

CHAPTER 13: SITE SPECIFIC ISSUES	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
<b>QUESTION 108: What approach should the Local Plan take to Cambridge Airport?</b>	
<p>i. Retain the current allocation for development at Cambridge East.</p> <p>Support:9 Object: 2 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst Marshalls have no current intention to move, it may change in period 2011-31. Most sustainable location - should be retained.</li> <li><b>Comberton and Hauxton Parish Councils</b> support this approach.</li> <li>Alternative sites for Marshalls to move to should be considered.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marshalls indicated they are no longer looking to relocate - confirms it will not be delivered in foreseeable future. Site is unavailable - 'unsound' to retain.</li> <li>Will not come forward in plan period. If it comes forward it can be reintroduced after thorough vetting.</li> </ul>
<p>ii. Safeguard the site for development after 2031 or through a review of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Support:18 Object: 2 Comment: 0</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Marshalls of Cambridge</b> – most sustainable location and no exceptional circumstances to justify changes to Green Belt. Safeguard the site.</li> <li><b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> - retain a policy and safeguard land for post plan development. An HRC is still required in Cambridge East area.</li> <li>Re-designation as Green Belt should not be implemented whilst chance for site to come forward for development after 2031.</li> <li><b>Comberton, Fen Ditton, Great Abington, Ickleton, Litlington, Little Abington and Oakington and Westwick Parish Councils</b> support this approach.</li> <li>Safeguard except the part reserved for a green corridor which should be returned to Green Belt.</li> <li>Policy needs to be clear site can only come forward if evidence it is available, required, and following allocation in Local Plan (para. 85 NPPF).</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marshalls indicated they are no longer looking to relocate, confirms it will not be delivered in foreseeable future. Site is unavailable - 'unsound' to retain. Return to Green Belt.</li> <li>Will not come forward in plan period. If it comes forward it can be reintroduced after thorough vetting.</li> </ul>
<p>iii. Return the whole site to the Green Belt or just the</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Return whole site to Green Belt – unavailable and</li> </ul>

<p>parts of the site which are open.</p> <p>Support:14 Object: 2 Comment:2</p>	<p>continued allocation is 'unsound' and will continue to result in piecemeal development to make up 5 year land supply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides green barrier and open space to this sector of Cambridge. If Marshalls left, a better use would be nature reserve or country park.</li> <li><b>Croydon Parish Council</b> – stop building on Green Belt and return any land not built on and use brownfield land for smaller developments.</li> <li>Majority of the (unbuilt) area should be returned to Green Belt, but built-up areas important for employment safeguarded as such. If Marshalls change mind, consider again post 2031.</li> <li>What was in the Green Belt should be returned to ensure clear separation between city and villages.</li> <li>Return the proposed green corridor west of Teversham to Green Belt and where possible increase biodiversity.</li> <li><b>Teversham Parish Council</b> – return open parts of the site to Green Belt.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little point returning it to Green Belt now it has been removed – may yet be windfall site.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support:1 Object: 0 Comment:7</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Comberton Parish Council</b> – airfield site eminently suited to providing housing close to Cambridge, but it can only be done if owners release it.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete Cambridge Airport from the Plan – falsehood it will make any contribution. Support north of Newmarket Road if transport can be addressed.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Cambridge City Council</b> – both councils working together and consulting on options – results will inform preferred options in draft plans.</li> <li>Do nothing until Marshalls decide.</li> <li>Designate the area for its current use as airport and associated engineering activities.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 109: What approach should the Council take to the potential for housing development on land north of Newmarket Road at Cambridge East?</b></p>	
<p>i. Conclude that development cannot be relied upon and the site be treated in the same way as</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close to the flight path – should be ruled out on noise and safety grounds.</li> <li>In the absence of certainty it could be delivered in</li> </ul>

