

200164


Support

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version


Respondent: Mr Simon Gough

Date received: 18/12/2024 via Web

Summary:

 I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan

Full text:

 I fully support the Neighbourhood Plan

Attachments: None

200165

Support

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Mrs Helen Hale

Date received: 18/12/2024 via Web

Summary:

■ I have inputted to this NP during the process, and am pleased with the result - my points have been addressed.

Full text:

■ I have inputted to this NP during the process, and am pleased with the result - my points have been addressed.

Attachments: None

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Professor Sandra Leaton Gray

Date received: 18/12/2024 via Web

Summary:

The plan is good but could better support community needs by enhancing provisions for young people and families, including affordable housing, childcare, and varied recreational opportunities. Diversifying the retail mix by fostering locally-orientated enterprises and introducing new ideas such as a 'Maker Space' for crafting and repair activities would strengthen economic resilience and community identity while reducing reliance on external retail hubs. Improved countryside access through walking routes and biodiversity enhancements would promote well-being. Addressing the limited capacity of the medical centre and schools is critical to meeting the growing population's needs, ensuring vibrant, multi-generational communities distinct from urban Cambridge.

Full text:

I am writing to provide observations on four critical areas addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan: provisions for children and young people, the retail mix, the quality of local walks, and expansion of medical centre facilities. These elements are pivotal to realising the long-term vision of Stapleford and Great Shelford as thriving, sustainable, and inclusive communities.

Children and Young People

The Plan highlights deficiencies in outdoor play spaces, particularly in the northern part of the area, as well as limited facilities for older children and young adults. While recent upgrades to play areas at the Great Shelford and Stapleford recreation grounds are commendable, these efforts fall short of addressing the broader recreational needs. Accessible, age-appropriate spaces available at little or no cost are essential to fostering community cohesion and promoting the physical and mental well-being of younger residents.

Expanding access to natural spaces offers an additional opportunity to encourage informal play and connection with the local landscape. These priorities should be integrated into development proposals through mechanisms such as Policy S&GS 20 (Protecting and improving routes into the countryside), ensuring that young people can actively engage with the area's rich natural environment.

Moreover, the Plan must address the increasingly pressing demand for affordable family housing and childcare to support younger families. The current scarcity of small and mid-sized affordable homes is driving younger residents to leave, undermining the area's intergenerational community structure. Policies S&GS 1 (Housing mix) and S&GS 2 (Prioritising local needs in the allocation of affordable housing) should be leveraged to deliver suitable housing options. Enhancing childcare provision more proactively, including a mixed economy of childminders, nurseries and pre/after school care, will further enable families to thrive locally, contributing to a balanced and sustainable demographic profile.

Additionally, exploring opportunities for free or affordable informal sporting activities, such as trim trails and multipurpose spaces for casual sports, could cater to diverse age groups. These initiatives would promote healthier lifestyles and encourage outdoor engagement across the community.

Retail Mix

The Plan rightly acknowledges the limited range of shopping options within the villages, including the absence of essential amenities such as a bank. Broadening the variety of shops and services would not only enhance economic resilience but also reduce reliance on external retail hubs. This is particularly important for carless younger families and older residents who may find frequent travel challenging.

To align with the vision of sustainable communities, the Plan should prioritise developments that support local commerce. Repurposing underutilised spaces for retail or community-focused businesses could create a more dynamic and accessible commercial environment. Introducing innovative spaces, such as a Maker Space for collaborative crafting and repair activities with shared equipment, would further strengthen economic sustainability, foster creativity, and reduce waste, while cultivating a stronger sense of community identity.

Quality of Local Walks

The countryside surrounding Stapleford and Great Shelford is a defining feature of the area. However, as the SWOT analysis reveals, access to these green spaces remains limited. Policy S&GS 20, which seeks to protect and improve countryside routes, is particularly valuable in this regard. Expanding off-road walking paths and connecting existing trails would significantly enhance residents' ability to access and enjoy the natural environment, promoting healthier, more active lifestyles.

Any improvements to local walking infrastructure should also incorporate biodiversity enhancements, as outlined in Policy S&GS 10 (Biodiversity net gain). This integrated approach ensures that interventions respect and enhance the

area's ecological and landscape character while increasing accessibility and recreational value.

Medical Centre Improvements

The Neighbourhood Plan should address the critical need to upgrade local healthcare facilities. With a growing and evolving population, the current medical centre risks becoming overstretched. Expanding and modernising the centre would be vital to ensuring that all residents, particularly older adults and young families, have access to the necessary healthcare services without having to travel increasing distances, as at present. Proactively addressing this issue will support the overall well-being and resilience of the community.

The Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan lays a solid foundation for future development. However, targeted enhancements in key areas—recreational spaces for young people, the retail mix, local walking routes, housing, childcare, informal sports facilities, creative community spaces, and more comprehensive and accessible healthcare services—could greatly enhance its effectiveness. I urge the Steering Group to incorporate these recommendations to better meet the evolving needs of the community.

Attachments: None

200167

Support

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Mrs Gillian Pett

Date received: 19/12/2024 via Web

Summary:

the neighbourhood plan accurately supports the views of residents and the needs of the villages and will provide protection of village status as well as providing for sympathetic planning for new building and renovations

Full text:

the neighbourhood plan accurately supports the views of residents and the needs of the villages and will provide protection of village status as well as providing for sympathetic planning for new building and renovations

Attachments: None

200169

Support

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Mr Keith Warth

Date received: 02/01/2025 via Web

Summary:

Footpath across Stapleford Allotments noted as important but often muddy, unsuitable for prams, not featured in aspirational items. It needs to be hard paved.

I believe most people in Stapleford are not concerned with Cambridge South Station but think it a brilliant proposal.

Views across fields between Gog Magog Way and Hinton Way feature large in NP but this is ideal location for extra houses and local facilities such as new shared Junior School and Medical Centre which are noted in NP as potential future problem. Proximity to transport infrastructure from this site is excellent - solves other problems

Full text:

Footpath across Stapleford Allotments noted as important but often muddy, unsuitable for prams, not featured in aspirational items. It needs to be hard paved.

I believe most people in Stapleford are not concerned with Cambridge South Station but think it a brilliant proposal.

Views across fields between Gog Magog Way and Hinton Way feature large in NP but this is ideal location for extra houses and local facilities such as new shared Junior School and Medical Centre which are noted in NP as potential future problem. Proximity to transport infrastructure from this site is excellent - solves other problems

Attachments: None

200190

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Transport for London

Date received: 18/12/2024 via Email

Summary:

I can confirm that we do not wish to comment on the Neighbourhood Plan and that there is no need to consult TfL on any future neighbourhood plan or other planning policy consultations in the Greater Cambridge area

Full text:

Thank you for consulting Transport for London (TfL). I can confirm that we do not wish to comment on the Neighbourhood Plan and that there is no need to consult TfL on any future neighbourhood plan or other planning policy consultations in the Greater Cambridge area

Best wishes

Richard Carr

Richard Carr | Principal Planner - Spatial Planning (He/Him/His)

TfL Planning, Transport for London

Attachments: None

200192

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Sport England

Date received: 19/12/2024 via Email

Summary:

Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.

Therefore, it is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 103 and 104. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.

https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy

Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.

https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications

Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 104 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.

Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.

<http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance>

If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/>

Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.

In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.

Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.

NPPF Section 8: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities>

PPG Health and wellbeing section: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing>

Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign>

Full text:

Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan.

Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.

Therefore, it is essential that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Parts 103 and 104. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.

https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy

Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.

https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications

Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Part 104 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.

Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.

<http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance>

If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/>

Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.

In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.

Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.

NPPF Section 8: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities>

PPG Health and wellbeing section: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing>

Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign>

(Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)

If you need any further advice, please do not hesitate to contact Sport England using the contact details below.

Yours sincerely,

Planning Technical Team

Attachments: None

200193

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Cambridge Group of Ramblers

Date received: 27/12/2024 via Email

Summary:

The Cambridge Group of the Ramblers is very supportive of the proposals to develop and enhance the network of Public Rights of Way and permissive paths mentioned in Sections 10 and 11 of your Neighbourhood Plan. There are many people using these footpaths for primarily recreational purposes, good mental and physical health and enjoyment of being in a rural and picturesque environment. There are a number of organisations who organise group led walks several days each week including the Cambridge Ramblers Group, U3A, the Cambridge Rambling Club, as well as local groups and dog walkers. Your proposals are appreciated by a wide network of people outside of your parishes. We particularly endorse the creation of paths beside Haverhill Road and Granhams Road to the Clay Pit Nature Reserve and the permissive path near White Hill Farm and the permissive paths connecting to Jenny's Path. In the plan could Jenny's path be enhanced to a Public Right of Way (bridleway status)?

The area that I, and my Committee, are greatly concerned about are the proposals for the Cambridge South East Transport Busway (CSET Busway), the plans as they relate to public rights of way and long-used permissive paths in the vicinity of Nine Wells, a small historic woodland area which is the source of the Hobson's Conduit.

At present there are a number of footpaths which are very well used for recreation; Nine Wells wood is accessed partly by Great Shelford Public Footpath 2, but also by permissive paths running from both the Addenbrookes complex and Urwin Gardens. A footpath also runs alongside the western edge of Nine Wells, linking up with the Great Shelford to Addenbrookes DNA cycle path. These paths mean that it is possible to access Nine Wells directly from Great Shelford Village and also provide circular walks from Addenbrookes itself.

The CSET busway plans as they are now formulated indicate that the permissive path network is to be extinguished, breaking direct links from both Great Shelford and Addenbrookes. The plans show the maintenance track and cycleway along the west side of the new busway, with no access from Nine Wells, on the east.

The permissive path network, established many years ago, recognised the substantial growth of employment on the Addenbrookes campus; every day many people are able to make use of these paths for recreation. With the huge increase in jobs envisaged now for future years it is vital that provision is made for outdoor recreation, which the Nine Wells area can provide. Yet now this is threatened to be lost! It is imperative that this valuable footpath network is retained, together with a link to the cycleway alongside the busway.

It is also of concern that there appear to be no improvements to the public rights of way network along other sections of the busway. During earlier consultations, it was stressed that the new cycleway would provide opportunities for new links and circular routes for recreation. In particular, the opportunity should be taken to provide a link north to the Magog Trust reserve.

The Cambridge Ramblers Group has made representation on the CSET Busway proposals. We wanted to alert your planners to the possible impact of the busway on your neighbourhood plan and in the hope that there may be some development opportunities in common.

Full text:

Dear Sir/Madam

I am contacting you in my capacity as Group Chair of the Cambridge Group of the Ramblers, a statutory consultee for developments affecting public rights of way. I am responding to your consultation on the Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan 2024-2041.

The Cambridge Group of the Ramblers is very supportive of the proposals to develop and enhance the network of Public Rights of Way and permissive paths mentioned in Sections 10 and 11 of your Neighbourhood Plan. There are many people using these footpaths for primarily recreational purposes, good mental and physical health and enjoyment of being in a rural and picturesque environment. There are a number of organisations who organise group led walks several days each week including the Cambridge Ramblers Group, U3A, the Cambridge Rambling Club, as well as local groups and dog walkers. Your proposals are appreciated by a wide network of people outside of your parishes. We particularly endorse the creation of paths beside Haverhill Road and Granhams Road to the Clay Pit Nature Reserve and the permissive path near White Hill Farm and the permissive paths connecting to Jenny's Path. In the plan could Jenny's path be enhanced to a Public Right of Way (bridleway status)?

The area that I, and my Committee, are greatly concerned about are the proposals for the Cambridge South East Transport Busway (CSET Busway), the plans as they relate to public rights of way and long-used permissive paths in the vicinity of Nine Wells, a small historic woodland area which is the source of the Hobson's Conduit.

At present there are a number of footpaths which are very well used for recreation; Nine Wells wood is accessed partly

by Great Shelford Public Footpath 2, but also by permissive paths running from both the Addenbrookes complex and Urwin Gardens. A footpath also runs alongside the western edge of Nine Wells, linking up with the Great Shelford to Addenbrookes DNA cycle path. These paths mean that it is possible to access Nine Wells directly from Great Shelford Village and also provide circular walks from Addenbrookes itself.

The CSET busway plans as they are now formulated indicate that the permissive path network is to be extinguished, breaking direct links from both Great Shelford and Addenbrookes. The plans show the maintenance track and cycleway along the west side of the new busway, with no access from Nine Wells, on the east.

The permissive path network, established many years ago, recognised the substantial growth of employment on the Addenbrookes campus; every day many people are able to make use of these paths for recreation. With the huge increase in jobs envisaged now for future years it is vital that provision is made for outdoor recreation, which the Nine Wells area can provide. Yet now this is threatened to be lost! It is imperative that this valuable footpath network is retained, together with a link to the cycleway alongside the busway.

It is also of concern that there appear to be no improvements to the public rights of way network along other sections of the busway. During earlier consultations, it was stressed that the new cycleway would provide opportunities for new links and circular routes for recreation. In particular, the opportunity should be taken to provide a link north to the Magog Trust reserve.

The Cambridge Ramblers Group has made representation on the CSET Busway proposals. We wanted to alert your planners to the possible impact of the busway on your neighbourhood plan and in the hope that there may be some development opportunities in common.

With kind regards

Jane Crawford-White
Chair Cambridge Ramblers Group

Attachments: None

200194

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: North Herts Council

Date received: 07/01/2025 via Email

Summary:

We have reviewed the content of the Neighbourhood Plan and can confirm that North Herts Council has no formal comments to make in respect of the proposed policies or the supporting text in the plan.

Full text:

Dear Sir

Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 16) – Consultation Response

Thank you for your email, dated 18 December 2024 about the Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 16 version).

We have reviewed the content of the Neighbourhood Plan and can confirm that North Herts Council has no formal comments to make in respect of the proposed policies or the supporting text in the plan.

Yours faithfully

Clare Skeels

Senior Planning Officer

Attachments:

Stapleford and Great Shelford NP Reg 16 Formal Response North Herts Redacted -
<https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6wz>

200195

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Cambridgeshire County Council

Date received: 09/01/2025 via Email

Summary:

The LLFA have reviewed the Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan and are pleased to see that the updates reflect our previous comments. The plan comprehensively addresses flood risk and the incorporation of SuDS in new development. The relevant policies have been referenced and surface water flood risk maps provided. The plan highlights the importance of mitigating flood risk in relation to climate change and promotes the use of SuDS - the inclusion of Figure 93 is particularly useful.

