

CHAPTER 2: HOUSING	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
QUESTION 1A: Which of the site options do you support or object to and why?	
<p>H1: Land at Cambourne Business Park</p> <p>Support: 19 Object: 20 Comment: 18</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already allocated for development, is within a village that is growing, is near services and facilities, has access to roads (including A428), includes modern infrastructure, and is not on green belt land. • Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. • The land is unused, so use it! • Caldecote Parish Council: natural expansion to existing development and there are sufficient facilities to accommodate new residents. • Campaign to Protect Rural England: no objection as the site has been allocated for many years without being developed for employment uses. • Development Securities (represented by Carter Jonas): Cambourne provides high level of services and facilities and the site is a short walk from a frequent bus service, no significant townscape, biodiversity or heritage constraints, vacant so available now, and infrastructure in place for business park. • Cambourne is a new settlement so sensible site for development, provided that local services are expanded to meet the extra demand. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn Parish Council: should be preserved for local employment (office or light industrial use) given lack of facilities in Cambourne. • Cambourne Parish Council: site is needed for employment opportunities, is detached from the rest of Cambourne and so would be difficult to integrate it with existing residential areas, there is not sufficient surplus infrastructure, existing transport problems, and the access road would be unsuitable. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future: should be retained for business use as delivering sustainability means providing jobs in Cambourne for residents to walk or cycle to. After a slow start, business take up is accelerating, so to use this for housing is short-sighted. • Cambourne need not be extended any more than it is – there are other villages that should be looked at that may be suitable for development and which

	<p>have not been entirely exhausted of their development potential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land was designated for employment and building housing on this land would simply confirm that the original plan is not sustainable and the original dream has failed. Make it attractive for businesses to come and they will come – we must reverse the commute into Cambridge. • Harcourt Developments & Martin Grant Homes (represented by Savills): should be retained for employment use as replacing employment with housing will not assist in increasing the sustainability of Cambourne, instead it will merely increase out commuting. Need a comprehensive long term vision for Cambourne that achieves sustainability. • Should be retained for employment uses as Cambourne needs more local employment not housing – Cambourne is already large enough, original 3000 houses has already been exceeded, infrastructure has not kept up with continual expansion so cannot support any further housing, site would not integrate well, access road is not considered suitable as was considered unsuitable for access to secondary school, need more employment to reduce commuting into Cambridge, ratio of jobs to residents would be worsened if site used for additional housing, and character of the business park would be adversely affected by introduction of housing. • No further development should take place at Cambourne until the A428 is duelled. More housing will cause unnecessary congestion. • RLW Estates & Defence Infrastructure Organisation (represented by Boyer Planning): object on the basis of loss of employment potential and consequent sustainability concerns. • Cambourne appears to be a soft target for planners as it is still a work in progress – should not result in it becoming a victim of further expansion simply because more established villages are able to repel development. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water: sewage treatment works may require capacity enhancement. Infrastructure and / or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. • Existing building in progress so more care needed to ensure that areas are not overcrowded. • Surely increased economic and population growth will mean that this land will finally be used for employment purposes.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whaddon Parish Council: further development at Cambourne will increase traffic on the A1198 and create further road noise for the residents of Whaddon – consideration needs to be given to the impacts on other established communities.
<p>H2: Former Bishops Hardware Store, Station Road, Histon</p> <p>Support: 30 Object: 5 Comment: 14</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good use of brownfield site within the village, ideal commute to City, improves townscape of the area, and near to local services and facilities, science park, guided bus. Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. Support as the land needs to be developed and makes sense to use it rather than Green Belt, but concerned about school places as any new development will put pressure on already oversubscribed schools in Histon. Cambridge Past, Present and Future: should be considered as part of the larger station development proposed as PC1 but if this is not taken forward, then this site should proceed on its own but with the lower end of the housing range proposed. Campaign to Protect Rural England: support use of this brownfield site. Small site that could be absorbed by the village and not have a great impact on present village life – 10 dwellings would not be too intrusive. Histon & Impington Parish Council: supports redevelopment of this site within the regeneration proposals (PC1). Mitre Property Development (represented by Januarys): support the site being considered as 'more sustainable site with development potential' as site is currently a wasted opportunity in need of remediation and improvement. Do not believe there are any 'cons' with promoting this site for housing development. Oakington & Westwick Parish Council: support as it is a very good use of this land. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object as development of this site for residential will limit the scope of the parish council plan and put further pressure on community resources such as schools. More suitable for business regeneration to compliment possible redevelopment of the station site – more local employment is needed around this commercial and transport hub. Will increase traffic congestion making it more difficult to commute into Cambridge and will destroy unique character of village.

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water: capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • Feel Histon is already quite packed. • Support mixed use development (as proposed by Parish Council) but not just housing. Development should include small businesses, start-up businesses, retail units and possibly a hotel. • Natural England: although support the reuse of underused or vacant sites in principle, development should only take place on sites that have low environmental and biological value. • Should have a maximum of 6 houses.
<p>H3: Land at Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston</p> <p>Support: 39 Object: 21 Comment: 22</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reuse of brownfield land within the village so more suitable and less damaging than sites in the Green Belt. Replacement of unused warehouse units and does not result in loss of farmland. Benefit from redevelopment – tidy up an ugly part of the village. • Support the development of this site but it may conflict with the possible Cambridge City FC development. • Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. Need more housing. • Support but serious consideration must be given to the mixing of residential and industrial traffic, the increased traffic flows along Babraham Road and from the proposed Cambridge City football stadium, and increased demand on already overstretched facilities in Sawston. • Support but road access is an issue – need to give due regard to traffic on Babraham Road. Will make Babraham Road very busy and without a number of zebra crossing would cut off those living to the north. • Sawston is a good and logical place to expand – good facilities and schools, close to main employment areas, and fairly good connections to village centre. New development will give jobs and possibly retail. • Campaign to Protect Rural England: support as reuse of brownfield site. • Support although fair distance from village amenities and need to consider mix of housing. • Village needs and influx of new residents to ensure continuing prosperity – so brownfield sites should be reused. • Infrastructure is key: support provided that existing infrastructure can cope and there is no adverse effect on the existing residents. • Least worst option but will still create extra traffic and water resource and displacement problems.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New homes will sit well within the area proposed and vastly improve a run-down industrial area. • Ideal for building as most road infrastructure in place (close to main road) and has good access onto Babraham Road allowing traffic to leave without passing through Sawston village. • Ok but all traffic will come down Babraham Road to leave the village or go through Babraham. • Will bridge the gap between Sawston and Babraham and the new cycle path may get used more with new houses and investment in the Babraham science parks coming soon. • Sawston Parish Council: more suitable as brownfield, proposed access through Wakelin Avenue would be unsuitable, need a separate link to Babraham Road, technical constraints such as foul sewer capacity should be investigated, need to consider cumulative effect on traffic generation from possible stadium and housing, need to ensure stadium would not result in undue noise and disturbance to nearby residential areas, should not exceed 100 dwellings, and should consider providing live-work units and industrial starter units. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aspec Precision Engineering: if Grove Road is used as the access to the site, there would be issues with HGV traffic to the industrial uses. The low water pressure would need to be improved. • Access is the main constraint – Wakelin Avenue would be unable to cope with increase traffic so may need a separate link to Babraham Road. • Loss of employment land that would be better kept for employment uses to create jobs for new residents. Need a greater range of appropriate employment opportunities in the village. Currently main employment area – less local jobs. • Sawston cannot sustain any more houses (already overpopulated) – infrastructure could not cope, the site will not generate any more footfall to High Street shops. • Would create too much traffic, road networks are poor, and would create hazardous traffic conditions (especially traffic onto Babraham Road which has been an issue for a number of years). • Mixing industrial and residential uses is not a good idea – noise and heavy road traffic. May also effect the existing businesses in terms of crime, footfall and traffic. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future: should be retained for employment use as a contribution to the local economy. • Where will the Cambridge City football stadium go?
--	---