<p>Cambridge Airport?</p> <p>Support: 7 Object: 0 Comment: 2</p>	<p>the plan period, the only realistic option is to safeguard it, similar to airport site as a whole.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No development to ensure clear separation from city. <b>Croydon Parish Council</b> – land should be retained as green space.</li> </ul>
<p>ii. Rely upon the policies of the Cambridge East Area Action Plan to determine any planning applications for development?</p> <p>Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 2</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Marshalls of Cambridge</b> – no changes have occurred since adoption of CEAAP to warrant reconsideration. Guidance and requirements of CEAAP are recent and remain relevant and accord with NPPF.</li> </ul>
<p>iii. Include a new policy for the site in the Local Plan allocating the land for a housing-led development?</p> <p>Support: 6 Object: 0 Comment: 7</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Probably not appropriate to rely on CEAAP as it assumes whole area would be developed, therefore some facilities designed to support this site could be accommodated on airfield site.</li> <li>Almost certain to come forward before 2031 - need to take proactive approach.</li> <li><b>Fen Ditton Parish Council</b> – possibly ok. Further work is needed on SCDC approach to options.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 1 Object: 0 Comment: 5</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delete Cambridge Airport from the Plan – falsehood it will make any contribution. Support north of Newmarket Road if transport can be addressed.</li> <li><b>Cambridge City Council</b> – whilst land within SCDC, given the functional relationship with the city, the Council wishes to work together on long-term future of this site.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Cambridge Past, Present and Future</b> – obvious site for development provided public transport along Newmarket Road can be improved. Green corridor opposite Teversham should be retained as Green Belt.</li> <li><b>Comberton Parish Council</b> - not qualified to comment.</li> <li>If it is concluded it can be delivered it should continue to be included, if not delete in favour of deliverable sites and could be reintroduced in next plan review.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 110: What do you think are the key principles for the development of Cambridge Northern Fringe East?</b></p>	
<p>i. Do you agree with our vision for the area?</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support provided traveller site is protected.</li> <li><b>Conservators of River Cam</b> – support.</li> </ul>

<p>Support: 21 Object: 1 Comment: 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fen Ditton Parish Council</b> support subject to further work on the site and issues affecting Fen Ditton.</li> <li>• Ensure enough railway land remains for future expansion of rail services (space for sidings for passenger and freight). Build guided bus interchange to allow reconversion to rail and integration with rail tracks. Think long term.</li> <li>• <b>Oakington and Westwick Parish Council</b> – perhaps, but it should avoid any existing residential allocations.</li> <li>• New station will make it a key development site – need comprehensive Masterplan, agreed by two Councils - for employment-led development with commuting links through station and guided bus to Northstowe and Waterbeach.</li> <li>• Exciting development.</li> <li>• Needs to be developed to high density but care taken to protect amenity of current residents.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Valuable brownfield site which links with last remnants of open space in NE of city. Cannot be developed without negative ecological impacts (LNR). Requires linear development to link to guided bus and disconnected from Science Park.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Cambridgeshire County Council</b> – Minerals and Waste Plan allocations and designations will influence vision, type and location of development.</li> <li>• New station would reduce car transport needs to and from Science Park and other employment, but would not want more jobs as pressure on housing already too high.</li> </ul>
<p>ii. Have we identified the right key principles for development?</p> <p>Support: 7 Object: 2 Comment: 8</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be very high density and high rise commercial and retail as it is a major interchange. Guided Busway interchange to allow connection for villages along route.</li> <li>• <b>Fen Ditton Parish Council</b> support subject to further work on the site and issues affecting Fen Ditton.</li> <li>• <b>Conservators of River Cam</b> – need to ensure connectivity to A14 without direct access across railway. Foul water provision essential. Could include marina and associated boat yard.</li> <li>• Should be largely / exclusively for employment purposes. Avoid more houses for London commuters.</li> <li>• <b>Milton Parish Council</b> – must include local access into Fen Road from Cowley Road. Support river crossing alongside railway bridge for</li> </ul>