Full text:

Good morning

Thank you for consulting the LLFA on the Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan.

The LLFA have reviewed the Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan and are pleased to see that the updates reflect our previous comments. The plan comprehensively addresses flood risk and the incorporation of SuDS in new development. The relevant policies have been referenced and surface water flood risk maps provided. The plan highlights the importance of mitigating flood risk in relation to climate change and promotes the use of SuDS - the inclusion of Figure 93 is particularly useful.

Kind regards

Jessica Gething

Attachments: None

200196

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Cambridgeshire Constabulary

Petition: 2 petitioners

Date received: 14/01/2025 via Email

Summary:

Security and Crime prevention measures should be considered at the earliest opportunity as an integral part of any initial design for a proposed development. It should incorporate the principles of 'Secured by Design' (SBD) and demonstrate how the development proposals address the following issues, to design out and reduce the incidence and fear of crime:

- Physical protection: Places that include necessary, well-designed security features.
- Access and movement: Places with well-defined routes, spaces and entrances that provide for convenient movement without compromising security.
- Safe routes: Creating safe routes that are as straight as possible, wide, well lit, without hiding places and well-maintained and overlooked for security and provide a sense of security for all users.
- Structure: Places that are structured so that different uses do not cause conflict.
- Lighting: Ensuring appropriate and non-obtrusive lighting levels are achieved.
- Private space: Creating a clear separation between public and private spaces, avoiding public routes next to back gardens.
- Surveillance: Places where all publicly accessible spaces are overlooked.
- Ownership: Places that promote a sense of ownership, respect, territorial responsibility, and community.
- Activity: Places where the level of human activity is appropriate to the location reduces the risk of crime and always creates a sense of safety and territoriality.
- Management and maintenance: Places that are designed with management and maintenance in mind, to discourage crime in the present and the future.

In practice this means that Secured by Design status for new developments can be achieved through careful design. Developers should, at an early stage, seek consultation and advice from the Police Designing out Crime Officers at Cambridgeshire Police Headquarters.

It is recommended that "Secured by Design" forms part of the conditions of any proposed planning application or re-development.

Full text:

Good morning,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the "Stapleford and Gt Shelford Neighbourhood plan".

Regarding Policy - we would like to refer you to the following and recommend these are included within the revised "The Stapleford and Gt Shelford" neighbourhood plan:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - Section 12 Paragraph 135 (f) which states: -

Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

In relation to the design and layout of new developments including homes, commercial space, schools, hospitals, and sheltered accommodation we make the following comment:

Security and Crime prevention measures should be considered at the earliest opportunity as an integral part of any initial design for a proposed development. It should incorporate the principles of 'Secured by Design' (SBD) and demonstrate how the development proposals address the following issues, to design out and reduce the incidence and fear of crime:

- Physical protection: Places that include necessary, well-designed security features.
- Access and movement: Places with well-defined routes, spaces and entrances that provide for convenient movement without compromising security.
- Safe routes: Creating safe routes that are as straight as possible, wide, well lit, without hiding places and well-maintained and overlooked for security and provide a sense of security for all users.
- Structure: Places that are structured so that different uses do not cause conflict.
- Lighting: Ensuring appropriate and non-obtrusive lighting levels are achieved.
- Private space: Creating a clear separation between public and private spaces, avoiding public routes next to back gardens.

- Surveillance: Places where all publicly accessible spaces are overlooked.
- Ownership: Places that promote a sense of ownership, respect, territorial responsibility, and community.
- Activity: Places where the level of human activity is appropriate to the location reduces the risk of crime and always creates a sense of safety and territoriality.
- Management and maintenance: Places that are designed with management and maintenance in mind, to discourage crime in the present and the future.

In practice this means that Secured by Design status for new developments can be achieved through careful design. Developers should, at an early stage, seek consultation and advice from the Police Designing out Crime Officers at Cambridgeshire Police Headquarters.

It is recommended that "Secured by Design" forms part of the conditions of any proposed planning application or re-development.

We would appreciate if the above could be taken into consideration.

Kind regards

Jules Hanrahan and Clare Darbyshire

Jules Hanrahan & Clare Darbyshire

Designing Out Crime Officers
Designing Out Crime Team (Estates)

Attachments: None

200197

Support

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Sawston Parish Council

Date received: 15/01/2025 via Email

Summary:

█ Sawston Parish Council support this application with no comments.

Full text:

█ Good morning Jonathan

Sawston Parish Council support this application with no comments.

Kind regards

Jo

Mrs Jo Keeler

Sawston Parish Clerk

Attachments: None

200199

Support

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Anglian Water Services Ltd

Date received: 17/01/2025 via Web

Summary:

Anglian Water has previously submitted comments on the pre-submission version (Reg 14) of the neighbourhood plan. We welcome the amendments in the submission version of the neighbourhood plan, following our comments and recommended changes. I can confirm, Anglian Water has no further comments to make on the document.

Full text:

Anglian Water has previously submitted comments on the pre-submission version (Reg 14) of the neighbourhood plan. We welcome the amendments in the submission version of the neighbourhood plan, following our comments and recommended changes. I can confirm, Anglian Water has no further comments to make on the document.

Attachments: None

200336

Support

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Mrs Tracey Brown

Date received: 27/01/2025 via Web

Summary:

■ I support the proposed Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan.

Full text:

■ I support the proposed Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan.

Attachments: None

200438

Support

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: The Association for Cultural Exchange

Date received: 28/01/2025 via Web

Summary:

We support the proposals for environment/habitat protection, landscape enhancement, public access and amenity contained in the Plan. While we are generally in support of enhanced public travel connections, we deplore any plan which would lead to prime agricultural land being utilised for transport services when other options exist.

Full text:

We support the proposals for environment/habitat protection, landscape enhancement, public access and amenity contained in the Plan. While we are generally in support of enhanced public travel connections, we deplore any plan which would lead to prime agricultural land being utilised for transport services when other options exist.

Attachments: None

200448

Support

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Mr Michael Pooles

Date received: 28/01/2025 via Web

Summary:

Please act upon this, particularly by preserving the villages as such rather than permitting increasing city encroachment.
Please also properly fund and support resistance to developers' planning appeals to achieve this result.

Full text:

Please act upon this, particularly by preserving the villages as such rather than permitting increasing city encroachment.
Please also properly fund and support resistance to developers' planning appeals to achieve this result.

Attachments: None

200452

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Forestry Commission

Date received: 19/12/2024 via Email

Summary:

Thank you for inviting the Forestry Commission to respond to the consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan, Unfortunately we do not have the resources to respond to individual plans but we have some key points to make relevant to all neighbourhood plans.

Full text:

Thank you for inviting the Forestry Commission to respond to the consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan, Unfortunately we do not have the resources to respond to individual plans but we have some key points to make relevant to all neighbourhood plans.

Forestry Commission and Neighbourhood Planning

Existing trees in your community

The Forestry Commission would like to encourage communities to review the trees and woodlands in their neighbourhood and consider whether they are sufficiently diverse in age and species to prove resilient in the face of tree pests and diseases or climate change. For example, if you have a high proportion of Ash, you are likely to see the majority suffering from Ash Dieback. Some communities are proactively planting different species straight away, to mitigate the effect of losing the Ash; you can find out more here. Alternatively, if you have a high proportion of Beech, you may find they suffer particularly from drought or flood stress as the climate becomes more extreme. There are resources available to help you get ideas for other species you can plant to diversify your tree stock and make it more resilient.

Ancient Woodland

If you have ancient woodland within or adjacent to your boundary it is important that it is considered within your plan. Ancient woodlands are irreplaceable, they have great value because they have a long history of woodland cover, with many features remaining undisturbed. This applies equally to Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS). It is Government policy to refuse development that will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland, unless "there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists" (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 180).

The Forestry Commission has prepared joint Standing Advice for the treatment of Ancient Woodland

If you have ancient woodland within or adjacent to your boundary it is important that it is considered within your plan. Ancient woodlands are irreplaceable, they have great value because they have a long history of woodland cover, with many features remaining undisturbed. This applies equally to Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS). It is Government policy to refuse development that will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland, unless "there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists" (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 180).

The Forestry Commission has prepared joint Standing Advice with Natural England on ancient woodland and veteran trees. This advice is a material consideration for planning decisions across England and can also be a useful starting point for policy considerations.

The Standing Advice explains the definition of ancient woodland, its importance, ways to identify it and the policies that relevant to it. It provides advice on how to protect ancient woodland when dealing with planning applications that may affect ancient woodland. It also considers ancient wood-pasture and veteran trees. It will provides links to Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory and assessment guides as well as other tools to assist you in assessing potential impacts.

Deforestation

The overarching policy for the sustainable management of forests, woodland and trees in England is a presumption against deforestation.

Woodland Creation

The UK is committed in law to net zero emissions by 2050. Tree planting is recognised as contributing to efforts to tackle the biodiversity and climate emergencies we are currently facing. Neighbourhood plans are a useful mechanism for promoting tree planting close to people so that the cultural and health benefits of trees can be enjoyed alongside their broader environmental benefits. Any planting considered by the plan should require healthy resilient tree stock to minimise the risk of pests and diseases and maximise its climate change resilience, a robust management plan should also be put in place.

with Natural England on ancient woodland and veteran trees. This advice is a material consideration for planning decisions across England and can also be a useful starting point for policy considerations.

The Standing Advice explains the definition of ancient woodland, its importance, ways to identify it and the policies that relevant to it. It provides advice on how to protect ancient woodland when dealing with planning applications that may affect ancient woodland. It also considers ancient wood-pasture and veteran trees. It will provides links to Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory and assessment guides as well as other tools to assist you in assessing potential impacts.

Deforestation

The overarching policy for the sustainable management of forests, woodland and trees in England is a presumption against deforestation.

Woodland Creation

The UK is committed in law to net zero emissions by 2050. Tree planting is recognised as contributing to efforts to tackle the biodiversity and climate emergencies we are currently facing. Neighbourhood plans are a useful mechanism for promoting tree planting close to people so that the cultural and health benefits of trees can be enjoyed alongside their broader environmental benefits. Any planting considered by the plan should require healthy resilient tree stock to minimise the risk of pests and diseases and maximise its climate change resilience, a robust management plan should also be put in place.

Kind Regards

Forestry Commission | Santon Downham | Brandon | Suffolk | IP27 0TJ

Attachments: None

200565

Support

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Dr John Coppendale

Date received: 01/02/2025 via Web

Summary:

I am very impressed by the amount of work that has gone into this comprehensive neighbourhood plan and I fully support it. I hope that it will be used to provide a genuine input to future proposed developments in Stapleford and Great Shelford.

Full text:

I am very impressed by the amount of work that has gone into this comprehensive neighbourhood plan and I fully support it. I hope that it will be used to provide a genuine input to future proposed developments in Stapleford and Great Shelford.

Attachments: None

200570

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: National Highways

Date received: 03/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

Notwithstanding the above comments, we have reviewed the document and note that the details set out within the document are unlikely to have an severe impact on the operation of the trunk road and we offer No Comment.

Full text:

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for consulting National Highways on the abovementioned Neighbourhood Plan.

National Highways is a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN).

It has been noted that once adopted, the Neighbourhood Plan will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Where relevant, National Highways will be a statutory consultee on future planning applications within the area and will assess the impact on the SRN of a planning application accordingly.

Notwithstanding the above comments, we have reviewed the document and note that the details set out within the document are unlikely to have an severe impact on the operation of the trunk road and we offer No Comment.

Kind regards,

Philip Porter

Assistant Spatial Planner
Operations (East) | National Highways

Attachments: None

200582

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Dr Geoff Hale

Date received: 04/02/2025 via Web

Summary:

I have noticed a discrepancy which needs to be reviewed by the Steering Group.

Paragraph 7.52 (page 69) lists (1) two Local Nature Reserves within the NP area - Beechwoods and Nine Wells, and (2) four County Wildlife Sites - Wandlebury Country Park, River Cam/Granta, Magog Down and Stapleford Pit.

However, the actual policy S&GS 9 (page 70) shows three Local Nature Reserves - Beechwoods, Nine Wells and Stapleford Pit. Only two County Wildlife Sites are listed - Wandlebury Country Park, River Cam/Granta,

I believe the details in 7.52 are correct and hence a small modification is required.

Full text:

I have noticed a discrepancy which needs to be reviewed by the Steering Group.

Paragraph 7.52 (page 69) lists (1) two Local Nature Reserves within the NP area - Beechwoods and Nine Wells, and (2) four County Wildlife Sites - Wandlebury Country Park, River Cam/Granta, Magog Down and Stapleford Pit.

However, the actual policy S&GS 9 (page 70) shows three Local Nature Reserves - Beechwoods, Nine Wells and Stapleford Pit. Only two County Wildlife Sites are listed - Wandlebury Country Park, River Cam/Granta,

I believe the details in 7.52 are correct and hence a small modification is required.

Attachments: None

200592

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Environment Agency

Date received: 05/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

Having previously commented on this plan we are pleased to see that our previous comments have largely been taken on board. We would encourage the Stapleford and Great Shelford Parish Councils to include consideration of waste water capacity within the plan for possible windfall development. We have no further detailed comments to make on this plan.

Full text:

Dear Planning Policy Team

STAPLEFORD & GREAT SHELFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SUBMISSION
VERSION CONSULTATION

Thank you for consulting us on the Submission Publication for the Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan.

We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.

Having previously commented on this plan we are pleased to see that our previous comments have largely been taken on board. We would encourage the Stapleford and Great Shelford Parish Councils to include consideration of waste water capacity within the plan for possible windfall development. We have no further detailed comments to make on this plan.

We hope this information is of assistance. If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully

Ms Alison Craggs

Sustainable Places Planning Advisor

Attachments:

EA response - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6y4>

200593

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Cambridge Group of the Ramblers

Date received: 05/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

Chapter 10 - Active Travel: We support improvements to the active travel network, including the bridge across the River Cam at Great Shelford and upgrades to the Haverhill Road path. We also emphasize securing Jenny's Path as an off-road bridleway and recommend a permissive path agreement to ensure its future use. Additionally, we call for efforts to keep the railway underpass open year-round for walkers, cyclists, and equestrians.