	<p>Proposal for new Cambridge City stadium here (not mentioned in this plan).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would severely compromise current standard of living, privacy and property values. • Will create additional traffic through Shelfords and Stapleford. • Will increase traffic congestion making it more difficult to commute into Cambridge and will destroy unique character of village. • Seems Melbourn and Sawston are once again taking a large number of houses, and whilst we need this housing the facilities in these two villages are going to be swamped. Other villages should take more of the pressure. • Uttlesford District Council: concerned about proposals for development south of Cambridge, especially in Sawston area due to potential impact on the road network in the north of Uttlesford and particular around M11 (junction 9) where there is already congestion. • Don't see how you can build new homes when there isn't the money to upgrade existing properties to an approved government standard – draught proofing, cavity wall insulation. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water: capacity available to serve proposed growth. • Sawston can perhaps cope with a small development such as this. • Development of all sites in Sawston (520 homes) would swamp all available facilities in the village, exacerbate existing under provision further and the cost of providing new facilities could be prohibitive. • Two site options on Dales Manor Business Park should be considered as one. • Any proposals would need to take account of cumulative impacts of traffic generation from new housing and proposal for Cambridge City football stadium. Also need to ensure noise / disturbance from stadium would not impact on nearby residential areas. • Consider including small convenience store, industrial starter units and / or live-work units on part of the site. • Capacity of foul sewer may be constraint. • Number of houses assigned to Babraham side of the village is excessive. • Need to consider traffic, parking, efficient drainage (especially flooding from additional hard surfaced areas) and provision of facilities in advance of development of site and in consultation with residents.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More care needed not to overcrowd these areas – is Sawston getting too big? • Will impose less on Green Belt but must improve parking at playing field, laybys for houses on Babraham Road, and restrict turning into Sunderland Avenue and along the link road. • Natural England: although support the re-use of underused or vacant sites in principle, development should only take place on sites that have low environmental and biological value. • Some of this site should be housing, but also support use of some of this site for Cambridge City football stadium providing the village with much needed sports facilities. • Until infrastructure guarantees available from responsible organisations, it is impossible to make realistic comments on possible development sites.
<p>H4: Land north of White Field Way, Sawston</p> <p>Support: 31 Object: 56 Comment: 13</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good access to Sawston and no impact on the village. • Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. Need more housing. • Although this is on flood plain, access to the main road and village centre is better than other possible sites. • Support as long as the copse is protected and preserved (only one of three woodland walks in Sawston with open access) and also the row of trees across the site. • Sawston has a wide range of facilities and infrastructure to support growth. Close to main employment areas. Access is not a problem (most road infrastructure in place), has good transport links, immediate access to the bypass that would not generate much increase of traffic in the village. • Logical place to expand and good site for housing – noise would not be a problem as existing residents nearer to roads and railway, existing woodland screens site from nearby properties which could be extended, close to main employment areas. • Support although fair distance from village amenities and need to consider mix of housing. • Support provided that existing infrastructure can cope and there is no adverse effect on the existing residents. • Least worst option but will still create extra traffic and water resource and displacement problems. • Spicers (represented by Bidwells): site is available, viable and deliverable. Willing to work with SCDC and Parish Council to provide a development which will benefit the local community. • New development will give jobs and possibly retail.

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Green Belt. • Unfair that requirements for providing housing for City's workforce ignores Sawston's Green Belt. • Site assessment is flawed – site is part of the flood plain and will undoubtedly result in flooding problems if developed. • Development of all sites in Sawston (520 homes) would swamp all available facilities in the village, exacerbate existing under provision further and the cost of providing new facilities could be prohibitive. • Access and traffic problems – Whitefield Way is a private road with insufficient capacity, New Road and Mill Lane are not able to take additional traffic, will create extra pressure on Mill Lane / A1301 junction which has poor accident record, High Street will become congested, adjacent to busy and dangerous road junction, increased traffic noise, parking problems, use of road for construction vehicles would be dangerous and unreasonable, and residents would be subject to obnoxious fumes from increased traffic. • On rising land – would intrude into open countryside and create more urban approach to the village. • Greenfield site - loss of productive agricultural land and disruption to wildlife habitats provided by adjoining wood. • Poorly related to village centre – will encourage more cars on the High Street with already inadequate parking and would encourage London commuters due to easy access to Whittlesford station – development proposals should focus on meeting local housing needs and encouraging local businesses. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future: not a sensible site for housing as will fill in the green space between the village and the bypass, is isolated from the rest of the village, and land to south is subject to flooding that will be made worse by development of this site. • Campaign to Protect Rural England: loss of Green Belt. • Water provision to the site appears expensive and speculative and sewage disposal is at capacity and funding uncertain. • Infrastructure unable to cope – health centre is at maximum capacity, new school places will be needed, population is at saturation point, parking facilities are inadequate, no gas service. Need to consider utilities. • Disruption from new build would be detrimental to wellbeing of existing residents.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access via a new road west of the tree line will ruin the use of this field for farming and will prevent the use of these trees from mitigating development in the Green Belt. • Harlton and Haslingfield Parish Councils: loss of Green Belt. • Important green space bisected by protected woodland – don't ruin our village. • Local area is being overdeveloped and housing being provided is small and overpriced – this will adversely affect the value of homes. • Do not agree with comments that there would be 'limited impact on landscape setting' and that development 'would preserve green foreground to Sawston'. Site is on rising land so prominent. • Any development must be in keeping with Whitefield Way – bungalows. New development will impact standard of living – privacy and light at nearby bungalows. • No jobs so why more houses – no companies employing in the village and Spicers has reduced its business. • 'Buffer zone' between bypass and urban edge – development of this site would set a precedent that would lead to 'flood gate' of building along western edge of village with negative impacts for Sawston and the surrounding villages. • Will create additional traffic through Shelfords and Stapleford. • Power lines across the proposed site. • Sawston is becoming an unattractive place to live – devaluing properties. • Sawston Parish Council: White Field Way is a private road with insufficient capacity to act as access for additional dwellings, New Road and Mill Lane are not able to take additional traffic, Highways Authority objected to planning application for starter business units on land adjacent to Spicers due to safety at this junction, Green Belt, rising land so development would intrude into the countryside and create urban approach to village, loss of agricultural land, and located on a chalk aquifer. • Will increase traffic congestion making it more difficult to commute into Cambridge and will destroy unique character of village. • Will become a commuter village as employment opportunities are in Cambridge not Sawston. • Predominantly chalk – if the site is developed, where will the water go? Protected groundwater area. • Seems Melbourn and Sawston are once again taking a large number of houses, and whilst we
--	---