	<p>cyclists and pedestrians only.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment-led consistent with known constraints (WWTW). Correctly identifies and encourages transport interchange – enhances sustainability and access to key employment. Compatible with Waterbeach, which will utilise rail and bus connectivity.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexibility is needed to respond to market conditions at time of delivery – propose mixed use rather than employment-led.</li> <li>• <b>CamToo Project</b> – new station will need flood alleviation where crosses River Cam flood plain.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major expansion opportunity and transport hub. May include tall buildings and would like housing, not just jobs.</li> <li>• Chisholm Trail should be integral part of plans.</li> </ul>
<p>iii. What sites should be included in the boundary of the area?</p> <p>Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 7</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Anglian Water</b> (Late Rep) – presumably the boundary is constrained by district boundary – need consistent approach by both councils.</li> <li>• Include sewage works, railway sidings, all land as far as Fen Road, Cowley Road P&amp;R, Science Park Phase 1 redevelopment.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge City Council</b> – disappointing that SCDC reps to City Local Plan that view already taken on sites to include. Joint Employment Land Review update suggests broader area, including science park. Continue to work together.</li> <li>• Anglia Water could redevelop WWTW to reduce emissions and possibly take up less room.</li> <li>• <b>Fen Road Steering Group</b> – propose a revised CNFE area which includes Fen Road area (FRA) and requirement for second road link out of eastern part of FRA with restraint on development until built.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 1 Object: 0 Comment: 5</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Anglian Water</b> (Late Rep) – important that policy recognises significance of WWTW and that its ability to operate is not prejudiced by development. Needs to be upgraded, relocation not viable. Odour impacts need assessing before land uses decided.</li> <li>• <b>Cambridge Past, Present and Future</b> – Urge comprehensive review of land use, including land east of railway, both sides of Fen Road. Station opens up new options for redevelopment. Prioritise employment around station, not housing for London commuters. Car parking should be underground or multi-storey. Three local authorities should work closely together on</li> </ul>

	<p>detailed analysis and options for future use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Old Chesterton Residents Association</b> – Absence of masterplan only a series of generalised principles. Need detailed analysis of land use, transport etc. to form basis of further joint consultation by three local authorities. Station should meet highest design standards. Include road access to Chesterton Fen Road and minimise impact on existing residents.</li> <li>• <b>Suffolk County Council</b> – note new station. Keen to see improvements to rail in region and supports proposals to improve services serving Suffolk.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 111: What should the Papworth Hospital site be used for when the hospital relocates to Addenbrooke's?</b></p>	
<p>i. A preference for continuation of healthcare on the site, and only if a suitable user cannot be found, other employment uses compatible with adjoining residential?</p> <p>Support: 9 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Another healthcare use or business with medical associations seems appropriate. New use(s) must be compatible with the character of the village.</li> <li>• Rural residents should continue to have access to medical facilities, should not be relocating all hospitals to cities.</li> <li>• It is imperative that an out of town site is kept for public healthcare use. Relocating everything to Addenbrooke's is a bad move for transport and congestion, and health – a rural location is more conducive to the healing process.</li> <li>• Papworth Everard Parish Council – relocation of the hospital will create a significant loss of employment and therefore a new major employer, preferably in healthcare, will be needed. If the employment use is lost, creating a sustainable future for Papworth Everard will be a major challenge.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust – does not consider the current LDF policy to be deliverable. Modern healthcare facilities of any significant scale are unlikely to be attracted to the site due to its comparative isolation and constraints, which are key drivers why the existing hospital is relocating. Some of the existing structures on the site as heritage assets and therefore they are highly unlikely due to their scale and nature of construction to be adaptable for modern healthcare uses.</li> </ul>
<p>ii. Employment uses that would be compatible with</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support site being used for employment uses</li> </ul>