Chapter 11 - Countryside Access and Enhancements: We agree with the policy to protect and improve countryside access, noting the lack of public routes and fragmented permissive paths. We advocate for long-term agreements for these paths and for reinstating missing signage. We support creating new paths with Public Right of Way status and the proposed off-road footpath along Granhams Road. We also stress the need to upgrade permissive paths near Nine Wells to Public Rights of Way, given potential impacts from infrastructure projects. We support the creation of new open spaces near Nine Wells.

Full text:

Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan – Comments on behalf of the Cambridge Group of the Ramblers, January 2025

Introduction

The Cambridge Group of the Ramblers welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan. We have focused on Chapter 10, concerning 'Active Travel' and particularly Chapter 11 'Countryside Access and Countryside Enhancements'.

Chapter 10 'Active Travel'

The Ramblers support the stated priorities for improvements to the active travel network, especially the installation of a bridge across the River Cam at Great Shelford Recreation Ground and improvements to the Chae path alongside Haverhill Road between the A1307 and Stapleford Village. We would like to see priority also given to secure the future availability of 'Jenny's Path' as an offroad bridleway linking Great Shelford to the A11 at Hauxton Mill. This route has the potential for much greater use, providing access not only to Trumpington Country Park, but also to the planned South West Cambridge travel hub/Park & Ride site. However, it is a permissive path and in recent years has been unusable by walkers and cyclists for several weeks each year due to flooding of the railway underpass. Whilst we would ideally see the route adopted as a Public Bridleway, we appreciate that this may not be immediately possible. Consequently we recommend the negotiation of a 'permissive path agreement' between the landowner and Cambridgeshire County Council for a specified period of time. It is also important that works are undertaken to keep the railway underpass open all year for walkers, cyclists and equestrians.

Chapter 11 'Countryside access and countryside enhancements'

The Ramblers fully concur with Planning policy S&GS 20: 'Protecting and improving routes into our countryside'. As the Plan says, there is a paucity of public access to the countryside in both Parishes. Even the permissive path network is poor and fragmented. Some of the permissive paths were initiated as 'Stewardship Scheme' routes, with EU funding. These agreements were time-limited and the continued availability of the paths to the public is uncertain.

Consequently, the Ramblers would like to see a reference in the Plan to securing agreements for long-term public access to both existing and new 'permissive' paths. Whilst it may be difficult to upgrade the routes to Public Rights of Way it is important to consider establishing 'permissive path agreements' between the landowners and Cambridgeshire County Council for specified periods. One further issue relating to permissive paths concerns signage. When established as Stewardship scheme paths there were signs installed at road ends and along the route, because there was no requirement to depict the paths on Ordnance Survey Maps. However, much of that signage has now disappeared – for example along the permissive footpath at White Hill Farm. This makes it very difficult to follow them or include such paths in published walking routes.

Paragraph 11.13 is particularly important in providing a suitable vehicle for creating new paths through the planning process. The 'goal' could be creating routes with 'Public Right of Way' status. With respect to the Plan's aspirations for new routes, the Ramblers are fully supportive. As already stated, we would like to see Jenny's Path, as it runs through to the A11 at Hauxton Mill, given a more certain future and attention given to sorting out the frequent flooding issue at the railway underpass. We support the proposals for two offshoots – which are already in informal use.

We have already indicated our support for improvements listed in Chapter 10 on Active Travel: (i) the path alongside Haverhill Road, leading from Stapleford to Magog Down and on to Wandlebury, and (ii) a bridge over the River Cam.

The Ramblers support the aspiration for an off-road footpath along Granhams Road between the permissive path at White Hill Farm and the houses in Great Shelford village. This would greatly improve safety for visitors to the Pocket Path and the public footpath which links with the DNA path and the overbridge of the railway.

The Plan includes a further six aspirational routes which have community support, but have yet to be agreed with landowners. The Ramblers are fully in support of these proposals. In all cases, we recommend aiming to establish 'permissive path agreements' between the landowner and Cambridgeshire County Council for a specified period, together with en-route signage.

Finally, we would like to raise a specific issue which is not discussed in detail in this Chapter. It concerns public access to/from Nine Wells, currently served by a dead-end Public Footpath in Great Shelford. At present there is an informal permissive path linking to the well-used DNA cycle/footpath and another permissive path across to both the Addenbrookes site and adjacent new housing development. These paths are extremely well used, especially by people working on the huge Addenbrookes/bio-park campus. The Ramblers consider that it is imperative that these 'permissive' paths are upgraded to Public Right of Way status. At present, the plans proposed by the Cambridge South East Transport (CSET) busway and the emerging plans for the East West Rail (EWR) line appear to cut the link to the DNA path. The area involves paths in both South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City, but a statement of principle in the S&GS NP would be very welcome.

We support the recommendation in 11.32 (8) to develop new open space close to Nine Wells.

Jill Tuffnell

Secretary, Cambridge Group of the Ramblers

Attachments:

Great Shelford Stapleford Neighbourhood Plan Comments January 2025_Redacted -
<https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6y5>

200594

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Quod

Date received: 06/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

Pigeon and LIH are seeking to have Cambridge South allocated in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan to deliver approximately 4,500 new homes to help meet Greater Cambridge's acute need for housing. LIH and Pigeon recognise that it is not for this version of the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate Cambridge South for this purpose. Should GSCP remove Cambridge South from the Green Belt and allocate it for development, however, the Neighbourhood Plan would require an early review to ensure that it does not undermine or constrain strategic policies in the newly adopted GCLP or conflict with national policy. LIH and Pigeon would be pleased to engage with the Parish Councils on any such review of the Neighbourhood Plan that may happen in the future. We request pursuant to Regulation 19(b)(ii) to be notified of any decision made by the local planning authority under section 38(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).

Full text:

Dear Madam/Sir

Response on behalf of Lands Improvement Holdings Limited and Pigeon Land to Regulation 16 consultation on the draft Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan

I write on behalf of Pigeon Land ('Pigeon') and Lands Improvement Holdings Ltd ('LIH') in response to the consultation on the Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan ('the S&GS NP') Submission (Regulation 15 version), November 2024.

LIH and Pigeon are jointly promoting 190 hectares of land for development, known as Cambridge South, located between Cambridge Road and the M1 and south of Addenbrookes Road, immediately south of Trumpington ('the Site'). A Site Location Plan is enclosed. The vision for Cambridge South is to deliver an exemplary new residential community comprising circa 4,500 new homes – of which 50% would be affordable – plus ancillary commercial uses and amenities alongside supporting social, transport, green and blue infrastructure. Much of the housing would be dedicated to meeting the documented need for homes to support existing needs and planned growth at the Cambridge Biomedical Campus. The majority of that land falls within the S&GS NP area and LIH and Pigeon therefore have a keen and valid interest in the Neighbourhood Plan.

The opportunity that Cambridge South provides is being put to GCSP and the Cambridge Growth Group ('CGG') so that it may form part of their emerging plans.

We recognise that it is not for the Neighbourhood Plan to confirm such an allocation given that the land is currently designated as Green Belt. The purpose of this letter is to make sure that the authors of the NP are aware of the Cambridge South development and that any restrictive allocation of the land set out in this NP may need to be reviewed at a relatively early stage, given the national importance of meeting the identified need for supporting CBC's expansion and tackling Greater Cambridge's housing issues.

Quod | 21 Soho Square London W1D 3QP | 020 3597 1000 | quod.com

Quod Limited. Registered England at above No. 7170188

1

Background

LIH and Pigeon have promoted Cambridge South for a number of years and have engaged at each stage of the Greater Cambridge Local Plan ('GCLP') currently being prepared by the Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service ('GCSP').

Most recently, LIH and Pigeon made a joint submission to the GCLP First Proposals consultation held in Spring 2021 alongside a consortium of landowners of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus ('CBC').

The submission set out the needs case for growing CBC and a holistic vision for achieving this alongside delivering much needed housing on Cambridge South to support the Campus' expansion and address the wider chronic issues facing the Cambridge housing market.

That submission comprised the following reports and studies (all of which are available to view via the GCSP Local Plan consultation webpage):

☒

☒

☒

☒

☒

☒

☒

CBC Vision 2050

Planning Report, prepared by Quod

Building a World Leading Innovation District for the Life Sciences, prepared by Creative Places

Spatial Masterplan Report, prepared by Allies and Morrison

Environmental Appraisal, prepared by Quod

Transport Strategy, prepared by Vectos

Utilities Appraisal, prepared by Buro Happold

The very serious issues facing the Cambridgeshire housing market are well known. The S&GS Housing Needs Assessment (2024 amendment) sets things out in stark terms:

"Local households on average incomes are unable to access even entry-level homes unless they have the advantage of a very large deposit. Market housing, even with the benefit of a higher than average income, is likely to remain out of reach to most. Private renting is generally only affordable to higher earners, with average earners able to afford entry-level market rents. Households made up of one or two lower quartile earners cannot afford the given rental thresholds." (paragraph 10)

S&GS are by no means alone in recognising the severity of these issues. A Housing Study commissioned by CBC Ltd based on a broad survey of people who work on the Campus (i.e., doctors, nurses, lab technicians, researchers, estate management staff) sets out the housing challenges they face, with many struggling to meet their housing needs. 30% of CBC workers are currently unable to afford rents on the open market; healthcare workers – who account for 70% of the total workforce within CBC – face having to pay 13-15 times their earnings to afford a property, which is twice the

national average.

OF

The effects of this are substantial and pervasive. High demand and low supply of affordable housing forces many to live in unsatisfactory conditions or to look for housing further field, leading to longer commute times which has effects on congestion, air pollution, climate change and quality of life. This imperils Cambridge's ability to attract workers, threatening its economy and long term prosperity.

The draft Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges and understands these issues and neatly summarises the problems they cause:

"It is very difficult for younger generations and even middle to high income earners to put down roots in Stapleford and Great Shelford. Property prices are high and trending upwards and there is a limited supply of suitable housing, affordable or otherwise, relative to demand. Without a better balance, Stapleford and Great Shelford could become ageing dormitory villages rather than the thriving multi-generational communities which they aspire to be." (paragraph 4.13)

Cambridge South provides an opportunity to address the housing needs of Stapleford and Great Shelford, of CBC and of the wider City. It can accommodate circa 4,500 new homes, half of which would be affordable. There is a real prospect of making a meaningful difference and addressing the very serious challenges that people face in finding well connected, affordable, high quality housing in the local area. LIH and Pigeon are continuing to engage with GCSP and CGG to make them aware of this and to seek its incorporation into their plans for the area. LIH and Pigeon would welcome engagement with the Parish Councils on their plans for Cambridge South, should either Council wish to.

2

Government support for growth in Cambridge

Successive governments have been clear in their support for growth in Cambridge and specifically in southern Cambridge as expressed across budget announcements, Written Ministerial Statements ('WMS') and Government publications. The consistent message is that there is a strong backing for realising the true potential of Greater Cambridge, which the Government sees as a national priority.

For instance:

☒

In September 2023, Michael Gove MP issued a WMS declaring the Government's support for "transformational change" to address barriers caused by "lack of new space for laboratories and the new housing necessary to attract and retain talent."

1 Cambridge Biomedical Campus Housing Study: Establishing the housing needs of the CBC workforce (April 2024). Available here: <https://cambridge-biomedical.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/CBC-Housing-Study-Report-Final-May24.pdf>

3

☒

☒

In March 2024 Government published The Case for Cambridge, which recognises the city's incredible history, built environment and institutions and seeks to "give new life to the spirit of innovation and endeavour which has been the cornerstone of Cambridge's success."

Following that, a further WMS was published in May 2024, setting out unusually location specific policy. It directly acknowledged the critical role that the Cambridge Biomedical Campus plays in the regional and national economy and invited proposals for its expansion. That WMS also set out the Government's ambitions to:

2

"address any barriers to the early expansion and coherent enhancement of the campus,

including through the accelerated delivery of any associated housing development and the provision of appropriate levels of affordable housing to meet the housing needs of those working at the campus.”

1F

⌘

Matthew Pennycook MP wrote an open letter to leaders and executives within GCSP in August 2024 to make clear that the current Government thinks the “recent focus on Cambridge and its untapped economic potential are entirely warranted.”

3

2F

Ambitions for growth are being matched by investment in the infrastructure to support it. The Minister for Housing and Planning set out plans to invest £7.9 billion investment in the next 5 years for water companies across the Oxford-Cambridge corridor, including to delivering the new Fens Reservoir serving Cambridge.

3F

5

4This follows Government funding for the Cambridge South Train station in 2019, due for completion in 2025.

4F

The above WMSs are not referenced in the as being relevant ministerial statements in paragraph 3.2 of the Basic Conditions Statement (2024) despite them clearly being so.

3

Relationship between the Neighbourhood Plan, the emerging GCLP and national policy

Cambridge South is the only site of scale within active travel distance of CBC that could sustainably meet the need identified in the WMS. It is apparent, therefore, that these national priorities could have

2

Available

online

here:

<https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2024-05>

[08/debates/24050858000017/CambridgeDeliveryGroupUpdate](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/2024-05)

3

Letter

from

Matthew

Pennycook

MP,

23rd

August

2024.

Available here:

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/66cdf3f68e33f28aae7e1f67/housing-minister-letter-to-greater-cambridge-leaders.pdf>

4MHCLG Growth Corridor Strategy Statement made, 29 January 2025

5Cambridge South infrastructure enhancement: Transport and Works Order, 18 June 2021

4

implications for the local area and the Neighbourhood Plan needs to be careful not to set itself in conflict with national policies.

6

The most effective way of doing this may be to recognise in the Plan itself that it would need to be reviewed in the event that the Greater Cambridge Local Plan or the Spatial Plan proposed to be produced by the Cambridge Growth company confirms plans for strategic scale growth within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Without this, several policies will likely become out of date and carry limited weight.

5F

It is also important in any event to be sure that the Neighbourhood Plan policies are consistent with other current national planning policies.

LIH and Pigeon would welcome the opportunity to engage with the Parish Councils if and when a review of the Neighbourhood Plan is carried out.