	<p>need this housing the facilities in these two villages are going to be swamped. Other villages should take more of the pressure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Would preserve green foreground to Sawston if no built development adjoining the A1301’ but if this site were developed there may be subsequent proposals to develop adjoining land. • Don’t see how you can build new homes when there isn’t the money to upgrade existing properties to an approved government standard – draught proofing, cavity wall insulation. • Uttlesford District Council: concerned about proposals for development south of Cambridge, especially in Sawston area due to potential impact on the road network in the north of Uttlesford and particular around M11 (junction 9) where there is already congestion. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water: capacity available to serve the proposed growth but sewers crossing the site. • Cambridgeshire County Council: access should be provided off Mill Lane rather than A1307. The capacity and safety of the Mill Lane / A1307 junction should be looked at as part of any transport assessment of the site. • English Heritage: concerned that there is no justification for removal of land from the Green Belt. Development of this site would set a precedent for Sawston to expand out to the bypass which would be detrimental to the relationship between the village and bypass. • Village needs an influx of new residents to ensure continuing prosperity. • Will impose less on Green Belt but must improve parking at playing field, laybys for houses on Babraham Road, and restrict turning into Sunderland Avenue and along the link road. • Natural England: site is in the Green Belt.
<p>H5: Former Marley Tiles Site, Dales Manor Business Park, Sawston</p> <p>Support: 41 Object: 19 Comment: 21</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reuse of brownfield land within the village so more suitable than sites in the Green Belt. Benefit from redevelopment. • Support the development of this site but it may conflict with the possible Cambridge City FC development. • Support as otherwise you won’t meet the 5 year targets. Need more housing. • Campaign to Protect Rural England: support as reuse of brownfield site. • Support but road access is an issue – need to give due regard to traffic on Babraham Road. Will make Babraham Road very busy and without a number

	<p>of zebra crossing would cut off those living to the north.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sawston is a logical place to expand as wide range of facilities, infrastructure and schools, and is close to main employment areas. New development will give jobs and possibly retail. • Support although fair distance from village amenities and need to consider mix of housing. • Village needs and influx of new residents to ensure continuing prosperity – so brownfield sites should be reused. • Infrastructure is key: support provided that existing infrastructure can cope and there is no adverse effect on the existing residents. • Worthy of further investigation as although not close to village centre, proposal does include potential for employment uses which would replace some of jobs lost. • Least worst option but will still create extra traffic and water resource and displacement problems. • New homes will sit well within the area proposed and vastly improve a run-down industrial area. • Good for housing but also for the Cambridge City football ground which will give the village extra sports facilities. • Support provided that only Dales Manor Business Park is chosen for housing development in Sawston – this would increase the population by at least 500 people and this is as much as the infrastructure could support. • Ideal for building as most road infrastructure in place and has good access onto Babraham Road allowing traffic to leave without causing extra congestion in the village centre. • Sawston Parish Council: more suitable as brownfield, proposed access through Wakelin Avenue would be unsuitable, need a separate link to Babraham Road, technical constraints such as foul sewer capacity should be investigated, need to consider cumulative effect on traffic generation from possible stadium and housing, need to ensure stadium would not result in undue noise and disturbance to nearby residential areas, should not exceed 100 dwellings, and should consider providing live-work units and industrial starter units. • Ok but all traffic will come down Babraham Road to leave the village or go through Babraham. • Will bridge the gap between Sawston and Babraham and the new cycle path may get used more with new houses and investment in the Babraham science parks coming soon. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aspec Precision Engineering: if Grove Road is
--	--

	<p>used as the access to the site, there would be issues with HGV traffic to the industrial uses. The low water pressure would need to be improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access is the main constraint – Wakelin Avenue would be unable to cope with increase traffic so may need a separate link to Babraham Road. • Loss of employment land that would be better kept for employment uses to create jobs for new residents. Need a greater range of appropriate employment opportunities in the village. May also affect the existing businesses in terms of crime, footfall and traffic. • Sawston cannot sustain any more houses – such a large development that would increase the housing stock by 10% is not required, maximum of 100 homes on H3 and H5, infrastructure could not cope, already overpopulated. • Serious consideration must be given to increased traffic flows along Babraham Road as well as additional traffic generated by proposed football stadium. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future: should be retained for employment use as a contribution to the local economy. • Concerns about traffic – would create too much traffic on an already busy road (Babraham Road), road networks are poor, development would create hazardous traffic conditions, Wakelin Avenue is unsuitable for access. • Where will the Cambridge City football stadium go? • Implications of contaminated land for new residents. • Will impact on amenity of neighbouring residential areas – overlooking so existing privacy would be compromised. • Will create additional traffic through Shelfords and Stapleford. • Seems Melbourn and Sawston are once again taking a large number of houses, and whilst we need this housing the facilities in these two villages are going to be swamped. Other villages should take more of the pressure. • Don't see how you can build new homes when there isn't the money to upgrade existing properties to an approved government standard – draught proofing, cavity wall insulation. • Providing homes for commuters working elsewhere. • Uttlesford District Council: concerned about proposals for development south of Cambridge, especially in Sawston area due to potential impact on the road network in the north of Uttlesford and particular around M11 (junction 9) where there is already congestion.
--	--

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water: Sewers crossing the site. Infrastructure and / or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. • Development of all sites in Sawston (520 homes) would swamp all available facilities in the village, exacerbate existing under provision further and the cost of providing new facilities could be prohibitive. • Two site options on Dales Manor Business Park should be considered as one. • Capacity of foul sewer may be constraint. • Any proposals would need to take account of cumulative impacts of traffic generation from new housing and proposal for Cambridge City football stadium. Also need to ensure noise / disturbance from stadium would not impact on nearby residential areas. • Consider including small convenience store, industrial starter units and / or live-work units on part of the site. • Number of houses assigned to Babraham side of the village is excessive. • Need to consider traffic, parking, efficient drainage (especially flooding from additional hard surfaced areas) and provision of facilities in advance of development of site and in consultation with residents. • More care needed not to overcrowd these areas. • Will impose less on Green Belt but must improve parking at playing field, laybys for houses on Babraham Road, and restrict turning into Sunderland Avenue and along the link road. • Natural England: although support the re-use of underused or vacant sites in principle, development should only take place on sites that have low environmental and biological value. • Until infrastructure guarantees available from responsible organisations, it is impossible to make realistic comments on possible development sites. • Endurance Estates & Salmon Harvester (represented by Savills): sustainable opportunity delivering housing and jobs on previously developed land. Comments on cons – loss of employment: existing low density employment uses will be replaced with higher density B1 uses that will provide a greater number of jobs; distance from services and facilities – small element of retail proposed within the development.
<p>H6: Land north of Babraham Road, Sawston</p> <p>Support: 28 Object: 39</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support this option else you won't meet your 5 year targets. • Logical place to expand. • Sawston - good facilities and schools.

Comment: 17

- Good access to village.
- Good option because no loss of employment land.
- Low impact and close to main employment areas (Science Parks etc).
- Will support more services and maybe jobs which is good.
- Least worse of the options in Sawston but implications for traffic and school capacities.
- Support but concerns at access to site – need zebra crossings.
- Would tidy up ugly part of Sawston and bridge the gap between Sawston and Babraham. Could get increased use of new cycle path to Babraham.