<p>adjoining residential?</p> <p>Support: 3 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p>compatible with adjoining residential developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support use of site for employment as the housing development already taking place will drown what is left of the village. There are some buildings on the site that have to be preserved and there are not enough green spaces or services in the village to cope with its expansion.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust – believes that major employment uses are not likely to find the site attractive due to its shape, various constraints, the need to preserve or enhance the setting of various heritage assets and the Conservation Area, and the proximity of existing residential properties. These constraints make the site unsatisfactory for modern, major employment uses of any scale.</li> </ul>
<p>iii. Housing led development including mixed uses?</p> <p>Support: 4 Object: 1 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support use of the site for housing led development including mixed uses. It falls within an existing settlement with amenities, facilities and infrastructure that could accommodate such a development.</li> <li>Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust – in the recent SHLAA the site performs well as a housing site as its within a larger village and is previously developed land. Residential use has the potential to adapt flexibly to the constraints (e.g. levels, mature trees, access and heritage assets) and also to deliver a sustainable and active use for parts of the site which may be designated as open space. Other uses that could be included as part of the scheme are: residential and non-residential institutions, community and leisure uses, hotel or small employment uses – where these would be compatible with the character of the village and existing adjacent land uses. This would help deliver a viable, diverse and vital legacy to the village.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not use this medical site for housing.</li> <li>Papworth Everard Parish Council – against the idea of predominantly residential development on this site.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 6</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The expressed order of priorities is the correct one.</li> <li>Natural England - the site lies adjacent to Papworth Wood SSSI and therefore any development could have an adverse impact on the special interest features of this nationally important woodland.</li> </ul>

	<p>Development could result in increased access to the woodland which would be damaging and therefore any proposals will need to be subject to a detailed assessment to identify impacts and mitigation requirements. [LATE REP]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust – supportive of the need for the Local Plan to include a policy which helps to facilitate the re-use of the site. It would be undesirable for the site to stand empty; however any solution must be a sustainable one in economic, environmental and community terms. Therefore wish to engage with the Council to ensure the delivery of a viable and timely alternative use for the site.</li> <li>• Near an already congested road network – any development may require additional lanes approaching the Caxton Gibbet roundabout and traffic lights would be needed for peak traffic times.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 112: How can we best invigorate Papworth Everard?</b></p>	
<p>i. Should the Local Plan include a specific policy to seek mixed use development with community uses, employment and housing development?</p> <p>Support: 7 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, the Local Plan should include a specific policy.</li> <li>• Support – the village is almost completely run by the Varrier Jones Trust and therefore it would be nice to have more areas for community use either controlled by the Parish Council or by the local community. The surgery, local shops and other services (including the bus service) need to be expanded to cope with the expansion already taking place.</li> <li>• This is the better policy despite a prejudice against too much government regulation.</li> <li>• Papworth Everard Parish Council – strongly support this option.</li> </ul>
<p>ii. Should we not include a policy and deal with individual site proposals on their merits?</p> <p>Support: 2 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, no policy is needed.</li> <li>• All site proposals should be dealt with on their merits – with all the recent developments there must now be adequate housing in the village, what is needed is jobs for the residents.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 1</p>	<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Papworth Everard Parish Council - existing redevelopment of facilities on the eastern side of Ermine Street is inadequate for the long term needs of the expanded village and mixed use will be essential to achieve a balanced outcome. The importance of providing new employment cannot be over-estimated and it will also be necessary to provide additional community facilities beyond</li> </ul>