Summary

Pigeon and LIH are seeking to have Cambridge South allocated in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan to deliver approximately 4,500 new homes to help meet Greater Cambridge’s acute need for housing. LIH and Pigeon recognise that it is not for this version of the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate Cambridge South for this purpose. Should GSCP remove Cambridge South from the Green Belt and allocate it for development, however, the Neighbourhood Plan would require an early review to ensure that it does not undermine or constrain strategic policies in the newly adopted GCLP or conflict with national policy. LIH and Pigeon would be pleased to engage with the Parish Councils on

any such review of the Neighbourhood Plan that may happen in the future.
We request pursuant to Regulation 19(b)(ii) to be notified of any decision made by the local planning authority under section 38(4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).

Yours sincerely
Gregory Blaxland
Associate Director

Attachments:

Cambridge South - SGS NP Reps (Reg 12) obo Pigeon and LIH (06.02.2025) -
<https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6y6>

200595

Support

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future

Date received: 10/02/2025 via Web

Summary:

We welcome the recognition which the Plan gives Wandlebury Country Park and the contribution the Park makes to the landscape, biodiversity, and accessible natural green space of the Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Policy S&GS 9: Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and nature networks in Stapleford and Great Shelford
We support the reference to the Cambridge Nature Network and the inclusion of Appendix 5.

S&GS 12 on protecting landscape character and S&GS 13 on Important Views

The work of Cambridge PPF includes protecting and enhancing the green setting of Cambridge and we therefore support these policies.

Full text:

We welcome the recognition which the Plan gives Wandlebury Country Park and the contribution the Park makes to the landscape, biodiversity, and accessible natural green space of the Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Policy S&GS 9: Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and nature networks in Stapleford and Great Shelford
We support the reference to the Cambridge Nature Network and the inclusion of Appendix 5.

S&GS 12 on protecting landscape character and S&GS 13 on Important Views

The work of Cambridge PPF includes protecting and enhancing the green setting of Cambridge and we therefore support these policies.

Attachments: None

200596

Object

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present and Future

Date received: 10/02/2025 via Web

Summary:

We request that the supporting text to Policy S&GS17 refers to developers making a financial contribution through a S106 Agreement, towards the improvement and expansion of natural green space on the Gog Magog Hills, and for the policy to refer, not only to informal open space, but natural green space, as a local priority.

Full text:

Policy S&GS 17 on delivering community infrastructure alongside new development.

The only reference in this policy to natural green space is to improve access to areas such as Magog Down and Wandlebury Country Park.

It can be expected that residents of any new development will look to the Gog Magog hills (Wandlebury Country Park and Magog Down) to access nature for recreational and health and wellbeing purposes. Development should therefore be required to contribute towards the enhancement of existing, and provision of new green infrastructure on the Gog Magog Hills. This is not unprecedented as S106 monies have successfully been secured from developments in Queen Ediths Ward and Sawston.

We therefore request that the supporting text to Policy S&GS17 refers to developers making a financial contribution through a S106 Agreement, towards the improvement and expansion of natural green space on the Gog Magog Hills, and for the policy to refer, not only to informal open space, but natural green space, as a local priority.

It would be helpful if the Neighbourhood Plan made reference to the Greater Cambridge Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document

Attachments: None

200598

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Miss Harston council

Date received: 10/02/2025 via Web

Summary:

Harston Parish Council provides feedback on the Great Shelford & Stapleford Neighbourhood Plan, highlighting key strategic considerations. The council suggests the Plan should explicitly state its position on East-West Rail for consistency in addressing transport projects. Concerns are raised about future healthcare capacity due to an aging population and increasing care homes, recommending a policy to address this. The Plan should also clarify its stance on local employment growth. Lastly, the proposed East-West ring road would benefit from integration into a broader South Cambridgeshire strategy. The council appreciates the opportunity to contribute and welcomes further discussion.

Full text:

We are writing to provide feedback on the Great Shelford & Stapleford Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and to highlight key strategic considerations that we believe should be addressed within the Plan.

East-West Rail

East-West Rail and the CSET busway are both identified as strategic planning issues beyond the scope of the GS&S Neighbourhood Plan. While the Plan clearly states the parishes' position on CSET, there is no equivalent stance regarding East-West Rail. To ensure consistency in addressing significant transport infrastructure projects impacting the area, we suggest that the GS&S NP explicitly outlines its position on East-West Rail.

Primary Healthcare Provision

The GS&S NP acknowledges the aging demographic within the Plan area and notes that, while current primary healthcare provision is adequate, there is a potential capacity risk in the future. This risk applies to both general practice healthcare and NHS dentistry. Given the increasing number of care homes being developed in the area, we recommend that the GS&S NP includes a policy proposal to address this anticipated imbalance in healthcare provision.

Character of the Plan Area (Employment)

The GS&S NP highlights that many residents work primarily in the Greater Cambridge area or the Cambridge Biomedical Campus, rather than within the Plan area itself. Additionally, it notes that those employed locally often do not reside within the area. We suggest that the GS&S NP clearly states its position on employment growth within the Plan area, as the current assumption appears to be that employment opportunities will largely develop outside of it.

Congestion and Traffic Management (East-West Ring Road)

The GS&S NP recognises the forecasted increase in road traffic congestion and includes a policy proposal for a ring road to manage East-West traffic. We believe this policy would have a greater chance of successful implementation if the proposed ring road were integrated into a broader strategic initiative across South Cambridgeshire, involving other villages that would also be impacted by the proposed route.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input on the GS&S Neighbourhood Plan and trust that these suggestions will be considered in the final drafting. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require any further clarification or discussion on these points.

Kind Regards

Paul Holdom

Harston Parish Council - Vice Chair

Attachments:

Consultation response - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6p5>

200606

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Mr Sam Webster

Date received: 12/02/2025 via Web

Summary:

A couple of suggestions around active travel changes

Full text:

This all looks very good so well done to those who have clearly put a lot of time into it. As a long time Camcycle campaigner, I would suggest adding an explicit expectation that, in the plan area, all highway safety related planning conditions are enforced, especially in the vicinity of schools. The LPA are amazingly reluctant to enforce safety conditions and very quickly roll out the 'enforcement is discretionary' line. It's great to see mention of LTN 1/20 but perhaps 10.14 could be modified along the lines of 'To incentivise active travel, it is important that high quality infrastructure is in place to support users of the active travel network. This includes insisting on the latest design standards, such as LTN 1/20, and ensuring that the condition of roads, pavement surfaces and designated cycle routes is maintained to a high standard'? Thanks

Attachments: None

200607

Object

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Great Shelford (Ten Acres) Ltd

Agent: Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd

Date received: 12/02/2025 via Web

Summary:

On behalf of our clients, Great Shelford Ten Acres Ltd (GSTA), we welcome this opportunity to comment on the Nov 2024 submission Reg 15 version of Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan (S&GS NP).

In its current form, we believe that it fails to meet the basic conditions as required by Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Those we consider are not met include a and d.

Please see attached document by policy with specific changes recommended.

Full text:

On behalf of our clients, Great Shelford Ten Acres Ltd (GSTA), we welcome this opportunity to comment on the Nov 2024 submission Reg 15 version of Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan (S&GS NP).

In its current form, we believe that it fails to meet the basic conditions as required by Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Those we consider are not met include a and d.

Please see attached document by policy with specific changes recommended.

Attachments:

Response to Reg 16- final.docx - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6y8>

200608

Object

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: St John's College Cambridge

Agent: Savills

Date received: 12/02/2025 via Web

Summary:

Objection to the designation of 'LGS 3. Horse pasture bounded by Granhams Road, the DNA path and Macaulay Avenue housing, Great Shelford' as a Local Green Space. See letter for full details.

Full text:

Objection to the designation of 'LGS 3. Horse pasture bounded by Granhams Road, the DNA path and Macaulay Avenue housing, Great Shelford' as a Local Green Space. See letter for full details.

Attachments:

SJC Reg 16 Reps S&GS NP 12.02.2025_Redacted.pdf - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6p6>

200609

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Swifts Local Network: Swifts & Planning Group

Date received: 12/02/2025 via Web

Summary:

Paragraph 7.61 and Policy S&GS 10 item 5 are welcome but please amend for clarity as per my detailed comments.

Full text:

Paragraph 7.61, and Policy S&GS 10 item 5, reference swift bricks which is welcome but I find them unclear at present.

Currently: Item 5 clearly refers to all developments; however, 7.61 refers to "development types otherwise exempt from BNG" which I find unclear.

Amendment requested to 7.61: To match item 5, please amend 7.61 to "...development types including those exempt from BNG."

Currently: Item 5 states "...through the provision of integrated bird boxes, swift bricks, bat boxes..."

This is unclear because swift bricks ARE integrated bird boxes, and as universal nest bricks they are the only type compliant with BS 42021 Integral Bird Boxes, and the only type in national planning guidance (NPPG 2019 Natural Environment paragraph 023), and also swifts are the only bird mentioned in NPPF December 2024, so swift bricks should be prioritised.

Amendment requested to item 5: For clarity, please amend item 5 to "...integrated bird boxes such as swift bricks, bat boxes, ..."

Currently: Given swift bricks priority status in planning guidance as set out above, we would also like 7.61 to be more strongly worded, amended from "Where swift bricks are installed, this should be..."

Amendment requested to 7.61: "Swift bricks should be..."

Many thanks.

Attachments: None

200610

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: NHS Property Services Ltd

Date received: 12/02/2025 via Web

Summary:

NHSPS have submitted comments regarding Draft Policy S&GS 17 and its supporting paragraphs (9.19 to 9.22) and Shelford Health Centre (supporting paragraphs 9.23). As suggested in the supporting letter, in ensuring the most appropriate and suitable form of mitigation for healthcare infrastructure in the area, the Council are encouraged to engage with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough ICS. This should also be applied when undertaking an exercise in exploring options for development of Shelford Health Centre (under NHSPS ownership). Further details are included in the supporting letter.

Full text:

Draft Policy S&GS 17 sets out the overarching policy to ensure new developments positively contribute to sustainable growth in the local area through the provision of new and improved community infrastructure, in line with local priorities. We welcome supporting paragraph 9.6 which states new development must address arising needs for specific infrastructure, including for healthcare. Health infrastructure is clearly identified as a priority, with an expectation that development proposals must make provision to meet healthcare infrastructure costs made necessary by the development.

Supporting paragraphs 9.19 to 9.22 sets out the Council's assumptions on the growth in demand for healthcare infrastructure in the local area, partly through the use of proxy data (Paragraph 9.19). NHSPS are supportive of the work the Council has undertaken thus far in exploring options to mitigate impact on healthcare infrastructure based on forms of population growth assumptions. In line with our previous response at Regulation 14 Stage (April 2024) however, we continue to recommend that the Council engage with Cambridgeshire and Peterborough ICS (C&P ICS) to ensure the most appropriate and suitable form of mitigation is identified in the area.

Healthcare providers should have flexibility in determining the most appropriate means of meeting the relevant healthcare needs arising from a new development. Where new development creates a demand for health services that cannot be supported by incremental extension or internal modification of existing facilities, this means the provision of new purpose-built healthcare infrastructure will be required to provide sustainable health services. Options should enable financial contributions, new-on-site healthcare infrastructure, free land/infrastructure/property, or a combination of these. It should be emphasised that the NHS and its partners will need to work with the Council in the formulation of appropriate mitigation measures.

Shelford Health Centre

NHSPS own the freehold to Shelford Health Centre ("the Site"), a site map of this is attached in Appendix 1 of the supporting letter.

We note that the Council has undertaken an exercise in exploring options for the Site's redevelopment within supporting paragraph 9.23. In line with the above, any quantum or retained and/or re-provided health or other community uses would need to be determined by the local health commissioners (the Integrated Care Board) – including that required for continued health services, and any part of the Site which may no longer be needed for the delivery of health services (and therefore available for alternative uses).

Local health commissioners are best placed to determine the means and form of mitigation to meet the healthcare needs of the local community, including when considering the expansion of facilities to increase the level of provision. As such, we recommend the Council engage in consultation with the ICB when determining forms of healthcare infrastructure provision.

Attachments:

Stapleford & Great Shelford (Reg.16) - NHSPS_C&PICS Response_Redacted.pdf -
<https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6p8>

200611

Object

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Mr Tim E Zoll

Agent: Property Link Consultants Ltd

Date received: 12/02/2025 via Web

Summary:

■ Full objection sent by email and attached for Grange Field reference number 40128

Full text:

■ Full objection sent by email and attached for Grange Field reference number 40128

Attachments:

Objection to Local Plan Framed_Redacted.pdf - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6p7>

200623

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Axis Land Partnerships

Agent: Carter Jonas

Date received: 12/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

In summary, the Axis representations to draft S&G SNP are as follows:

- Comment on the Policy Context section of draft S&G SNP to highlight those development plan documents that are not referred to (Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP), to identify relevant emerging development plan and policy documents (emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan), and revised national policy (NPPF December 2024).
- Comment on the housing and affordable housing references in the Vision for draft S&G SNP, which would not be addressed by the lack of policy support in the document for additional housing.
- Comment on those objectives of draft S&G SNP related to development because they are unlikely to be delivered without any support for additional residential development.
- Object to Policy S&GS 12 because it does not take into account that the land between Stapleford and Great Shelford and Cambridge is already designated as Green Belt.
- Object to Policy S&GS 13 because the proposed important views from Stapleford Cemetery (View T) and Gog Magog Way (View U) (as shown on Map 7 and described in Appendix 7) are general views of the countryside rather than a notable view of a particular feature from a public footpath or vantage point.
- Comment on Policy S&GS 17 because draft S&G SNP does not support new development that might enable the delivery of new community infrastructure.
- Object to Policy S&GS 19 because it is inconsistent with and duplicates transport policy requirements in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and revised NPPF December 2024.
- Object to Policy S&GS 21 because the proposed Improved Landscape Area designation (as shown on Map 14) is inconsistent with and duplicates a similar countryside enhancement designation in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP.