OBJECTIONS:

- Village needs an influx of new residents to help ensure its continuing prosperity but not this option.
- Uttlesford District Council concerned at development proposals south of Cambridge and especially all housing options in Sawston – impact on wider road network- impact on already congested M11.
- Loss of Green Belt land. Prefer brownfield land.
- Does not meet very special circumstances NPPF says is needed to take land out of green belt.
- Sawston, Haslingfield and Harlton Parish Councils object to loss of Green Belt.
- RLW Estates and Defence Infrastructure Organisation object to release of green belt land.
- Village will merge with Cambridge.
- Sets a precedent for more release of green belt.
- Increased traffic congestion and make more difficult to commute into Cambridge – already gridlocked at peak times.
- More development will ruin unique character of village.
- Loss of agricultural land.
- Development on protected groundwater area.
- Sawston Parish Council – Development would result in loss of agricultural land and chalk aquifer.
- Land in Babraham parish – need change of boundary. Keeps separation between the villages.
- Why build new when no money to upgrade old properties?
- Detrimental impact on local amenity provision - schools and doctors near capacity.
- Impact on safety of residents due to increased vehicular traffic. Babraham Rd already busy. Local road infrastructure cannot cope. Car parking in village a problem.
- Need to take into account impact of Cambridge City Club football stadium – increased traffic – need transport Masterplan.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to Sawston sites due to additional traffic through Shelfords and Stapleford. • Detrimental impact on village character and views of village from south. • Overdevelopment. • Water pressure - Aspec Precision Engineering Ltd mention problems of low water pressure. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England notes that situated at distance from any local service centre and facilities which will increase dependence on use of the private car. • Anglian Water - capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • Concern at number of houses allocated to site and all others in Sawston – will swamp village. • Why Sawston and Melbourn and not other villages like Foxton, Orwell or Harston? • Concern that local village services will not meet demand – already over stretched. • This site could be part used and in conjunction with sites 158 and 278 to east of Sawston, could provide a coherent edge to village.
<p>H7: Land to east of New Road, Melbourn</p> <p>Support: 69 Object: 688 Comment: 71</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melbourn has good services and facilities and should welcome further limited development, particularly low cost affordable housing, shared ownership / key worker housing, housing for the next generation of local residents, 1-2 bed homes, and bungalows. Not enough affordable housing in Melbourn – huge waiting list. Need more houses available to rent. People need homes and no reason why Melbourn should not welcome them. • BUT must consider impacts on services, facilities and infrastructure – resources should be made available to anticipate demands. • Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. • Logical progression from existing housing on New Road, high ground so not affected by flooding, within walking distance of local amenities, and good access routes. • Hope that new development would bring more services and facilities to the village. No objection to housing if it is guaranteed that infrastructure will be improved to cope with the expanded population. May provide job opportunities. Benefit to existing businesses and local shops – need a coffee shop, village hall – could these be incorporated?. Would provide more evidence of a case for better library provision. Will help pay for the village hub. • People need houses and the local economy will benefit BUT houses need to be built with sensible layouts, sufficient access and services.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melbourn is one of the best villages for additional development – good access to sustainable transport (bus and train) for residents to get to jobs in Cambridge, Royston or London. Cycle route to Addenbrooke's. • Endurance Estates (represented by Bidwells): no technical reason why this site cannot be successfully developed for new housing, can provide much needed homes in a sustainable village, and can help to deliver community benefits. • Foxton Parish Council: Melbourn is a larger village and can sustain development which will be of benefit to its facilities. • Locations chosen seem well placed in the village – within easy reach of the village centre. More houses will not be noticed – people need to live somewhere. Area has been subject to consideration for change of use for some time – once close to proposed route for by-pass. • This development is our fair share of the required homes and not resulting in loss of open space that is benefitting the village – not in centre or a playing field. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed size of development is not sustainable in Melbourn – limited train and bus services, too few shops, amenities and employment opportunities, and will put strain on / overwhelm infrastructure, services (e.g. schools and doctors), and general utilities that are already at capacity. • Primary school cannot accommodate existing needs – some children already attend Meldreth Primary School. Current inadequate mains drainage. Low water pressure due to recent nearby developments. No solution for Foxton crossing so longer queues. Inadequate facilities and recreation areas for young people and children. County Council unable to solve drainage problems as do not have financial resources to relay the High Street system – will take legal action if development takes place. • Building on green belt land is unforgivable – sacrosanct and must be preserved. Green Belt is there for a reason and not just to be moved as and when you please. • Concerns about traffic and roads - will create extra traffic on already inadequate roads (in village centre and by school), congestion and more through traffic, noise pollution and emissions, will be detrimental to safety, will create parking problems, speeding is already a problem, village will become a rat run, need a new link road between A10 and New Road, distance from local
--	---

	<p>services will increase in traffic into the village, junction of A505 / New Road is an accident hotspot, concerned about construction traffic having to use road by primary school, part of Bramley avenue is unadopted and ransom strip by East Farm, a new road through the development from Russet Way / Bramley Avenue to New Road would create a new rat run, and cycling links would need to be upgraded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in village population by significant percentage changing entire nature and character of the village. In danger of losing village identity – Melbourn is a village not a city. Will become a dormitory. • Already have drainage and flooding problems (particularly when heavy rain), putting open land under concrete is likely to increase these rather than alleviate this. On a downward slope and therefore at risk of flooding. • Detrimentially affect quality of life of existing residents and unacceptable impact to residents living on village boundary – noise, disturbance, overshadowing, loss of light, and loss of open aspect. Will affect house prices. Size and length of time to complete development would cause unacceptable levels of noise, dirt and traffic. • Will not help community cohesion as will create a separate community. Risk of increased crime. Village already has antisocial issues. • Large scale developments should be limited to larger well served communities closer to Cambridge. Lots of new building already in Royston, Cambridge, Trumpington and Cambourne so why is this site needed? • More housing is needed in the country but not in this area – need more Government encouragement to move to areas further north where there is more space and need for job creation. • Adverse effect on village setting and major impact on the landscape. Imposing projection of development on sloping land. Views of the development would be extensive. Existing properties are hidden by crest of hill. • Other more suitable brownfield sites e.g. old Bassingbourn Barracks, Mettle Hill. • Do not need new houses. Number of proposed houses exceeds village needs. Increase in population will make the village overcrowded. Demographic projections show the population has decreased, but already dense infilling that is increasing housing stock. • Houses on the market are not selling so adding more houses will make it more difficult to sell. • Existing high density houses have no off road
--	---

	<p>parking causing congestion on site side roads which would be used for access to H7 and H8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unacceptable loss of farmland (needed for food production given forecasted food shortages) and countryside outside the village framework. Area of natural beauty and wildlife area - habitats for flora and fauna. Almost all orchards in Melbourn have been built on - big effect on wildlife. Destruction of habitats used by bats is illegal. • Environmental and quality of life considerations are being disregarded in favour of developers greed – another example of uncontrolled urban sprawl that will lead to destruction of rural South Cambridgeshire. • Once building starts it won't stop – will end up building all the way to A505. What is the point of a village framework boundary? • Main problem is location – make the village longer not wider. The suggested housing is on the wrong side of the village – site between old and new A10 would be better. Sufficient other housing sites being developed in Melbourn e.g. Victoria Way extension, old police station. Development should be spread around the village and not concentrated in one estate. • Access to site is likely to prove difficult. • Loss of habitat for many birds. Several significant trees on site - orchard. • Notice should be given to the Village Plan (subject to comprehensive consultation) which showed huge resident opposition to new development outside of the village boundary and identifies current problems in Melbourn. • Campaign to Protect Rural England: object as greenfield site outside of the village framework. • Should build on brownfield sites first. Development replacing previous buildings is ok. • Setting of old orchard should be given significant weight. • Creation of urban mass. Too many houses in too small a space. No confidence that site will be well designed – very little flair has been designed into new developments, usually crammed. • Scale of development is unsustainable and environmentally damaging. • For proposal to go ahead will need community support, which this does not have. Will have profound impact on community. Residents rightly fear impact on schools, health providers, shops, traffic etc – none of which have been addressed in the consultation documents. Village Plan makes clear the wishes of the community and this should be used in decision making. • Large water storage area below this site and
--	---