	those offered by the village hall.
<b>QUESTION 113: What approach should the Local Plan take to the Fen Drayton Land Settlement Association area?</b>	
<p>i. Continue to support the redevelopment of existing buildings on the former Fen Drayton LSA site to support on-site experimental or other forms of sustainable living?</p> <p>ii. How do you think the former Fen Drayton LSA should evolve?</p> <p>Support: 30 Object: 0 Comment: 16</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support the redevelopment of existing buildings, although such strict 'experimental' living criteria is unnecessary and relaxing the criteria should be considered.</li> <li>• Support the redevelopment of this land and this scheme as it gives people the opportunity to build environmentally friendly dwellings that will have less impact on the surroundings and environment than the bigger multi house developments built elsewhere.</li> <li>• Support the scheme and the SPD but feel that it should be looked at again as stakeholders are confused by ambiguous and contradictory statements, especially in light of recent planning decisions.</li> <li>• Limited redevelopment which advances the concept and implementation of sustainable living within a rural context should continue to be supported. The challenges of implementing the SPD should be examined to ensure that unnecessary barriers are not created.</li> <li>• Support the continuation of the policy - the SPD was subject to extensive consultation and the situation has not changed.</li> <li>• The Issues &amp; Options Report has highlighted importance of providing housing for local people – the policy for Fen Drayton would meet some of this need. Support the policy as it allows first time buyers the opportunity to remain in the village.</li> <li>• The SPD is extremely thorough and well thought out, with sound principles, however although applaud requirement for Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6, levels 4 or 5 might be more attainable for local residents.</li> <li>• Character of the area should be retained – every opportunity should be given for agricultural use, but where this is not possible then the principles of sustainability should be applied in encouraging redevelopment for zero carbon homes.</li> <li>• Support the continuation of the policy, but as the SPD is proving difficult to implement maybe the criteria on siting of buildings could be relaxed.</li> <li>• The SPD should be retained but need better clarity concerning planning requirements, joint working to enable development, reinvigoration of SPD through dialogue and inclusion of social housing.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The idea of restricting development to the footprint of former agricultural buildings is excellent as it allows limited development which will have minimal impact on the character of the area. However, the sustainability criteria make development extremely difficult and expensive.</li> <li>• Owners are extremely interested in developing relevant buildings, however as there is difficulty in gaining planning permission, other owners are waiting for this to be resolved before submitting their proposals. The process for gaining planning permission should be made quicker and easier for applicants.</li> <li>• The village should be allowed to have some development to sustain the local community. Land could provide opportunities for small 'cottage industry' projects – which should be encouraged as could provide benefits for the community, including local employment.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development should be subject to building regulations and sustainability standards applied to other planning applications – not applying the same criteria may be considered discriminatory.</li> <li>• Just because the site is outside the village framework should not mean it can automatically be considered as open countryside. Fen Drayton Former LSA estate is already developed to some degree.</li> </ul>
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 6</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy area should be regularised to include the whole of Daintree's Farm including its outbuildings, fields and ditch.</li> <li>• Fen Drayton could be used as a test site for how to sympathetically allow some development which enhances a small local community without damaging its character.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning committee are making it far more difficult than is necessary to implement and the planners have moved the goal posts in certain areas. We were once optimistic, now we are discouraged.</li> <li>• Middle Level Commissioners – it is understood that any concerns regarding the adverse impacts from this proposal have been alleviated, however caution should be taken if this becomes an allocated site.</li> <li>• Policy SP/11 alone will not solve the problem of the untidy nature of the former LSA estate – limited additional development should be allowed to mitigate this problem, as the appearance of the</li> </ul>