Full text:

INTRODUCTION

Carter Jonas has been instructed by Axis Land Partnerships Ltd (Axis) to respond to the Reg.16 consultation for the submission draft Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan (draft S&G SNP). Axis has an interest in land within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

In summary, the Axis representations to draft S&G SNP are as follows:

- Comment on the Policy Context section of draft S&G SNP to highlight those development plan documents that are not referred to (Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP), to identify relevant emerging development plan and policy documents (emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan), and revised national policy (NPPF December 2024).
- Comment on the housing and affordable housing references in the Vision for draft S&G SNP, which would not be addressed by the lack of policy support in the document for additional housing.
- Comment on those objectives of draft S&G SNP related to development because they are unlikely to be delivered without any support for additional residential development.
- Object to Policy S&GS 12 because it does not take into account that the land between Stapleford and Great Shelford and Cambridge is already designated as Green Belt.
- Object to Policy S&GS 13 because the proposed important views from Stapleford Cemetery (View T) and Gog Magog Way (View U) (as shown on Map 7 and described in Appendix 7) are general views of the countryside rather than a notable view of a particular feature from a public footpath or vantage point.
- Comment on Policy S&GS 17 because draft S&G SNP does not support new development that might enable the delivery of new community infrastructure.
- Object to Policy S&GS 19 because it is inconsistent with and duplicates transport policy requirements in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and revised NPPF December 2024.
- Object to Policy S&GS 21 because the proposed Improved Landscape Area designation (as shown on Map 14) is inconsistent with and duplicates a similar countryside enhancement designation in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP.

The draft S&G SNP will need to be in general conformity with strategic policies in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. It is acknowledged that the Local Plan does not allow for the release of land from the Green Belt around Stapleford or Great Shelford through the neighbourhood plan process.

In due course draft S&G SNP will be examined by an Independent Examiner who will determine whether the basic conditions for a neighbourhood plan have been met. As explained in this response, it is considered that some of the policies and designations in draft S&G SNP do not meet Basic Condition (a) and are inconsistent with national policy, or Basic Condition (e) and are not in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area.

At the end of the representations to each policy is a summary and the requested changes.

All references to the NPPF in these representations relate to the December 2023 version unless otherwise stated because of the transitional arrangements for neighbourhood plans contained in Paragraph 239 of the December 2024 NPPF.

REPRESENTATIONS TO DRAFT S&G SNP

Policy Context

COMMENT

Paragraphs 3.2 to 3.5 of draft S&G SNP seeks to identify the policy context for the document. It is considered that this section covers only part of the relevant policy context, and omits references to other development plan documents, to emerging development plan documents, and to national policy. This is relevant because some policies in draft S&G SNP are inconsistent with adopted and emerging development plan policies and with national policies, as set out in these representations. Those inconsistencies might not have occurred if the policy context section had provided a more comprehensive review of adopted and emerging policy.

The policy context section does not identify the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP as a relevant development plan document for draft S&G SNP. As set out in the representations to Policy S&GS 12 and Policy S&GS 21, the proposed Improved Landscape Area duplicates similar policies in the Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP but does not mention the important connection between the delivery of countryside enhancements and development contained in the AAP.

The policy context section refers to the Green Belt and highlights the extent of the Green Belt around the villages and between the villages and Cambridge. The policy section does not refer to national policy relating to the Green Belt as contained in Chapter 13 of the NPPF. As set out in the representations to Policy S&GS 12, the adopted Local Plan and the NPPF already provide strong protection from development for land located within the Green Belt, and it is unnecessary for draft S&G SNP to include similar policies to these areas.

Paragraph 3.5 provides some limited commentary on the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, but other matters should have been included too. Stapleford and Great Shelford will continue to be classified as Rural Centres in the settlement hierarchy for the emerging Local Plan. The status of these villages in the settlement hierarchy reflects the good range of services and facilities within them. The emerging Local Plan identifies these villages within a new Rural Southern Cluster which seeks to connect employment growth to housing in an accessible location. The Rural Southern Cluster approach reflects the close proximity of the villages to employment including Cambridge Biomedical Campus, and the availability of a railway station, bus services and cycle routes from the villages, and the transport improvements to be delivered by the planned Cambridge South East Transport Project in the future.

The emerging Local Plan will need to be consistent with the changes to national policy contained in the revised NPPF published in December 2024. Those changes include a higher housing need figure for both Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, that development needs should be met in full, and where exceptional circumstances exist to review and release land from the Green Belt to meet those development needs in sustainable locations. In addition, the Government has recently confirmed a commitment to further growth in the Oxford to Cambridge corridor. It is very likely that the development strategy in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan will need to be updated to reflect changes to national policy and growth aspirations, and this is likely to affect land within the draft S&G SNP area.

It is considered that a more comprehensive review of the relevant policy context for draft S&G SNP would have highlighted that some policies and designations are not required.

Summary Representation

Paragraphs 3.2 to 3.5 of draft S&G SNP provide only part of the relevant policy context. The adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP should be identified as a relevant development plan document. The policy context should include more detailed commentary on the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan and national policy. It is considered that a more comprehensive review of the relevant policy context for draft S&G SNP would have highlighted that some policies and designations are not required.

Requested Change

It is requested that the policy context section in draft S&G SNP refers to the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP and includes more detailed commentary on the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan and national policy.

Vision

COMMENT

The Vision for draft S&G SNP refers to addressing identified housing and affordable housing needs. The Housing Needs Assessment (AECOM March 2023) identified a high need for both social rent and affordable home ownership housing in the villages. It should be noted that affordable housing is mostly delivered in conjunction with market housing, and that rural exception schemes are typically small scale and provide a limited number of dwellings. The affordable housing

requirement in the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan is for 40% of housing to be affordable from developments of 10 or more dwellings. As such, sufficient land to provide both market and affordable housing would need to be allocated to meet the identified affordable housing needs.

It would be appropriate for the Vision to seek to address those housing needs. However, as set out in this response, the draft S&G SNP does not provide any policy support for housing and affordable housing needs to be addressed through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan. It appears that draft S&G SNP seeks to introduce new policy designations that are clearly intended to limit development at the villages in the future, and to restrict potential options for the growth of the villages. It is unlikely that the aspirations in the Vision to address housing and affordable housing need would be achieved without positive policy support in draft S&G SNP to actually meet those needs.

Draft S&G SNP should include an additional policy that supports the allocation of land for development at the villages through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan process to meet housing and affordable housing needs.

Summary Representations

It is unlikely that the aspirations in the Vision to address housing and affordable housing need would be achieved without positive policy support in draft S&G SNP to actually meet those needs.

Requested Change

No changes are requested to the Vision.

Objectives

COMMENT

Paragraph 5.2 identifies 10 theme-based objectives for draft S&G SNP. These objectives are appropriate. It is noted that the objectives related to housing, biodiversity, community amenities and infrastructure, and countryside enhancement all refer to development, and it is assumed that additional development is necessary to support the delivery of those objectives. However, draft S&G SNP does not allocate any land for development and does not provide any policy support for development to be brought forward in the future through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan process.

Draft S&G SNP should include a policy that supports the allocation of land for development at the villages through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan process to deliver the housing, biodiversity, community amenities and infrastructure, and countryside enhancement related objectives.

Summary Representation

It is unlikely that those objectives that are associated with the delivery of additional development - housing, biodiversity, community amenities and infrastructure, and countryside enhancement - would be achieved without specific policy support for development.

Requested Change

No changes are requested to the objectives.

Policy S&GS 12: Protecting and Enhancing Stapleford and Great Shelford's Landscape Character

OBJECT

Policy S&GS 12 relates to landscape character. Criteria 1(b) of this policy seeks to retain the existing area of separation between Stapleford and Great Shelford and the City of Cambridge. Criteria 4 of this policy refers to development affecting the proposed Landscape Improvement Area in Policy S&GS 21. In summary, these criteria do not take into account that all of the land between the villages and Cambridge is already designated as Green Belt, or that a Countryside Enhancement Strategy is identified in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP.

Policy S/4 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seeks to maintain a Green Belt around Cambridge, with any development proposals in the Green Belt assessed against national policies contained in the NPPF. The Green Belt at Great Shelford and Stapleford is defined on the Local Plan Proposals Map Inset No.45. Stapleford Allotments fall within the land designated as Green Belt. As highlighted in Paragraph 142 of the NPPF, openness is identified as an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. Policy NH/2 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance landscape character, and refers to National Character Areas. Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF states that plans, including neighbourhood plans, should "serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)".

Criteria 1(b) of Policy S&GS 12 would duplicate the openness requirement of the Green Belt designation that already applies to land between the villages and Cambridge, and landscape character is already protected by Policy NH/2 of the adopted Local Plan. It is not necessary to duplicate development plan policies and national policies, and to do so would be inconsistent with Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF. Therefore, criteria 1(b) of Policy S&GS 12 would not meet Basic

Condition (a). In addition, it is not clear what is meant by the term “existing area of separation” between the villages and Cambridge, as it is not defined in draft S&G SNP.

As set out below in the representations to Policy S&GS 21, the proposed Improved Landscape Area duplicates and is inconsistent with the area allocated for a Countryside Enhancement Strategy in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP. The countryside enhancement strategy proposed in the adopted AAP are linked to and funded by development. There are no development allocations in draft S&G SNP that would support the delivery of the proposed Improved Landscape Area in Policy S&GS 21. As also requested in representations to Policy S&GS 21, the proposed Improved Landscape Area referred to in criteria 4 should be deleted, because it is inconsistent with and duplicates an adopted development plan policy which is contrary to national policy and would not meet Basic Condition (a).

Summary Representation

The reference in Criteria 1(b) of Policy S&GS 12 to retain the existing area of separation between the villages and Cambridge is not necessary because this area is already designated as Green Belt. Criteria 1(b) should be deleted.

The proposed Improved Landscape Area, referred to in Criteria 4 of Policy S&GS 12, duplicates and is inconsistent with the area allocated for a Countryside Enhancement Strategy in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP. Criteria 4 should be deleted.

Requested Change

It is requested that criteria 1(b) and criteria 4 of Policy S&GS 12 are deleted.

Policy S&GS 13: Important Views

OBJECT

Policy S&GS 13 identifies a number of proposed important views around the villages, which are to be maintained and enhanced as part of any development proposals. Those proposed important views are listed in Policy S&GS 13, shown on Map 7, and described in Appendix 7. It is noted that the majority of land at the edge of the villages fall within a proposed important view.

Axis' land interest falls within the following identified views: New countryside park between Haverhill Road and Hinton Way (View O); Gap between 27 and 31 Mingle Lane (View S); Stapleford Cemetery (View T); and from Gog Magog Way (View U).

Axis has instructed The Landscape Partnership to provide an independent appraisal of the identified Important Views O, S, T and U. The Landscape Rebuttal Statement is provided in Appendix A. The Visualisations of those Important Views is provided in Appendix B.

In summary, it is concluded in the Rebuttal Statement that no clear methodology has been provided with Policy S&GS 13 as to how the Important Views have been identified and what, if any, qualities they need to have to qualify. There is no public footpath or bridleway across the land off Hinton Way, and there are no public footpaths or bridleways within the proposed important views at Views O, S, T and U. The proposed important views at Views O, S, T and U do not take into account the changes to landscape and visual character that are taking place as a result of the retirement village development and associated countryside park at land of Haverhill Road, which is currently under construction. The proposed important views at Views O, S, T and U do not take into account the future potential changes to landscape and visual character that are likely to arise from the Cambridge South East Transport project (a new busway to the east of Stapleford with stops at Haverhill Road and Hinton Way), or the draft allocation for residential development off Mingle Lane in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan (draft Policy S/RSC/HW for 100 dwellings).

Paragraph 041 (Ref ID: 41) of the Planning Practice Guidance states that “It [neighbourhood plan policies] should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence”. The evidence put forward to explain and justify the proposed important views at Views O, S, T and U is not robust, and as such these proposed designations do not have regard to national policy and would not meet Basic Condition (a). It is considered that Views O, S, T and U are general views of the countryside, and typical of other similar views on the edge of villages elsewhere in South Cambridgeshire.

Policy NH/2 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seeks to protect landscape character and the landscape of the National Character Areas. Policy HQ1 identifies the design principles for development, which includes preserve and enhancing the character of the area and responding to the site context in the wider landscape (criteria a) and providing high quality landscape (criteria m). Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF states that plans, including neighbourhood plans, should “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)”. The landscape character around the villages, and at Views O, S, T and U, is already protected by Policy NH/2, and high quality landscaping is required by Policy HQ1 of the adopted Local Plan. It is not necessary to duplicate development plan policies related to protecting landscape character, and to do so would be inconsistent with Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF and would not meet Basic Condition (a).

It might be helpful for the Neighbourhood Plan Group to review the Examiner's Report for the Fulbourn Neighbourhood

Plan (published April 2022), which also considered proposed locally important views for that document - see Paragraphs 7.33 to 7.35. In summary, the draft Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan identified multiple viewpoints into and out of the village that should be protected. The Examiner concluded that those proposed viewpoints were general in nature, the importance of those views to the surrounding landscape was not explained, and the relationship between the views and the settlement was not identified. The Examiner recommended that all of the proposed locally important viewpoints be deleted. It is suggested that the outcome should be the same for the proposed important views identified in Policy S&GS13, including Views O, S, T and U.

It is noted that no other made neighbourhood plans in South Cambridgeshire include a policy to protect identified views. A consistent approach should be applied for all neighbourhood plans within the same district.

Summary Representation

The proposed important views at Views O, S, T, and U are general views of the countryside only, do not contain any particularly notable landscape or topographic features, and the assessment of those views does not explain why those views are important to warrant special protection. The adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan already contains policies that seek to protect landscape character and policies that require high quality landscaping to be provided with development proposals, and it is not necessary to duplicate those policies in draft S&GSNP. It is requested that proposed Views O, S, T and U are deleted.

Requested Change

It is requested that the proposed important views at New countryside park between Haverhill Road and Hinton Way (View O), Gap between 27 and 31 Mingle Lane (View S); Stapleford Cemetery (View T), and from Gog Magog Way (View U) are deleted from Policy S&GS13 and from Map 7, and that references to these views are removed from Appendix 7.

Policy S&GS 17: Delivering Community Infrastructure Priorities Alongside New Development

COMMENT

Policy S&GS 17 relates to the delivery of community infrastructure through planning obligations, and identifies a specific need for informal open space and play space.