	<p>exposed position means subject to strong winds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why not make smaller villages like Shepreth and the Eversdens bigger to bring back their community? • Will increase traffic congestion making it more difficult to commute into Cambridge and will destroy unique character of village. • Seems Melbourn and Sawston are once again taking a large number of houses, and whilst we need this housing the facilities in these two villages are going to be swamped. Other villages should take more of the pressure. • Surely the Local Plan should take account of the existing Village plan? Current proposals seem to ignore this. Development of the scale proposed would need the support of local existing community to be successful. Concerned at lack of funding to meet aspirations of draft Transport Plan and therefore unlikelihood of any improvements away from Cambridge southern fringe. End of rural bus subsidies will increase isolation for residents in these communities. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No indication is given to type of housing that will be built. Melbourn needs more housing but mainly starter homes, retirement homes or social housing, not 4+ bedroom homes with small gardens. Social housing provided needs to go to local residents not outsiders. • Better to build to 3-4 storeys than to build close together, must have adequate off road parking, open space and village style buildings (not ultra-modern) in variety of styles. Important new homes have rooms of a reasonable size and adequate floor space for family life. • Will need considerable investment in infrastructure and adequate infrastructure must be provided before new homes are occupied. Hoped that all support services will be increased to meet the needs of the increased village size – assessment of capacity of all services and facilities needs to be undertaken. • Anglian Water: sewage treatment works may require capacity enhancement. Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. • Off road parking and green space is essential to any new development. • Will a new primary school be built? • Elsewhere derelict houses have been renovated and sold or rented to young couples – could this be done in Melbourn? Need to use existing housing
--	--

	<p>stock more effectively.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Growth should be organic and at a sustainable pace. If it goes ahead it should be implemented incrementally over a number of years to allow time for the supporting infrastructure and services to be improved. • Need houses but not a development of this size, would support a much smaller scale development. Village cannot support all of H7 and H8, should be 100-120 homes max. • Financial cost of new infrastructure must be borne by the developer – there must be no increase in council tax for local residents to subsidise development costs. • Encourage bus company to provide route to include this development. • Decision should be made based on local opinion. • Melbourn Primary School: the school can accommodate 315 pupils and present numbers vary from 300-320 pupils. With other new developments already being built, school has very little spare capacity. Need to plan for school expansion (there is space on site) if any further developments. • Have service providers been consulted about this proposal? Doctors, school etc. • Natural England: site is a distance from any local services and facilities so will increase the dependence on use of cars. • Whaddon parish Council: additional housing in Melbourn is likely to lead to increased use of trains that are already busy at peak times. Assessment of transport options needed. • Melbourn Housing Development Awareness Campaign: over 500 responses from villagers – 8% comment, 8% support, 84% object. 9 responses from parish councillors – 1 support, 8 object.
<p>H8: Orchard and land at East Farm, Melbourn</p> <p>Support: 68 Object: 670 Comment: 69</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melbourn has good services and facilities and should welcome further limited development, particularly low cost affordable housing, shared ownership / key worker housing, housing for the next generation of local residents, 1-2 bed homes, and bungalows. Not enough affordable housing in Melbourn – huge waiting list. Need more houses available to rent. People need homes and no reason why Melbourn should not welcome them. • BUT must consider impacts on services, facilities and infrastructure – resources should be made available to anticipate demands. • Support as otherwise you won't meet the 5 year targets. • Logical progression from existing housing. Cycle route to Addenbrooke's.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hope that new development would bring more services and facilities to the village. No objection to housing if it is guaranteed that infrastructure will be improved to cope with the expanded population. May provide job opportunities. Benefit to existing businesses and local shops – need a coffee shop, village hall – could these be incorporated?. Would provide more evidence of a case for better library provision. Will help pay for the village hub. • People need houses and the local economy will benefit BUT houses need to be built with sensible layouts, sufficient access and services. • Foxton Parish Council: Melbourn is a larger village and can sustain development which will be of benefit to its facilities. • Locations chosen seem well placed in the village. More houses will not be noticed – people need to live somewhere. Area has been subject to consideration for change of use for some time – once close to proposed route for by-pass. • This development is our fair share of the required homes and not resulting in loss of open space that is benefitting the village – not in centre or a playing field. • Could be absorbed by the village. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed size of development is not sustainable in Melbourn – limited train and bus services, too few shops, amenities and employment opportunities, and will put strain on / overwhelm infrastructure, services (e.g. schools and doctors), and general utilities that are already at capacity. • Primary school cannot accommodate existing needs – some children already attend Meldreth Primary School. Current inadequate mains drainage. No solution for Foxton crossing so longer queues. Inadequate facilities and recreation areas for young people and children. County Council unable to solve drainage problems as do not have financial resources to relay the High Street system – will take legal action if development takes place. • Building on green belt land is unforgivable – sacrosanct and must be preserved. Green Belt is there for a reason and not just to be moved as and when you please. • Concerns about traffic and roads - will create extra traffic on already inadequate roads (in village centre and by school), congestion and more through traffic, noise pollution and emissions, will be detrimental to safety, will create parking problems, speeding is already a problem, village will become a rat run, need a new link road between A10 and New Road, distance from local
--	---

	<p>services will increase in traffic into the village, junction of A505 / New Road is an accident hotspot, concerned about construction traffic having to use road by primary school, part of Bramley avenue is unadopted and ransom strip by East Farm, and a new road through the development from Russet Way / Bramley Avenue to New Road would create a new rat run.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in village population by significant percentage changing entire nature and character of the village. In danger of losing village identity – Melbourn is a village not a city. Will become a dormitory. • Already have drainage and flooding problems (particularly when heavy rain), putting open land under concrete is likely to increase these rather than alleviate this. On a downward slope and therefore at risk of flooding. • Detrimently affect quality of life of existing residents and unacceptable impact to residents living on village boundary – noise, disturbance, overshadowing, loss of light, and loss of open aspect. Will affect house prices. Size and length of time to complete development would cause unacceptable levels of noise, dirt and traffic. • Will not help community cohesion as will create a separate community. Risk of increased crime. Village already has antisocial issues. • Large scale developments should be limited to larger well served communities closer to Cambridge. Lots of new building already in Royston, Cambridge, Trumpington and Cambourne so why is this site needed? • More housing is needed in the country but not in this area – need more Government encouragement to move to areas further north where there is more space and need for job creation. • Adverse effect on village setting and major impact on the landscape. Imposing projection of development on sloping land. Views of the development would be extensive. • Other more suitable brownfield sites e.g. old Bassingbourn Barracks, Mettle Hill. • Number of proposed houses exceeds village needs. Increase in population will make the village overcrowded. Demographic projections show the population has decreased, but already dense infilling that is increasing housing stock. • Houses on the market are not selling so adding more houses will make it more difficult to sell. • Existing high density houses have no off road parking causing congestion on site side roads which would be used for access to H7 and H8. • Unacceptable loss of farmland (needed for food
--	---

