the Local Plan should protect undesignated heritage assets?</p> <p><b>B:</b> If so, are there any specific buildings or other assets that should be included?</p>
<b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b>	Providing information to support consideration of locally important heritage assets would support achievement of the historic environment objective. Wide range of heritage assets in the district was noted in the Scoping Report.
<b>Representations Received</b>	<p><b>A:</b> Support:63 Object: 4 Comment: 5</p> <p><b>B:</b> Comment: 10</p>
<b>Key Issues from Representations</b>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should be flexible to allow future assets to be added</li> <li>• 18 Parish Councils support policy</li> <li>• Note often a group of buildings contribute to local character. (CPRE)</li> <li>• Need to do district survey</li> <li>• Needs to be asset and site specific</li> <li>• Support but manpower restrictions may mean not a top priority</li> <li>• Where local communities designate asset or create a Community Asset Register need protection</li> <li>• If undesignated assets are identified need to follow guidance set out by English Heritage in its "Good Practice Guide for Local Heritage Listing"(May 2012). This requires owners of affected buildings to be consulted in advance of identification being made.</li> <li>• Not all ancient woodlands and ancient trees are recorded therefore should be included in policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If heritage asset is important should be given appropriate level of protection – not for Local Plan to introduce another designation.</li> <li>• Heritage assets which are undesignated are not designated for a reason; they are not of sufficient quality to be on the statutory list.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only designate where majority of local community want it</li> <li>• Changes to the current Comberton ones should be derived from any current/future Village Plan.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All undesignated buildings in Conservation Area</li> <li>• Many agricultural buildings are of local vernacular interest and should be recorded before they are converted into expensive houses.</li> <li>• A number of comments suggested specific buildings or areas which should be local heritage assets.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	<p>Undesignated Heritage Assets has been included in the wider heritage assets policy. This includes assets identified in conservation area appraisals, through the development process and through further supplementary planning documents.</p> <p>The Council will consider identifying further undesignated heritage assets in a Supplementary Planning document. The heritage assets suggested in representations can be considered through the SPD preparation process.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that undesignated heritage assets are a material planning consideration.</p>
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy NH/14: Heritage Assets

**Policy NH/15: Heritage Assets and Adapting to Climate Change**

<p><b>Issues and Options 2012 Issue 44</b></p>	<p><b>Heritage Assets and adapting to climate change</b></p>
<p><b>Key evidence</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Design Guide SPD 2010</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Development Affecting Conservation Areas SPD 2010</li> <li>• South Cambridgeshire Listed Building SPD 2009</li> </ul>
<p><b>Existing policies</b></p>	
<p><b>Analysis</b></p>	<p>The energy efficiency of buildings is covered in the climate change chapter. However, the implications of energy efficient measures for historic buildings need particular consideration. There are opportunities in most historic buildings to improve energy conservation without causing harm, through measures such as secondary glazing, improved loft insulation using natural materials, low energy lighting, and use of fuel efficient boilers. In some situations, renewable energy technologies can also be installed without causing harm. Where harm would be caused by energy conservation or renewable energy measures, then less harmful measures should be considered. Where conflict is unavoidable, the benefits of the energy conservation measures and the extent of harm to the heritage significance should be weighed against public benefits.</p> <p>The South Cambridgeshire Listed Building SPD provides guidance on general sustainability, improving energy efficiency and renewable energy relating to listed buildings. An issue for the Local Plan is how climate change mitigation can be carried out on historic assets. Future detailed guidance could be provided in an SPD.</p> <p><b>Potential for Reasonable Alternatives:</b> An option for the Local Plan is to include a policy that provides guidance on how listed buildings can be adapted to improve their environmental performance. The preferred method would be the one that causes the least harm to the heritage significance of the building. The Council could encourage the use of innovative design solutions to mitigate climate change whilst making every effort to preserve the historic fabric by the use of traditional construction methods to achieve the adaptation.</p>
<p><b>Which objectives does this issue or policy address?</b></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 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><b>Final Issues and Options Approaches</b></p>	<p><b>Question 44:</b></p> <p><b>A:</b> Should the Local Plan include a policy to provide guidance on how listed buildings and buildings in Conservation Areas can be adapted to improve their environmental performance?</p> <p><b>B:</b> If so, where should the balance lie between visual impact, and the benefits to energy efficiency?</p>
<p><b>Initial Sustainability Appraisal Summary</b></p>	<p>The option seeks to balance the need for climate change mitigation with the protection of heritage assets. It therefore seeks to achieve both relevant sustainability objectives. References to least harm could mean compromise, albeit minor, to the heritage assets objective. Views are sought on where the balance lies, the appraisal therefore reflects this uncertainty.</p>
<p><b>Representations Received</b></p>	<p><b>A:</b> Support:36 Object: 7 Comment: 11</p> <p><b>B:</b> Comments: 32</p>
<p><b>Key Issues from Representations</b></p>	<p><b>Question 44A</b></p> <p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to see reduction in carbon footprint of old buildings. Need to be sympathetic to their heritage but benefit to all if significant embodied energy within these buildings can be beneficially extended</li> <li>• Support from 16 Parish Councils</li> <li>• Current owners of listed buildings and buildings in conservation areas are unclear on what may /may not do. Many not allowed to fit energy efficiency measures. Need to allow green options</li> <li>• People more likely to look after such buildings if they can enjoy benefits of solar heating/double glazing so long as minimum impact on character of building</li> <li>• English Heritage has published advice on how energy conservation can be achieved in historic buildings based on a careful analysis of the special interest of the building and the range of options for energy conservation that are available. Can be found on the Historic Environment Local Management website.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan not proper place for guidance. Number of listed buildings wasting energy in heating them is not likely to be significant!</li> <li>• Objections from 4 Parish Councils</li> <li>• What is needed is advice, guidance and information – not a policy. Expand the Conservation Section?</li> <li>• Specialist advice available on a national level</li> <li>• Should allow owners to do own development within English Heritage guidelines</li> <li>• Leave listed building alone. Design and function may be</li> </ul>