Policy TI/8 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seeks planning obligations from development for the delivery of necessary infrastructure. Paragraph 57 of the NPPF sets out the three tests for planning obligations. Section ID.23b of the Planning Practice Guidance provides further national guidance on planning obligations. As set out in Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF, it is not necessary for neighbourhood plans to duplicate development plan policies or national policies, and therefore it is suggested that the first part of Policy S&GS 17 relating to planning obligations could be deleted.

Criteria 3 of Policy S&GS 17 appears to imply that the community infrastructure necessary to support a development is provided on that development site. The CIL Regulations, the supporting text to Policy TI/8 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and Section ID.23b of the Planning Practice Guidance all allow for planning obligations to be pooled to meet strategic requirements and for obligations to be spent on off-site infrastructure projects. Criteria 3 of Policy S&GS 17 is inconsistent with regulations, national policy and development plan policy, and should be amended or deleted.

Criteria (a) of Paragraph 97 of the NPPF requires planning policies to plan positively for the provision of community facilities including open space. Policy S&GS 17 of draft S&GSNP identifies a need for informal open space and play space as a priority. However, as noted elsewhere in this response, draft S&GSNP does not provide any policy support for residential development that might deliver planning obligations for new community infrastructure. Policy S&GS 17 identifies community infrastructure needs, but does not explain how that infrastructure would actually be delivered without support from additional development. It is considered that Policy S&GS 17 would be ineffective at delivering community infrastructure in the absence of development or specific policy support for additional development, and it is likely that the identified needs for informal open space and play space would remain undelivered which would be a negative outcome. For these reasons, Policy S&GS 17 is inconsistent with Paragraph 97(a) of the NPPF, and as such would not meet Basic Condition (a).

Summary Representation

It is not necessary for Policy S&GS 17 to duplicate development plan policies or national policies relating to planning obligations. The first part of Policy S&GS 17 relating to planning obligations could be deleted.

Criteria 3 of Policy S&GS 17 is inconsistent with regulations, national policy and development plan policy, in respect of pooled and off-site contributions, and should be deleted.

Policy S&GS 17 would be ineffective at delivering community infrastructure in the absence of development or specific policy support for additional development. The identified needs for informal open space and play space would remain undelivered, which would be an outcome that is inconsistent with national policy.

Requested Change

It is requested that the first part of Policy S&GS 17 relating to planning obligations for community infrastructure is reviewed in order to determine whether it is necessary to duplicate adopted development plan policies and national policy for these matters.

It is requested that Criteria 3 of Policy S&GS 17 is deleted.

The references to identified needs for informal open space and play space should be retained in Policy S&GS 17, but it is requested that the policy includes a mechanism for the delivery of these community infrastructure items.

Draft S&GSNP should include policy support for additional development that could support the delivery of community infrastructure.

Policy S&GS 19: Managing the impacts of new development in the Plan area with respect to the movement of people and vehicles

Policy S&GS 19 of draft S&GSNP sets out the policy requirements for developments that have an impact on traffic. Policy TI/2 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan deals with similar transport matters, including mitigating transport and environmental impacts. However, Policy TI/2 also refers to document requirements to identify transport impacts and sustainable transport options to address impacts. Chapter 13 of the NPPF and Section Id.42 of the Planning Practice Guidance provide detailed policy requirements for assessing the transport impacts of development. Paragraph 115 of NPPF 2023 (and Paragraph 116 of NPPF 2024) states that development should only be refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF states that plans, including neighbourhood plans, should “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)”. It is considered that Policy S&GS 19 duplicates parts of Policy TI/2 of the Local Plan and parts of national policy on sustainable transport contained in Chapter 13 of the NPPF, which is not necessary. Policy S&GS 19 does not mention sustainable transport options to address transport impacts, and is inconsistent with Policy TI/2 and Paragraphs 109, 114 and 116 of the NPPF. Policy S&GS 19 is inconsistent with Paragraph 115 of the NPPF in terms of the highway impacts being severe. Policy S&GS 19 would be contrary to national policy, and as such would not meet Basic Condition (a). It is requested that Policy S&GS 19 is deleted or amended to be consistent with development plan policy and national policy on transport matters.

Summary Representation

Policy S&GS 19 duplicates development plan policies and national policies on transport, and would be inconsistent with Paragraph 115 of the NPPF, both of which would be contrary to national policy and would not meet Basic Condition (a).

Requested Change

It is requested that Policy S&GS 19 is deleted or amended to be consistent with development plan policy and national policy on transport matters.

Policy S&GS 21: Delivering Stapleford and Great Shelford’s Improved Landscape Area

OBJECT

Policy S&GS 21 of draft S&GSNP seeks to designate all of the land on the eastern edge of Stapleford and Great Shelford as an Improved Landscape Area, for the purpose of countryside enhancement measures. The proposed Improved Landscape Area is shown on Map 14.

Policy CSF/5 of the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP, which is part of the adopted development plan for South Cambridgeshire, already designates the same land for a countryside enhancement strategy. The land designated by Policy CSF/5 is shown on Inset E of the adopted AAP. Policy CSF/5 provides additional detail of the landscape, planting and access measures required. The countryside enhancement strategy proposed in the adopted AAP are linked to and funded by development. There are no development allocations in draft S&GSNP that would support the delivery of the proposed Improved Landscape Area in Policy S&GS 21, and without an effective delivery mechanism this proposed designation would not be implemented. The fact that the proposed Improved Landscape Area is unrelated to development and contains no delivery mechanism makes it inconsistent with Policy CSF/5 in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP.

Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF states that plans, including neighbourhood plans, should “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)”. It is clear that the proposed Improved Landscape Area designation in Policy S&GS 21 duplicates Policy CSF/5 of the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP, which is not necessary. Policy S&GS 21 would be contrary to national policy, and as such would not meet Basic Condition (a).

The second paragraph of Policy S&GS 21 requires planning obligations for landscape initiatives listed in Paragraph 11.32. Most of the listed landscape improvements are located on private land, and some are related to specific development proposals. It is not clear whether there is landowner agreement for these landscape improvements, and how they would be delivered on private land that is unrelated to a particular development. The landscape improvements for a particular development should be determined in a site specific policy for an allocation and at planning application stage, and contributions should not be sought for potentially unrelated landscape projects. The second paragraph of Policy S&GS 21 is not consistent with national policy on planning obligations contained in Paragraph 57 of the NPPF. In addition, Paragraph 10.46 provides the supporting text to Policy TI/2 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and identifies landscaping and the historic landscape as matters where planning contributions may be required. It is not necessary for Policy S&GS 21 to also seek contributions towards landscape improvements. Therefore, the second paragraph of Policy S&GS 21 would be contrary to national policy, and as such would not meet Basic Condition (a).

Summary Representation

The proposed Improved Landscape Area duplicates and is inconsistent with the area allocated for a Countryside Enhancement Strategy in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP. It is requested that the proposed Improved Landscape Area in Policy S&GS 21 and shown on Map 14 is deleted.

The planning obligations for landscape initiatives referred to in Policy S&GS 21 and listed in Paragraph 11.32 are mostly unrelated to development and delivery is uncertain when it involves unrelated private land. It is requested that the second paragraph of Policy S&GS 21 is deleted.

Requested Change

It is requested that the proposed Improved Landscape Area in Policy S&GS 21, and shown on Map 14, is deleted.

It is requested that the second paragraph of Policy S&GS 21 is deleted.

Attachments:

Appendix A - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6yw>

Appendix B - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6yf>

200624

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Cambridgeshire County Council - Strategic Assets Team

Agent: Carter Jonas

Date received: 11/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

In summary, Cambridgeshire County Council's representations to draft S&G SNP are as follows:

- Comment on the Policy Context section of draft S&G SNP to highlight those development plan documents that are not referred to (Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP), to identify relevant emerging development plan and policy documents (emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan and draft Cambridge Biomedical Campus SPD), and revised national policy (NPPF December 2024).
- Object to Policy S&GS 12 (Protecting and Enhancing Stapleford and Great Shelford's Landscape Character) because it does not take into account the allocation for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, or that all of the land between Stapleford and Great Shelford and Cambridge is already designated as Green Belt.
- Object to Policy S&GS 13 (Important Views) because View K (DNA Path next to bridge over railway) and View P (High point on Granhams Road) are general views of the countryside and do not contain any notable landscape features, Policy E/2 includes landscape requirements for the extension to the Biomedical Campus, and Policies NH/2 and HQ1 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan already protect landscape character and the character of areas in the wider landscape.
- Object to Policy S&GS 21 (Delivering Stapleford and Great Shelford's Improved Landscape Area) because it is not in general conformity with and undermines the allocation for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus in Policy E/2 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and the land included within this proposed designation is already identified as an area for a Countryside Enhancement Strategy under Policy CSF/5 of the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP which remains part of the development plan and should not be duplicated.

Full text:

INTRODUCTION

We have been instructed by Cambridgeshire County Council, as landowner, to respond to the Reg.16 consultation for the submission draft Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan (draft S&G SNP). Cambridgeshire County Council owns the land allocated in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus – Policy E/2. As set out in these representations, there are policies and designations in draft S&G SNP that are not in general conformity with and undermine this allocation, and are inconsistent with national policy.

In summary, Cambridgeshire County Council's representations to draft S&G SNP are as follows:

- Comment on the Policy Context section of draft S&G SNP to highlight those development plan documents that are not referred to (Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP), to identify relevant emerging development plan and policy documents (emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan and draft Cambridge Biomedical Campus SPD), and revised national policy (NPPF December 2024).
- Object to Policy S&GS 12 (Protecting and Enhancing Stapleford and Great Shelford's Landscape Character) because it does not take into account the allocation for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, or that all of the land between Stapleford and Great Shelford and Cambridge is already designated as Green Belt.
- Object to Policy S&GS 13 (Important Views) because View K (DNA Path next to bridge over railway) and View P (High point on Granhams Road) are general views of the countryside and do not contain any notable landscape features, Policy E/2 includes landscape requirements for the extension to the Biomedical Campus, and Policies NH/2 and HQ1 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan already protect landscape character and the character of areas in the wider landscape.
- Object to Policy S&GS 21 (Delivering Stapleford and Great Shelford's Improved Landscape Area) because it is not in general conformity with and undermines the allocation for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus in Policy E/2 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and the land included within this proposed designation is already identified as an area for a Countryside Enhancement Strategy under Policy CSF/5 of the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP which remains part of the development plan and should not be duplicated.

In due course draft S&G SNP will be examined by an Independent Examiner who will determine whether the basic conditions for a neighbourhood plan have been met. As explained in this response, it is considered that some of the policies and designations in draft S&G SNP do not meet Basic Condition (a) and are inconsistent with national policy, or Basic Condition (e) and are not in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area.

At the end of the representations to each policy is a summary and the requested changes.

REPRESENTATIONS TO DRAFT S&G SNP

Policy Context

COMMENT

Paragraphs 3.2 to 3.5 of draft S&G SNP seeks to identify the policy context for the document. It is considered that this section covers only part of the relevant policy context, and omits references to other development plan documents, to emerging development plan and policy documents, and to national policy. This is relevant because some policies in draft S&G SNP are inconsistent with adopted and emerging development plan policies and with national policies, as set out in these representations. Those inconsistencies might not have occurred if the policy context section had provided a more comprehensive review of adopted and emerging policy.

The policy context section identifies Policy E/2 in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus, and refers to some of the criteria contained in the adopted policy, but not all. Criteria (e) and criteria (h) to Policy E/2, not referred to in the policy context, are relevant to the representations to Policy S&GS 21. It is noted that Map 14, which is related to Policy S&GS 21, incorrectly includes the land allocated for an extension to the Cambridge Biomedical Campus within the proposed Improved Landscape Area. The full text of Policy E2 is provided in Appendix A of these representations, and the associated Proposals Map (Inset E South of Addenbrookes) is provided in Appendix B.

The policy context section does not identify the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP as a relevant development plan document for draft S&G SNP. As set out in the representations to Policy S&GS 12 and Policy S&GS 21, the proposed Improved Landscape Area duplicates similar policies in the Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP but does not mention the important connection between countryside enhancements and development contained in the AAP.

The policy context section refers to the Green Belt and highlights the extent of the Green Belt around the villages and between the villages and Cambridge. The policy section does not refer to national policy relating to the Green Belt as contained in Chapter 13 of the NPPF. As set out in the representations to Policy S&GS 12, the adopted Local Plan and the NPPF already provide strong protection from development for land located within the Green Belt, and it is unnecessary for draft S&G SNP to include similar policies to these areas.

Paragraph 3.5 of the policy context section refers to the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan. The draft S&G SNP refers to a preferred allocation within the plan area. However, it does not mention the preferred allocation immediately adjacent to the northern edge of the plan area boundary adjacent to Cambridge Biomedical Campus - Policy S/CBC Cambridge Biomedical Campus (including Addenbrooke's Hospital). The full text and plans relating to emerging Policy S/CBC are provided in Appendix C. This preferred allocation is relevant to the representations to Policy S&GS 12 and Policy S&GS 13.

Greater Cambridge Shared Planning Service has recently consulted on a draft Cambridge Biomedical Campus SPD, which has been prepared in the context of adopted Policy E/2 and emerging Policy S/CBC. The draft SPD outlines some development principles for the expansion of Cambridge Biomedical Campus, including principles for design, landscape and open space. The draft SPD is not mentioned in the policy context section of draft S&G SNP. The draft SPD is relevant to the representations to Policy S&GS 12 and Policy S&GS 13.

It is considered that a more comprehensive review of the relevant policy context for draft S&G SNP would have highlighted that some policies and designations are not required.

Summary Representation

Paragraphs 3.2 to 3.5 of draft S&G SNP provide only part of the relevant policy context. The adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP should be identified as a relevant development plan document. Policy E/2 in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Policy S/CBC in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, and the Green Belt policy in the NPPF should be referenced in more detail. The draft Cambridge Biomedical Campus SPD should be referenced as relevant policy guidance. A more comprehensive review of the relevant policy context for draft S&G SNP would have highlighted that some policies and designations are not required.

Requested Change

It is requested that the policy context section in draft S&G SNP refers to the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP and draft Cambridge Biomedical Campus SPD, and refers to additional policy requirements from Policy E/2 in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, Policy S/CBC in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan, and Chapter 13 in the NPPF.