	<p>production given forecasted food shortages) and countryside outside the village framework. Area of natural beauty and wildlife area - habitats for flora and fauna.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No development as orchards provide a vital environment for invertebrates and pollinators. Bat colony at East Farm - destruction of habitats used by bats is illegal. • Environmental and quality of life considerations are being disregarded in favour of developers greed – another example of uncontrolled urban sprawl that will lead to destruction of rural South Cambridgeshire. • Once building starts it won't stop – will end up building all the way to A505. What is the point of a village framework boundary? • Main problem is location – make the village longer not wider. The suggested housing is on the wrong side of the village – site between old and new A10 would be better. Sufficient other housing sites being developed in Melbourn e.g. Victoria Way extension, old police station. Development should be spread around the village and not concentrated in one estate. • Access to site is likely to prove difficult. • Loss of habitat for many birds. Several significant trees on site - orchard. • Notice should be given to the Village Plan (subject to comprehensive consultation) which showed huge resident opposition to new development outside of the village boundary and identifies current problems in Melbourn. • Campaign to Protect Rural England: object as greenfield site outside of the village framework. • Should build on brownfield sites first. Development replacing previous buildings is ok. • Setting of old orchard should be given significant weight. • Creation of urban mass. Too many houses in too small a space. No confidence that site will be well designed – very little flair has been designed into new developments, usually crammed. • Scale of development is unsustainable and environmentally damaging. • For proposal to go ahead will need community support, which this does not have. Will have profound impact on community. Residents rightly fear impact on schools, health providers, shops, traffic etc – none of which have been addressed in the consultation documents. Village Plan makes clear the wishes of the community and this should be used in decision making. • Large water storage area below this site and exposed position means subject to strong winds.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why not make smaller villages like Shepreth and the Eversdens bigger to bring back their community? • Seems Melbourn and Sawston are once again taking a large number of houses, and whilst we need this housing the facilities in these two villages are going to be swamped. Other villages should take more of the pressure. • Surely the Local Plan should take account of the existing Village plan? Current proposals seem to ignore this. Development of the scale proposed would need the support of local existing community to be successful. Concerned at lack of funding to meet aspirations of draft Transport Plan and therefore unlikelihood of any improvements away from Cambridge southern fringe. End of rural bus subsidies will increase isolation for residents in these communities. • Already rejected H8 for sound and logical reasons, inclusion of H7 does not resolve issues. • Wildlife Trust: objects as unacceptable negative impacts on wildlife through loss of an area of orchard. Should be retained and managed as a traditional orchard. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No indication is given to type of housing that will be built. Melbourn needs more housing but mainly starter homes and social housing, not 4+ bedroom homes with small gardens. Social housing provided needs to go to local residents not outsiders. • Better to build to 3-4 storeys than to build close together, must have adequate off road parking, open space and village style buildings (not ultra-modern) in variety of styles. Important new homes have rooms of a reasonable size and adequate floor space for family life. • Will need considerable investment in infrastructure and adequate infrastructure must be provided before new homes are occupied. Hoped that all support services will be increased to meet the needs of the increased village size – assessment of capacity of all services and facilities needs to be undertaken. • Anglian Water: capacity available to serve proposed growth. • Off road parking and green space is essential to any new development. • Will a new primary school be built? • Elsewhere derelict houses have been renovated and sold or rented to young couples – could this be done in Melbourn? Need to use existing housing stock more effectively. • If it goes ahead it should be implemented
--	---

	<p>incrementally over a number of years to allow time for the supporting infrastructure and services to be improved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need houses but not a development of this size, would support a much smaller scale development. Village cannot support all of H7 and H8, should be 100-120 homes max. • Financial cost of new infrastructure must be borne by the developer – there must be no increase in council tax for local residents to subsidise development costs. • Decision should be made based on local opinion. • Melbourn Primary School: the school can accommodate 315 pupils and present numbers vary from 300-320 pupils. With other new developments already being built, school has very little spare capacity. Need to plan for school expansion (there is space on site) if any further developments. • Have service providers been consulted about this proposal? Doctors, school etc. • Natural England: site is a distance from any local services and facilities so will increase the dependence on use of cars. • Whaddon parish Council: additional housing in Melbourn is likely to lead to increased use of trains that are already busy at peak times. Assessment of transport options needed. • Melbourn Housing Development Awareness Campaign: over 500 responses from villagers – 8% comment, 8% support, 84% object. 9 responses from parish councillors – 1 support, 8 object. • English Heritage: would not directly impact on the historic built environment but is not well related to the built-up area if developed on its own, and would result in loss of one of the few remaining orchards in the area.
<p>H9: Land north of Bannold Road, Waterbeach</p> <p>Support: 14 Object: 44 Comment: 11</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support this option else you won't meet your 5 year targets. • Persimmon Homes support this option with additional land to west up to Cody Rd – 2.2ha. Site available and deliverable. • Support this small development because impact of loss of barracks on low businesses. Object to large scale of proposed development of barracks. • Small scale of development will not have great impact on village. • Low impact and close to main employment areas (Science Parks etc). • Ideal site for housing. Waterbeach has services and with barracks gone there is need for housing to support local businesses.

	<p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will lose rural aspect that is part of historic character of village. Would remove green buffer between village and barracks. • Waterbeach Parish Council has extremely serious reservations about this option. Real risk of drainage and flooding. Proposed access is opposite doctors surgery which is already busy • Impact on wildlife. • Loss of agricultural land. • Influx of new people will undermine village identity. • Already accepted new development recently within village. Waterbeach should not have to take so much new housing to meet targets. • Do not want this option AND redevelopment of barracks site. • Too much low cost affordable housing. • Prefer gradual infill in village of housing with mixed style and sizes. • Increased traffic from development detrimental to road safety - Bannold Road and Way Lane (doctors surgery and primary school). • Traffic problems at junction of Cody Road, Bannold Road and Way Lane. • Bannold Rd serves as access for farmland with very large lorries transporting crops and tankers to Anglian Water treatment works. • Increased traffic congestion especially commuting into Cambridge at peak times. • Object unless A10 improved. • Waterbeach Railway station heavily overused. • Land is within Internal Drainage District and falls below 5m contour. • Poor drainage. Land has flooded in past. If new housing where will flood water drain to? • Treatments work in Bannold Drive at capacity. • 300 empty houses within barracks so new houses not needed. • Villages services near capacity e.g. schools. • Cottenham Village College would have to be expanded and then would be too big. • Follow guidance of 1993 Inspector who indicated these sites should not be included and land should keep its open rural character. • Outside village framework. • Better to develop barracks and leave this site as green lung. • Ashdale Land and Property Company object to this option because SHLAA site 142 better option. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English Heritage thinks site should not be allocated at this stage until proposals for Waterbeach
--	---