compromised by misguided desire to make them more energy efficient.

**COMMENTS:**

- Nature of Listed Buildings is that they are unique and therefore having a prescriptive policy detailing how energy performance should be dealt with is not practicable. This issue should be dealt with on a site by site basis
- Only need guidance if adds value to national policy
- Need sensitive solutions that do not detract from visual impact when seen from public places
- Listed Building SPD and Conservation Area SPD plus local design guides should cover this policy. Local design guide would need to have local details to ensure local character is not lost
- Need advice on Victorian/Edwardian houses within district
- Only within financial reason – if made too difficult and costly sites will be lost
- Best done on case by case basis.

**Question 44B**

- Case by case basis
- Not appropriate subject for policy which will freeze things for life of plan. Advice needs to change as appropriate
- Do not see need for traditional materials or methods to be used in restoration of listed buildings, provided that new materials do not detract from the appearance of the building. What are we trying to protect anyway?
- Traditional material shown to last centuries. Modern materials need replacing e.g. plastic double glazing – every 10yrs. Balance of damage to building by installing modern which would only last short time. Building industry needs to develop products that meet both criteria
- Aesthetics of listed building should not be compromised for greater energy efficiency
- Any modification to enhance energy use should not destroy essential fabric of building
- Retro-fitting of listed building does not have to be unsightly if conservation measures are internal rather than external
- SPAB advice?
- Balance towards visual impact when seen from public places – energy efficiency improvement should not detract.
- Need to liaise with building control to enable ‘reasonable’ provision is maintained against historic details.
- Concentrate on improving new build homes. Older buildings have greater importance in visual character of village so need to retain original features. This benefit offsets any adaption for climate change

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although costly it is possible to improve insulation of listed building without changing its appearance</li> <li>• Should have legal requirement to insulate walls and secondary double glazing</li> <li>• English Heritage says measures should be compatible with historic fabric and character of individual assets rather than seeking 'a balance'. They have published advice on how energy conservation can be achieved in historic buildings</li> <li>• Hauxton Mill been redundant for too long but could be used to generate hydro-electricity.</li> </ul>
<b>Preferred Approach and Reasons</b>	Include a policy to provide guidance on how listed buildings and buildings in Conservation Areas can be adapted to improve their environmental performance. The policy provides an appropriate balance to protecting heritage assets, whilst encouraging adaptation to climate change.
<b>Policy included in the draft Local Plan?</b>	Policy NH/15: Heritage Assets and Adapting to Climate Change
<b>Policy NH/15: Heritage Assets and Adapting to Climate Change (and paragraphs 6.59 – 6.63)</b>	
<b>Proposed Submission Representations Received</b>	Total: 9 Support: 1 Object: 8
<b>Main Issues</b>	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support.</li> </ul> <p><b>Object</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past Present and Future</b> - Support policy but object to weak wording in bullet 2 which talks only about 'adequate' safeguarding. Should refer to heritage character. Suggest amending policy to read: <i>'effectively safeguards heritage significance and character...'</i></li> <li>• <b>English Heritage</b> – Suggest re-wording part 2 of policy to reflect approach of NPPF more closely: <i>'Proposals for energy efficient and renewable energy measures for historic buildings will be supported where they are individually tailored to the historic building and are developed with the benefit of a full understanding of the historic and architectural significance of the building such that the proposals will not result in harm to heritage significance.'</i></li> <li>• Policy welcomed but section 2 is too broad. Suggest adding following words: <i>'...will be permitted, provided the proposal does not impact on, or detract from, the heritage value of the historic building.'</i></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not consider policy usefully addresses how balance heritage significance and environmental adaption. Need for clearer guidance. Need for clarity on how to reach a balance in paras 6.61 - 6.62.</li> <li>• Wording in part 1 of policy weak - 'encourage and support' should be replaced with 'destruction of these buildings will not be permitted'.</li> <li>• Need for stricter definition of what allowable re-use is. Suggest that where possible should be a community asset. Should specify priorities.</li> </ul>
<b>Assessment</b>	<p>This is a new policy to provide guidance on the balance between heritage and climate change. The Council recognises the importance of protecting the heritage assets within the district and at the same time allowing appropriate adaptations to respond to the challenges of climate change. The policy cannot totally prevent change to historic buildings as was proposed by one respondent. The Council considers that the policy provides an appropriate balance to protecting heritage assets, whilst providing for adaptation to climate change.</p>
<b>Approach in Submission Local Plan</b>	<b>No change</b>