Policy S&GS 12: Protecting and Enhancing Stapleford and Great Shelford's Landscape Character

OBJECT

Policy S&GS 12 relates to landscape character. Criteria 1(b) of this policy seeks to retain the existing area of separation between Stapleford and Great Shelford and the City of Cambridge. Criteria 4 of this policy refers to development affecting the proposed Landscape Improvement Area in Policy S&GS 21. In summary, these criteria do not take into account the allocation for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local

Plan, that all of the land between the villages and Cambridge is already designated as Green Belt, or that a Countryside Enhancement Strategy is identified in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP.

Policy E/2 in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan allocates land for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus, which is located on the edge of Cambridge and within the northern boundary of the draft S&G SNP Area. The full text of Policy E2 is provided in Appendix A of these representations, and the associated Proposals Map (Inset E South of Addenbrookes) is provided in Appendix B. Policy E/2 is a strategic policy as set out in Appendix E of the adopted Local Plan. Policy S/CBC in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan identifies a preferred allocation for an additional extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus, which is located beyond and adjacent to the northern boundary of the draft S&G SNP Area. The full text and plans relating to emerging Policy S/CBC are provided in Appendix C. No planning applications have been submitted for either the adopted or emerging allocations at Cambridge Biomedical Campus. However, these two allocations would both reduce the separation between the villages and Cambridge. Criteria 1(b) of Policy S&G SNP is not in general conformity with Policy E/2 in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, and as such does not meet Basic Condition (e).

Policy S/4 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seeks to maintain a Green Belt around Cambridge, with any development proposals in the Green Belt assessed against national policies contained in the NPPF. The Green Belt at Great Shelford and Stapleford is defined on the Local Plan Proposals Map Inset No.45. As highlighted in Paragraph 142 of the NPPF, openness is identified as an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. Policy NH/2 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance landscape character, and refers to National Character Areas. Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF states that plans, including neighbourhood plans, should “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)”. Criteria 1(b) of Policy S&G 12 would duplicate the openness requirement of the Green Belt designation that already applies to land between the villages and Cambridge, and landscape character is already protected by Policy NH/2 of the adopted Local Plan. It is not necessary to duplicate development plan policies and national policies, and to do so would be inconsistent with Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF. It is considered that, criteria 1(b) of Policy S&G 12 is not consistent with national policy, and as such would not meet Basic Condition (a).

As set out below in the representations to Policy S&G 21, the proposed Improved Landscape Area as currently defined in Map 14 of draft S&G SNP incorrectly includes the land allocated for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus in Policy E/2 of the adopted Local Plan. The proposed Improved Landscape Area designation duplicates and is inconsistent with the area allocated for a Countryside Enhancement Strategy in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP. As requested in the representations to Policy S&G 12, the proposed Improved Landscape Area should as a minimum exclude the land allocated for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus, but preferably should be deleted entirely. As set out in the representations to Policy S&G 12, the proposed Landscape Improvement Area is not in general conformity with Policy E/2 in the adopted Local Plan and as such does not meet Basic Condition (e), and duplicates Policy CSF/5 of the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP and as such would not meet Basic Condition (a).

Summary Representation

The reference in Criteria 1(b) of Policy S&G 12 to retain the existing area of separation between the villages and Cambridge is inconsistent with the adopted and emerging allocations for extensions to Cambridge Biomedical Campus, and is not necessary because this area is already designated as Green Belt. Criteria 1(b) should be deleted.

The proposed Improved Landscape Area, referred to in Criteria 4 of Policy S&G 12, duplicates and is inconsistent with the area allocated for a Countryside Enhancement Strategy in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP. Criteria 4 should be deleted.

Requested Change

It is requested that criteria 1(b) and criteria 4 of Policy S&G 12 are deleted.

Policy S&G 13: Important Views

OBJECT

Policy S&G 13 identifies a number of proposed important views around the villages, which are to be maintained and enhanced as part of any development proposals. Those proposed important views are listed in Policy S&G 13, shown on Map 7, and described in Appendix 7. It is noted that the majority of land at the edge of the villages fall within a proposed important view.

Cambridgeshire County Council owns two parcels of land within the proposed important views. One parcel of land is allocated in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus (Policy E/2) – see plan in Appendix B. The second parcel of land is identified as a preferred allocation for an additional extension to the Campus in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan (Policy S/CBC) – see plan within Appendix C. These two parcels of land fall within View K (DNA Path next to bridge over railway) and View P (High point on Granhams Road). In summary, it is considered that proposed View K and View P are general views of the countryside only, do not contain any particularly notable landscape or topographic features, and the assessment of those views does not explain why those

views are important to warrant special protection. There are other adopted development plan policies that would ensure the delivery of appropriate landscaping with development.

Appendix 7 of draft S&G SNP describes the proposed important views at View K and View P, and seeks to explain why those views should be protected. The photographs of View K and View P show a typical view of the countryside at these locations, containing agricultural land, hedgerows and trees, and areas of woodland. There are no notable key landscape or topographic features within those views to identify them as particularly important or as a defining characteristic of the adjacent villages. It is noted that the viewpoints for View K and View P are not from the edge of the villages and are not in the direction of the villages. The commentary for View K and View P in Appendix 7 of draft S&G SNP and the assessment of LCA B2 (Hobsons Brook and Ninewells arable lowland) in the Stapleford & Great Shelford Landscape Character Assessment (October 2019) does not identify any key landscape features or provide the evidence to justify why these views are sufficiently important to warrant special policy protection. The commentary for LCA B2 identifies Cambridge University Hospitals and Cambridge Biomedical Campus as visually dominant features of this area. Paragraph 041 (Ref ID: 41) of the Planning Practice Guidance states that "It [neighbourhood plan policies] should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence". The evidence put forward to explain and justify the proposed important views at View K and View P is not robust, and as such these proposed designations do not have regard to national policy and would not meet Basic Condition (a).

Policy NH/2 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seeks to protect landscape character and the landscape of the National Character Areas. Policy HQ1 identifies the design principles for development, which includes preserve and enhancing the character of the area and responding to the site context in the wider landscape (criteria a) and providing high quality landscape (criteria m). Policy E/2 identifies the policy requirements for the extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus, some of which are related to protecting landscape character – the full text of Policy E/2 is provided in Appendix A. Criteria 2(a) of Policy E/2 would retain and enhance the landscape boundary at the allocation, criteria (b) would provide a landscape setting for Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve, and criteria (g) relates to building heights for the allocation. It is anticipated that similar landscaping requirements would be identified for the preferred allocation for an additional extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus in Policy S/CBC in the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan. Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF states that plans, including neighbourhood plans, should "serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)". The landscape character around the villages, and at View K and View P, is already protected by Policy NH/2, and high quality landscaping is required for all developments by Policy HQ1 and specifically for the extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus by Policy E/2. It is not necessary to duplicate development plan policies related to protecting landscape character, and to do so would be inconsistent with Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF and would not meet Basic Condition (a).

It is suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan Group for draft S&G SNP review the Examiner's Report for the Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan (published April 2022), which also considered proposed locally important views for that document - see Paragraphs 7.33 to 7.35. In summary, the draft Fulbourn Neighbourhood Plan identified multiple viewpoints into and out of the village that should be protected. The Examiner concluded that those proposed viewpoints were general in nature, the importance of those views to the surrounding landscape was not explained, and the relationship between the views and the settlement was not identified. The Examiner recommended that all of the proposed locally important viewpoints be deleted. It is suggested that the outcome would be the same for the proposed important views identified in Policy S&GS12, including View K and View P.

It is noted that no other made neighbourhood plans in South Cambridgeshire include a policy to protect identified views. A consistent approach should be applied for all neighbourhood plans within the same district.

Summary Representation

It is considered that proposed View K and View P are general views of the countryside only, do not contain any particularly notable landscape or topographic features, and the assessment of those views does not explain why those views are important to warrant special protection. The evidence and assessment that has informed the decision to identify View K and View P is not robust. There are other adopted development plan policies that would ensure the delivery of appropriate landscaping with development. It is not necessary to duplicate other landscape development plan policies. It is requested that View K and View P are deleted.

Requested Change

It is requested that the proposed important views at View K (DNA Path next to bridge over railway) and View P (High point on Granhams Road) are deleted from Policy S&GS 13 and from Map 7, and that references to these views are removed from Appendix 7.

Policy S&GS 21: Delivering Stapleford and Great Shelford's Improved Landscape Area

OBJECT

Policy S&GS 21 of draft S&G SNP seeks to designate all of the land on the eastern edge of Stapleford and Great Shelford as an Improved Landscape Area, for the purpose of countryside enhancement measures. The proposed Improved Landscape Area is shown on Map 14. Bullet No.8 in Paragraph 11.32 (and in the table following Paragraph 12.11)

identifies a proposed area of open space adjacent to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve (and adjacent to allocation Policy E/2). In summary, the proposed Improved Landscape Area incorrectly includes land allocated for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan, it refers to a new area of open space for use by Biomedical Campus employees when the allocation specifically excludes pedestrian access to adjacent areas, and it duplicates and is inconsistent with the area allocated for a Countryside Enhancement Strategy in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP.

Map 14 in draft S&G SNP identifies the extent of the proposed Improved Landscape Area and is referenced in Policy S&GS 21. Policy E/2 in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan allocates land for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus. Map 14 incorrectly includes land allocated under Policy E/2 within the proposed Improved Landscape Area. The full text of Policy E/2 is provided in Appendix A of these representations, and the associated Proposals Map (Inset E South of Addenbrookes) is provided in Appendix B. Policy E/2 is identified as a strategic policy as set out in Appendix E of the adopted Local Plan. Therefore Map 14 and Policy S&GS 21 are not in general conformity with the strategic policy Policy E/2 in the adopted Local Plan, and as such do not meet Basic Condition (e). It is requested that, as a minimum, the land allocated by Policy E/2 in the adopted Local Plan is deleted from the proposed Improved Landscape Area shown on Map 14, so that Policy S&GS 21 does not apply to this land.

Bullet No.8 in Paragraph 11.32, which provides the supporting text to Policy S&GS 21, identifies a proposed area of open space adjacent to Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve for use by Biomedical Campus employees amongst others. This proposed area of open space is also referenced in the table after Paragraph 12.11. The proposed area of open space is located adjacent to allocation Policy E/2 in the adopted Local Plan. It is anticipated in Paragraphs 11.32 and 12.11 and in Policy S&GS 21 that the proposed area of open space would in part be delivered by development at Cambridge Biomedical Campus. However, criteria (e) of Policy E/2 specifically excludes pedestrian accesses from being provided on the western, southern and eastern boundaries of the allocated site, in order to minimise visitor pressure on Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve. Criteria (h) of Policy E/2 expects the proposed extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus to include open space within the allocated site, and not elsewhere off-site. The table after Paragraph 12.11 indicates that development at Cambridge Biomedical Campus would in part be responsible for the delivery of the proposed area of open space shown on Map 14, but there is no evidence that this has been discussed or agreed with the Biomedical Campus or with the landowner Cambridgeshire County Council. Therefore, the proposed area of open space shown on Map 14 and referenced in Paragraphs 11.32 and 12.11 and in Policy S&GS 21 are not in general conformity with the strategic Policy E/2 in the adopted Local Plan, and as such do not meet Basic Condition (e). It is requested that the reference to the proposed area of open space being required for Cambridge Biomedical Campus employees is deleted from Bullet No.8 in Paragraph 11.32, and that the reference to development at Cambridge Biomedical Campus being required in part to support the delivery of this open space is deleted from the table after Paragraph 12.11.

Policy CSF/5 of the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP, which is part of the adopted development plan for South Cambridgeshire, already designates the same land as the proposed Improved Landscape Area for a countryside enhancement strategy. The land designated by Policy CSF/5 is shown on Inset E of the adopted AAP. Policy CSF/5 provides additional detail of the landscape, planting and access measures required. The countryside enhancement strategy proposed in the adopted AAP are linked to and funded by development. There are no development allocations in draft S&G SNP that would support the delivery of the proposed Improved Landscape Area in Policy S&GS 20. It is considered that without an effective delivery mechanism the proposed Improved Landscape Area designation would not be implemented. Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF states that plans, including neighbourhood plans, should “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)”. It is clear that the proposed Improved Landscape Area designation in Policy S&GS 20 duplicates Policy CSF/5 of the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP, which is not necessary. Policy S&GS 21 would be contrary to national policy, and as such would not meet Basic Condition (a). It is requested that the proposed Improved Landscape Area in Policy S&GS 21 and shown on Map 14 is deleted.

It should be noted that a green infrastructure initiative is proposed through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan at Gog Magog Hills and Chalkland Fringe (see Policy BG/GI: Green Infrastructure), which is expected to carry forward the countryside enhancements strategy contained in the Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP.

Summary Representation

The proposed Improved Landscape Area incorrectly includes land allocated for an extension to Cambridge Biomedical Campus in Policy E/2 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. The supporting text to Policy S&GS 21 refers to a new area of open space for use by Biomedical Campus employees, when the Policy E/2 allocation specifically excludes pedestrian access to adjacent areas. The proposed Improved Landscape Area duplicates and is inconsistent with the area allocated for a Countryside Enhancement Strategy in the adopted Cambridge Southern Fringe AAP. It is requested that the proposed Improved Landscape Area in Policy S&GS 21 and shown on Map 14 is deleted.

Requested Change

It is requested that, as a minimum, the land allocated by Policy E/2 in the adopted Local Plan is deleted from the proposed Improved Landscape Area shown on Map 14, so that Policy S&GS 21 does not apply to this land.

It is requested that the reference to the proposed area of open space being required for Cambridge Biomedical Campus employees is deleted from Bullet No.8 in Paragraph 11.32, and that the reference to development at Cambridge Biomedical Campus being required in part to support the delivery of this open space is deleted from the table after

Paragraph 12.11.

It is requested that the proposed Improved Landscape Area in Policy S&GS 21 and shown on Map 14 is deleted.