	<p>barracks are more clearly established - may be desirable to retain this open space between existing village and any new community established on the barracks site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If barracks are developed this site should be left as open space. • Anglian Water - Sewage Treatment Works may require capacity enhancement. Infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades required to serve proposed growth or diversion of assets may be required. • Maximum of 90 to preserve 'village'. • National Trust - Housing at Waterbeach could contribute to improved access across River Cam into Wicken Vision area. A new bridge and footpath improvements would help ensure River does not form a barrier between the town and this area of strategic Green Infrastructure.
<p>H10: Land at Bennell Farm, West Street, Comberton</p> <p>Support: 15 Object: 102 Comment: 19</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To meet 5 year land supply targets. • Can be well integrated with village, if well designed and not too large. • Proposal for overflow car park for Village College at busy times which will alleviate existing parking problems in residential streets at this end of village; • Site can be developed without adverse landscape impact and demonstrates that a low density solution to the redevelopment of this site can be achieved. • Well-served by supporting facilities and local bus services. • Near to village college. • Available, suitable, achievable and deliverable. • Site scores exceptionally well in the Council's Interim Sustainability Appraisal (2013). • On-site surface water drainage systems are achievable. • Drainage and sewer problems should not be made worse. • Would need to address landscape impacts; • It would appear to be a better option than the other sites identified in Comberton. • Would bring further employment to the village. • Meet needs for affordable housing. • Toft Parish Council – Supports some development, but currently too large. Need to demonstrate infrastructure able to cope. Conditional support as could help meet affordable housing needs of Toft residents. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erosion of Green Belt. • Outside the existing Village Framework.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 2/3 agricultural land. • Sewage infrastructure inadequate. Unable to cope with any more development Since provision of mains drainage in Comberton and Toft there have been countless problems with flooding from foul water manholes - into gardens in Barton Road and Swaynes Lane. In many areas of Comberton the sewage is "managed" by being taken away by large trucks because the piped infrastructure cannot cope. • Site frequently waterlogged due to the low lying nature of the site and the geology of the heavy soil type. • Increased risk of water flooding from Tit Brook into South Street. • Rainwater runoff, from the land to the North of H10, drains through Kentings and to the field to the south, which is prone to flooding. If development is successful the concreting over of this large area will increase the rainwater runoff. • Flooding often occurs along Barton Road, east of mini roundabout. • Excess waste water from Cambourne causes flooding downstream in Comberton and other places. • Poor public transport to/from areas of work and recreational activities at evenings/weekends. • There are no cycle paths to NW Cambridge. • Increased traffic, noise, and pollution. • The minor road (B1046) is already very busy at peak times and is also subject to a lot of rat running by heavy lorries, commercial vehicles and other traffic. • Traffic pressures on West Street, especially at morning / afternoon school times. Road too narrow and too many bikes / school children to be safe for increase in traffic. • Barton Road/West St. - narrow road. No off-street parking and small car park of local shop often overflowing - traffic jams. • The entry and exit roads to the village are already in a poor state and badly maintained • Increased traffic in Barton. • Comberton is Group Village. • No jobs in Comberton. Increased commuting. • Lack of shopping facilities / services. • No mains gas. • All objections to other option sites in Comberton, related to sustainability, ability of the village to absorb further significant developments and the lowland landscape are relevant here. • Comberton village is not suitable for housing development of this scale; this size of settlement
--	--

	<p>should be restricted to brownfield sites with appropriate amenities and infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medical centre at capacity. • Unfair and unreasonable that Toft could receive the benefits and Comberton carry the cost. • The Comberton/Toft parish boundary should be changed so that Comberton Village College and possibly Bennell Farm are inside Comberton. • Currently attractive pastoral land and adds greatly to the rural character of Comberton. • An impossible situation for Comberton financially- for infrastructure etc. • The proposed development is too large; it would damage the rural character and village atmosphere of Comberton. • Important to keep the village compact by preventing its gradual creep along the B1046 and the eventual merger with Toft. • Comberton is an historic village that has a linear plan-form, but this has been eroded through developments in depth. • Impact on biodiversity. • Applications for development on this site have been rejected and there must be compelling reasons before this policy is changed. • The area outside and around the Village College is already congested with traffic at peak times and often dangerous with problematic exit from the College itself. • Already have additional housing near The Valley. • Restricting development due to arbitrary appraisal of settlement's 'sustainability' tick box assessment of services criticised in report Living Working Countryside: Taylor Review of Rural Economy and Affordable Housing. • Sites in Toft preferable to no loss of Green Belt, being forced into consideration due to strategy approach of rejecting infill villages. • CPRE - Object to loss of Green Belt. • Comberton Parish Council – Significant majority of residents object to development in and adjacent to Comberton. Erosion of the Green Belt. Impact on already overloaded sewage system in Comberton. Poor public transport to/from areas of work and recreational activities at evenings/weekends. Lack of village (retail) facilities. Increased risk of water flooding from Tit Brook into South Street. Additional traffic through the village, mitigation through perhaps an enlarged Parish Boundary to permit both funding and local representation at Parish / District level. • Haslingfield Parish Council, Harlton Parish Council – Object to loss of Green Belt.
--	--

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anglian Water - Capacity available to serve the proposed growth. • English Heritage – village has historic linear character. Some limited housing fronting onto west street might be possible without harming local character. • Natural England – notes site in Green Belt. • Probably a good location as long as this is the only development. • Barton Parish Council – Need to ensure calming and reduction of traffic through Barton. Provision of cycleway in Comberton. • No objection on proviso that infrastructure is sorted out. • Site was suggested for affordable houses and car park for Village College - very beneficial to village and would be least painful of five sites proposed in Comberton. • Recent flooding in east of village e.g. Swaynes Lane is unacceptable. • Need to ensure calming and reduction of commuter traffic through Barton and provision of cycleway in Comberton. • The problem of it being in Toft parish should be resolved by moving the parish boundary westward to the edge of the Comberton built-up area. • Traffic calming measures near the Village College the position of the exit onto West Street would need careful consideration. • This site is preferable to the alternatives because; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - well screened from West Street and on approach from Toft and adjacent the existing village college area, adjacent to the bus route in West Street and would not generate access traffic through existing housing. • May be acceptable if it provided for local Affordable Housing needs for the foreseeable future. • Should be decided by local opinion.
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 4 Object: 9 Comment: 57</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support development in larger villages in district. • RLW Estates and Defence Infrastructure Organisation: recognise and support provision of additional development in rural settlements of district, at a scale commensurate with their local needs and other circumstances. Evidently there are constraints affecting each of the site options included in consultation document. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of these sites are needed. Covering ground in concrete. Sufficient small sites within villages to meet need.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to current villages, already being infilled and losing their individuality and identity, being further developed out of all proportion. • Objections to all sites in Sawston. • Objections to sites in Cambourne. • Shepreth Parish Council objects to all housing sites – new housing should be in north of district in new settlement. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection to building on brownfield sites but greenfield is irreversible. • Brown field not Green Belt. • Prefer small infill sites. • I think any developments should be spread proportionally around the villages in South Cambs. • Due to housing need in area parishes should be prepared to accept housing developments where suitable sites exist but only where adequate infrastructure exists to accommodate increased housing. • Local people to decide. Not for developers to be asked to promote suitable sites. • Orwell Parish Council believes parish council should have first say on sites – process too biased towards developers and landowners. Infrastructure to be in place before development started. No building in flood plain. • Development should be concentrated in Cambridge not pushed out into villages – not sustainable. • Only small developments so they do not swamp existing communities. • Allow infill at small scale – self building will create character. • Object to lots of small sites because cumulative effect will impact on services – need long term planning. • Do not need new sites until Northstowe and Waterbeach completed. • All development will impact on traffic in Cambridge area. • New housing needs to be near to services in villages. • New houses not for local people - bought by speculators. • Infrastructure cannot cope with increased housing. • Foxton Parish Council do not support housing developments on business park land, as it will deduce the space available for expansion of local businesses. • No provision for elderly pensioners in housing schemes in Sawston – need retirement
--	---