	<p>LSA estate does not reflect well on the rest of the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take this opportunity to re-engage with stakeholders to ensure successful implementation of the policy – insufficient time has been allowed for the policy to be implemented.</li> <li>• Some merit in comments made by Great Abington Parish Council on flexibility of land use on the former LSA estate adjoining their village. Inconsistent approach with the Great Abington Former LSA Estate, where more flexible proposals have been subject to consultation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 114: Great Abington Former Land Settlement Association Estate</b></p>	
<p>Do you consider that if the Local Plan retains limits on the scale of extensions to existing dwellings or the size of replacement dwellings in the countryside, a different approach should be taken in the former Great Abington LSA area to provide greater flexibility?</p> <p>Support: 5 Object: 1 Comment: 10</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already huge mix of housing, so appropriate to allow further extension and larger properties given the land area.</li> <li>• Support the parish council’s proposal - extensions and replacement dwellings should be allowed up to the largest existing dwelling, but additional dwellings should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances due to the limited road network.</li> <li>• Being neither countryside nor within the village framework, the LSA area should have a separate policy.</li> <li>• Flexibility is appropriate but only in allowing extensions, improvements or replacements. New dwellings would create more traffic and destroy the rural feel that gives the area its special character.</li> <li>• Should be treated as a special case – dwellings should be allowed to be developed on large plots as this would not change the look and feel of the estate. An emphasis should be placed on sustainable / green construction.</li> <li>• Needs to be a special policy for this area to ensure consistency in future decision making and to provide greater certainty for local residents.</li> <li>• The few dwellings that are unsuitable could be replaced by substantial dwellings on their existing plots, but increases in the number of dwellings should be resisted to preserve the character of the area.</li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Abington Parish Council would like: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the former LSA estate to remain outside the village framework;</li> <li>▪ reasonable developments to be permitted as long as they would not result in adverse impact on the unique character and appearance of the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>area or on residential amenity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ no development that would result in a substantial increase in traffic or need significant road improvements;</li> <li>▪ extensions to be allowed provided that the total building floor area does not exceed 250 sqm;</li> <li>▪ replacements to be allowed provided that the new building does not exceed the floor area of the existing dwelling or 250 sqm (whichever is larger);</li> <li>▪ each of the existing 62 original dwellings to be allowed to convert one existing outbuilding to a dwelling, provided that the total floor area of the new building does not exceed 150 sqm; and</li> <li>▪ new and replacement dwellings to be set back from the roads, at least as far as the original but not significantly further back, and all new buildings to be in keeping with the original housing stock.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest as an alternative, a new project to develop the whole of the LSA area into an ecologically sustainable housing site (e.g. fully insulated houses, photovoltaic panels, small wind turbines, drainage via reed beds).</li> <li>• Needs to have a specific plan drawn up by residents and the parish council, with the help of the Council.</li> </ul>
<b>QUESTION 115: Linton Special Policy Area</b>	
<p>Should the Local Plan continue to restrict residential development south of the A1307 at Linton?</p> <p>Support: 9 Object: 3 Comment: 3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor access and adjacent to a busy area.</li> <li>• Further development would add to the significant congestion and access problems on A1307. View supported by <b>Great Abington</b> and <b>Little Abington Parish Councils</b>.</li> <li>• Residential development would cause increased congestion from additional vehicles accessing the A1307 and increased use of the pelican crossing.</li> <li>• A1307 has poor safety record.</li> <li>• Policy remains relevant as community cohesion is important. A1307 is not conducive to safe and convenient for crossing pedestrians. Development to the south of the A1307 would not visually relate well to the main settlement of Linton.</li> <li>• <b>St Edmundsbury Borough Council</b> – significant residential development south of A1307, away from the village’s main services and facilities, could have further detrimental impact on A1307 and congestion.</li> <li>• <b>Suffolk County Council</b> – support if the retention of the policy assists with promotion of road safety.</li> </ul>

	<p>Would welcome reference to transport issues in the wider area, and improving safety and reducing congestion on A1307.</p> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residential development should be allowed south of the A1307 – to think that people will walk to use facilities the other side of the road is naïve.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be decided by local Parish Council.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QUESTION 115: The Imperial War Museum site at Duxford Airfield</b></p>	
<p>Should the Local Plan maintain the approach to development at the Imperial War Museum at Duxford, that it must be associated with the continued use of the site as a museum of aviation and modern conflict?</p> <p>Support: 28 Object: 2 Comment: 3</p>	<p><b>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internationally important museum, major tourist attraction and significant historical asset - should be preserved and supported.</li> <li>Existing approach appears to be working – don't change it.</li> <li>Much of the site is a Conservation Area and the Imperial War Museum (IWM) should respect the airfield as a relic in itself.</li> <li>Flying should be limited to aircraft movements directly related to the museum - large amounts of noise on a few days where there are Air Displays can be accepted.</li> <li>Maintain the approach, remembering it is also an operational civil airfield which brings significant income and employment to the museum.</li> <li>Any development at the IWM should be strictly associated with the museum of aviation and modern conflict. No other uses should be considered. Consider impact on local communities from any extra activities.</li> <li><b>Comberton, Croydon, Fowlmere, Foxton, Great Abington, Ickleton, Litlington, Little Abington, Oakington and Westwick, Over, Steeple Morden and Whaddon Parish Councils support.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OBJECTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Imperial War Museum</b> - proposes a more flexible policy to ensure the long term financial viability of the site and make good use of assets by allowing a broader use of the site for Imperial War Museum specific activities, third party uses, ancillary uses and other appropriate uses to maximise income and create sustainability. Current policies DP/3 and TR/6 are an appropriate level of control relating to impacts on the local amenity and character. A revised policy is included.</li> </ul> <p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannot see what development would be</li> </ul>

	appropriate nearby given the frequent, popular air displays.
--	--