Attachments:

Appendix A - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6yx>

Appendix B - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6yj>

Appendix C - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6yk>

200625

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Ely Diocesan Board of Finance (EDBF)

Agent: Carter Jonas

Date received: 11/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

In summary, EDBF objects to the following designations in draft S&G SNP:

- the proposed Visually Important Open Land designation at Stapleford Allotments (as shown on Map 8 and described in Appendix 6) on the basis that this term is not defined, this land is already designated as Green Belt which is specifically about retaining openness, and the site is surrounded by dwellings and trees so it is not visible from the wider surrounding area; and
- the proposed Local Green Spaces designation at Stapleford Allotments (LGS 8) (as shown on Map 11) on the basis that the land is already designated as Green Belt and it is not necessary to duplicate policy designations that have an identical status.

Full text:

INTRODUCTION

We have been instructed by Ely Diocesan Board of Finance (EDBF) to respond to the Reg.16 consultation for the draft Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan (draft S&G SNP).

EDBF owns the land occupied by allotments to the west of Haverhill Road in Stapleford, which would be directly affected by some of the proposed policy designations within draft S&G SNP. A site location plan for the allotment land is provided in Appendix A. EDBF also owns land east of Haverhill Road in Stapleford. It is proposed to improve the path on the eastern side of Haverhill Road adjacent to EDBF land, and to create a new public rights of way route into the countryside on land that EDBF own.

In summary, EDBF objects to the following designations in draft S&G SNP:

- the proposed Visually Important Open Land designation at Stapleford Allotments (as shown on Map 8 and described in Appendix 6) on the basis that this term is not defined, this land is already designated as Green Belt which is specifically about retaining openness, and the site is surrounded by dwellings and trees so it is not visible from the wider surrounding area; and
- the proposed Local Green Spaces designation at Stapleford Allotments (LGS 8) (as shown on Map 11) on the basis that the land is already designated as Green Belt and it is not necessary to duplicate policy designations that have an identical status.

In due course draft S&G SNP will be examined by an Independent Examiner who will determine whether the basic conditions for a neighbourhood plan have been met. As explained in this response, it is considered that some of the policies and designations in draft S&G SNP do not meet Basic Condition (a) and are inconsistent with national policy.

At the end of the representations to each policy is a summary and the requested changes.

All references to the NPPF in these representations relate to the December 2023 version unless otherwise stated because of the transitional arrangements for neighbourhood plans contained in Paragraph 239 of the December 2024 NPPF.

REPRESENTATIONS TO DRAFT S&G SNP

Objectives

COMMENT

Paragraph 5.2 identifies 10 theme-based objectives for draft S&G SNP. These objectives are appropriate. It is noted that the objectives related to housing, biodiversity, community amenities and infrastructure, and countryside enhancement all refer to development, and it is assumed that additional development is necessary to support the delivery of those objectives. However, draft S&G SNP does not allocate any land for development and does not provide any policy support for development to be brought forward in the future through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan process.

Draft S&G SNP should include a policy that supports the allocation of land for development at the villages through the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan process to deliver the housing, biodiversity, community amenities and infrastructure, and countryside enhancement related objectives.

Summary Representation

It is unlikely that those objectives that are associated with the delivery of additional development - housing, biodiversity, community amenities and infrastructure, and countryside enhancement - would be achieved without specific policy support for development.

Requested Change

No changes are requested to the objectives.

Policy S&GS 12: Protecting Stapleford and Great Shelford's Landscape Character

OBJECT

Policy S&GS 12 relates to landscape character, and as part of this policy seeks to designate land as Visually Important Open Land. The land at Stapleford Allotments is designated as proposed Visually Important Open Land (part of Site Ref. 8), which is shown on Map 6 and described in Appendix 6. EDBF own the land at Stapleford Allotments. The allotments are unrelated to the adjacent land included within Site Ref. 8, and have a different character and relationship with that land and the surrounding area.

In summary, it is not necessary for land at Stapleford Allotments to be designated as Visually Important Open Land, when this land is already protected as Green Belt which is specifically about retaining openness, the landscape character of the existing allotments would be protected by adopted Local Plan policies, and the allotment land has limited visibility from the surrounding area.

Policy S/4 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seeks to maintain a Green Belt around Cambridge, with any development proposals in the Green Belt assessed against national policies contained in the NPPF. The Green Belt at Great Shelford and Stapleford is defined on the Local Plan Proposals Map Inset No.45. Stapleford Allotments fall within the land designated as Green Belt, and are located outside of the development framework for the villages. As highlighted in Paragraph 142 of the NPPF, openness is identified as an essential characteristic of the Green Belt. Policy NH/2 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance landscape character, and refers to National Character Areas. Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF states that plans, including neighbourhood plans, should "serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)".

The proposed Visually Important Open Land designation at Stapleford Allotments would duplicate the openness requirement of the Green Belt designation that already applies to this land, and landscape character is already protected by Policy NH/2 of the adopted Local Plan. It is not necessary to duplicate development plan policies and national policies, and to do so would be inconsistent with Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF. It is considered that, in respect of the proposed Visually Important Open Land designation at Stapleford Allotments, Policy S&GS 12 is not consistent with national policy, and as such would not meet Basic Condition (a).

Policy SC/8 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan already protects existing allotments, including Stapleford Allotments. It is not necessary to duplicate development plan policies that already protect allotment use, and to do so would be inconsistent with Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF.

There is no reference to the current Green Belt designation or the policy protection for existing allotments in the decision to identify Stapleford Allotments as Visually Important Open Land in Policy S&GS 12. If there had been then the land at Stapleford Allotments would not have been included within this proposed designation.

Appendix 6 of draft S&GSNP seeks to explain why land at Stapleford Allotments is proposed as Visually Important Open Land. The term 'Visually Important Open Land' is not defined in draft S&GSNP, but it appears from criteria (d) of Policy S&GS12 to be related to landscape matters. There is limited visibility of Stapleford Allotments from the surrounding area. There is housing located to the west, south and east of the allotments, and there are trees, hedgerows and other vegetation at all of the boundaries to the allotments. It is incorrect to describe the land at Stapleford Allotments as 'visually important', when in fact the land is fairly well enclosed. The allotments are adjacent to roads, residential uses, and a primary school, and as such are unlikely to be a particularly tranquil area that warrant special protection for this reason. Paragraph 041 (Ref ID: 41) of the Planning Practice Guidance states that "It [neighbourhood plan policies] should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence". The evidence put forward to explain and justify the proposed Visually Important Open Land designation at Stapleford Allotments is not robust, and as such this proposed designation does not have regard to national policy and would not meet Basic Condition (a).

Summary Representation

It is not necessary for land at Stapleford Allotments to be designated as Visually Important Open Land. This land is already protected as Green Belt which is specifically about retaining openness, the landscape character of the existing allotments would be protected by adopted Local Plan policies, and the allotment land has limited visibility from the surrounding area. It is requested that the proposed Visually Important Open Land designation of land at Stapleford Allotments (part of Site Ref. 8) is deleted.

Requested Change

It is requested that the proposed Visually Important Open Land designation of land at Stapleford Allotments (part of Site Ref. 8) is deleted from Map 6, and references to this proposed designation of the allotment land are removed from Appendix 6.

Policy S&GS 15: Local Green Spaces and Protected Village Amenity Area

OBJECT

Policy S&GS 15 seeks to designate land as Local Green Space. The land at Stapleford Allotments is designated as Local Green Space (Ref. LGS 7), which is shown on Map 9 and described in Paragraph 8.28. EDBF own the land at Stapleford Allotments.

In summary, it is not necessary for land at Stapleford Allotments to be designated as Local Green Space when they are already protected by Green Belt, and to do so would duplicate policies that already apply to the land and would be inconsistent with national policy.

Policy S/4 of the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan seeks to maintain a Green Belt around Cambridge, with any development proposals in the Green Belt assessed against national policies contained in the NPPF. The Green Belt at Great Shelford and Stapleford is defined on the Local Plan Proposals Map Inset No.45. Stapleford Allotments fall within the land designated as Green Belt. It is noted that the emerging Greater Cambridge Local Plan does not seek to change the Green Belt status of the land at Stapleford Allotments. Section 13 of the NPPF sets out national Green Belt policy, including the purposes, when boundaries can be amended, the exceptional circumstances required to amend boundaries, and the types of development that are not inappropriate. The adopted Local Plan and the NPPF already provide strong protection from development for land located within the Green Belt, including the land at Stapleford Allotments. In addition, Policy SC/8 of the adopted Local Plan also seeks to protect existing allotments and to prevent their loss to other uses.

Paragraphs 105 to 107 of the NPPF explain the approach to designating land as Local Green Space. It is clear from Paragraph 107 that the development policies that would apply to land designated as Local Green Space should be identical to those that apply to land within the Green Belt. It is not necessary for land at Stapleford Allotments to be designated as both Local Green Space and Green Belt if the policies that apply to that land would be identical under both designations.

Paragraph 010 of Section Id.37 of the Planning Practice Guidance deals with circumstances where land protected by Green Belt should also be designated as Local Green Space. There is no assessment in draft S&GSNP as to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designating Stapleford Allotments as Local Green Space when it is already designated as Green Belt. Stapleford and Great Shelford are not washed over by the Green Belt so the exception of identifying Local Green Space in villages included in the Green Belt does not apply in this case.

Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF states that plans, including neighbourhood plans, should “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant)”. It is considered that designating Stapleford Allotments as Local Green Space in Policy S&GS 14 would duplicate the Green Belt designation and policies contained in the adopted South Cambridgeshire Local Plan and the policies in the NPPF that already apply to this land. It is not necessary for Policy S&GS 14 to duplicate adopted Local Plan policies or national policy, and to do so would be inconsistent with Paragraph 16(f) of the NPPF. It is considered that Policy S&GS 14 is inconsistent with national policy, and as such would not meet Basic Condition (a).

The Examiner’s Report for the Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan (published August 2021), which considered proposed Local Green Space designations, addressed this same matter - see Paragraphs 6.107 to 6.116 and Recommendation 20 of the Examiner’s Report. In summary, the Examiner concluded that it was not necessary for allotments located in the Green Belt to also be designated as Local Green Space because they were already adequately protected by the Green Belt designation. The Examiner recommended that the proposed Local Green Space designation of allotments was deleted from the Waterbeach Neighbourhood Plan. It is suggested that the outcome should be the same, and the proposed designation of land at Stapleford Allotments as Local Green Space should be deleted from draft S&GSNP.

Summary Representation

It is not necessary for land at Stapleford Allotments to be designated as Local Green Space. The allotments are already protected by Green Belt, and to do so would duplicate policies that already apply to the land and would be inconsistent with national policy. It is requested that the proposed Local Green Space designation at Stapleford Allotments (Ref. LGS 7) is deleted.

Requested Change

It is requested that the proposed Local Green Space designation at Stapleford Allotments (Ref. LGS 7) is deleted from Policy S&GS 15 and from Map 9, and references to this proposed designation are removed from Paragraph 8.28.

Policy S&GS 20: Protecting and Improving Routes into our Countryside

COMMENT

Policy S&GS 20 of draft S&GSNP seeks to protect and improve the public right of way network in order to provide routes into the countryside. Map 13 identifies those locations where there are aspirations for improving routes into the

countryside. The approach towards improving the public right of way network and access to the countryside would be consistent with Paragraph 104 of the NPPF.

There are a number of ways that new routes and connections to the public right of way network can be created. It might be possible to agree a right of access with a landowner, but this is unlikely if there would be no benefit to the landowner. A public body might allow access across its land as part of providing a benefit to the local community, but this would depend on landownership arrangements. It is more likely that new public rights of way would be agreed and delivered if there were benefits to a landowner, such as in conjunction with development. However, draft S&G SNP does not provide any policy support for development that might deliver new public right of way routes and connections.

Paragraph 11.15 of draft S&G SNP refers to a community aspiration to improve the existing path alongside Haverhill Road, between Stapleford and the A1307, in order to provide access for all non-motorised users e.g. pedestrians, cyclists, horses. EDBF own part of the land adjacent to the existing path. It is not clear from Paragraph 11.15 whether the proposed improvements to the path could be undertaken entirely within public highway owned land, the width of the land required for the proposed path and associated infrastructure, and what landscaping/boundary treatments would be provided adjacent to the proposed path. There has been no discussion or agreement with EDBF about improving this path.

If land owned by EDBF is required to improve the existing path alongside Haverhill Road, it is requested that this should be discussed with them in advance.

Summary Representation

The approach towards improving the public right of way network and access to the countryside would be consistent with national policy. Paragraph 11.15 of draft S&G SNP refers to a community aspiration to improve the existing path alongside Haverhill Road, between Stapleford and the A1307, in order to provide access for all non-motorised users. If land owned by EDBF is required to improve the existing path then this should be discussed with them in advance.

Requested Change

No changes are requested to Policy S&GS 20.

Attachments:

Appendix A - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6ym>

200626

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: East West Rail Company

Agent: Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd

Date received: 11/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

Please find attached the East West Railway Company Limited (EWR Co) response to the submission version of the Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan. For the avoidance of doubt, Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd are the planning agent for EWR Co.

Full text:

Please find attached the East West Railway Company Limited (EWR Co) response to the submission version of the Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan. For the avoidance of doubt, Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd are the planning agent for EWR Co.

Attachments:

EWR Response - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6pt>

200627

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: South Cambridgeshire District Council

Date received: 12/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

Please see attached the Council's formal response to the Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 consultation.

Full text:

Please see attached the Council's formal response to the Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 consultation.

Attachments:

SGS Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Council Response.pdf - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6yy>

200628

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Historic England

Date received: 10/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

■ we do not consider it necessary for Historic England to provide detailed comments at this time

Full text:

■ Please find our response to this consultation attached.

Attachments:

Consultation response - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6p3>

200629

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Natural England

Date received: 10/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

Please find Natural England's response in relation to the above mentioned consultation attached.

Full text:

Please find Natural England's response in relation to the above mentioned consultation attached.

Attachments:

497252 Stapleford & Great Shelford NP NE Response.pdf - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6yq>

200630

Comment

Document Element: Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version, Stapleford & Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Submission Version

Respondent: Nightingale Land

Date received: 12/02/2025 via Email

Summary:

Please find attached the formal Representation to the Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 16) from Nightingale Land and The Hill Group.

Full text:

Please find attached the formal Representation to the Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan Consultation (Regulation 16) from Nightingale Land and The Hill Group.

Attachments:

Representation - <https://cambridge.oc2.uk/a/3v6pr>