	<p>apartments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority to sites accessible by train for commuters to London. • No more developments in north unless A10 improved. • Should take into account Parish / Village Plans. • Expand Cambourne, infill at Histon and regenerate Waterbeach. • Trinity College (represented by Bidwells): maintain commitment to bringing forward site option 34 which is in single ownership, vacant, no loss of employment unlike other sites in Gamlingay, viable and deliverable.
<p>QUESTION 1B: Do you have any comments on sites rejected by the Council?</p>	
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 2 Object: 22 Comment: 45</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support those where buildings already exist e.g. Histon, former bishops store. • Houses needed. • Support the concept of a mix of housing and work places, so transport needs are reduced. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppose any development in the Green Belt – these areas were designated as Green Belt to stop development on them! • Object to those proposals for building on farm land. • Failure to account for adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the traveller pitch need and social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area, as required by Paragraph 9 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and Paragraph 158 of the NPPF. • Why are you not considering ‘brown field’ / conversions more i.e. the empty pub in Bassingbourn that could be converted into a number of homes!? • Object to any removal of Green Belt land, a greater vision is needed on the way forward for Cambridge as an alternative to destruction of Green Belt land. • Shepreth Parish Council can see no benefit in Meldreth Road site inside village framework (rep 55329) but could see considerable benefit in keeping land agricultural outside envelope. <p><u>SHLAA Sites</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocation of land east of Fen Road, Chesterton (SHLAA Site 094) is essential in helping to meet the existing backlog of Traveller Pitch Need. • Noted that some six criteria are advanced for the purpose of selecting additional housing site options

	<p>for consultation. In relation to SHLAA Site 162, Land between Teversham Road and Cow Lane, Fulbourn, these criteria are entirely met and therefore the site should appear in the Local Plan document for consultation purposes. The SHLAA cannot be used as a document to support or not support the inclusion of sites within the Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Cambourne (SHLAA Site 265): objection to rejection of site, not reconsidered as part of the SHLAA update, or in relation to overall sustainability appraisal - did not assess North Cambourne on comparable basis with other sites, did not properly consider highways issues, nor correctly identify landscape capacity and potential mitigation. Allocation has several unique benefits over similar proposals; greater proximity to existing services; greater proximity for existing residents to new facilities; good interconnectivity with cycle and pedestrian links across A428; access to wider countryside north of A428; potential for Park and Ride; linear development to south of A428 avoided. • Land to rear of High Street, Cottenham (SHLAA Site 316): objection to rejection of site, disagree with site assessment – a well-designed scheme would enhance area, sustainable location. • Land at The Woodyard, Church Lane, Cottenham (SHLAA Site 269): objection to rejection of site, readily available and has necessary infrastructure, well located for extensive local amenities, careful design would avoid harm to setting, loss of storage and ancillary building would reduce commercial traffic. • Driftwood Farm, Swavesey (SHLAA Site 250): objection to rejection of site, more development should be directed towards larger villages such as Swavesey which are sustainable locations, within 1km of guided busway, limited development will help enhance setting of Conservation Area and nearby Scheduled Ancient Monument, could help facilitate provision of additional facilities within village. • Land north of Poorsfield Road, Waterbeach (SHLAA Site 142): objection to rejection of site, considered more sustainable than Site Option H9, suitable for 5-7 houses as derelict orchard adjoining existing residential development, can be accessed from existing residential development and would 'round-off' residential uses in this part of Waterbeach. • Land west of High Street, Fowlmere (SHLAA Site 107): objection to rejection of site, failure to account for adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and
--	--

	<p>environmental characteristics and prospects of the area, as required by Paragraph 158 of the NPPF, and in specific relation to the village of Fowlmere. Essential in retaining in excess of 40 jobs at Ion Science.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land off St Neots, Hardwick (SHLAA Site 180): objection to rejection of site, neighbourhood centre including doctors and dentist facilities, further shopping facilities could be considered if required, access from St. Neots road will provide for 125 dwellings or so with additional open space and community woodland, footpath / cycleway facilities, financial contribution to Parish Council for community facilities improvement. • Land to the rear of 98-102 High Street, Harston (SHLAA Sites 226 & 289): objection to rejection of site, failure to account for adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area, as required by Paragraph 158 of the NPPF, and in specific relation to the village of Harston. • Land at Kettle Close, Oakington (SHLAA Site 185): objection to rejection of site, clear advantages in changing the site from engineering to residential use. Notwithstanding the rejection of this site at the initial local plan stage, circumstances have fundamentally changed with the construction of the guided bus, improvement of the access into Cambridge, and facilities of the market town of St Ives. • Land north of New Road, Over (SHLAA Site 182): objection to rejection of site, Facilities at Over, with deletion of new village at Bourn, and lack of any development at Northstowe, can justify scale of development. Object to use of land for open space (SP/14(1a)) - offer compromise - transfer some land to Parish Council as extension to playing fields (conditional on planning permission being granted) with remainder of land (min 3 acres) for 28 dwellings. • Land adjacent to Petersfield Primary School, Orwell (SHLAA Site 020): objection to rejection of site, support local services, close proximity of Mainline Railway Station, opportunity to provide mix of housing, including affordable and enhancement of community facilities. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some larger villages should be developed especially where work places are also established. • Don't allow development in existing villages – infrastructure won't take it and rural feel will be destroyed.
--	---

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

	<p>use of energy and water. Concerns for new developments near rivers and brooks. Waterbeach, Bourn and Melbourn expansion should be limited and constructed to protect rivers as well as providing public space for enjoyment. No building in flood plains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Countryside Restoration Trust: Support the use of mixed use development so that jobs, shops and houses are close to each other and a diversity of buildings is achieved. Some larger villages should be developed especially where work places are also established. These plans should link with sustainable transport. • Great Chesterford Parish Council: particularly are concerned at the in-filling developments proposed in Sawston, Shelford and Stapleford. Cumulative numbers of new dwellings go well into the hundreds, our village alone will also increase by 100 houses and we ask that housing developments in Uttlesford are also factored into a Traffic strategy. • Histon & Impington Village Action Group: want to see a community which evolves in a way that does not impact on quality of life of people. Services are already over-stretched and need investment in schools and healthcare, community facilities and traffic management, surface water and sewerage management and creation of safe pathways and cycle paths. cursory references to infrastructure in SHLAAs do not reflect true picture of Histon and Impington's current infrastructure capacity. • Natural England: majority of rejected sites were rejected due to a poor rating through the Sustainability Appraisal process and for negative impacts on natural environment. <p><u>SHLAA Sites</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not appear to be any positive collaboration between South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge City Council on areas such as Barrington Cement Works (SHLAA Site 169). Site is unused, would provide an opportunity for redevelopment with a railway line connection which can be re-established. • SHLAA Sites 241 & 269 Cottenham: supporting rejection, against development due to costly constraints and requirements on adjoining property and provision of drainage. • SHLAA Site 316 - Land to rear of High Street Cottenham: while CPC can appreciate exclusion from SCDC's Local Plan, this site would appear to be included in the Neighbourhood Development
--	--

	<p>Plan Option 2 and to that extent, CPC's acceptance/rejection of this site is subject to the consultation response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHLAA Site 092 - Land at Mangers Lane, Duxford: the site forms part of the centre of Duxford and falls completely within the village framework. The sole constraint to development of the site is the existing PVAA designation, despite its complete unsuitability. • SHLAA Site 276 - Land at Paynes Meadow, Linton: allocate for residential development, Linton is suitable village as a Minor Rural Centre, SHLAA and SA identified no significant constraints, well-related to exiting development framework. <p><u>New Sites (Edge of Cambridge)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge, Fen Road, Cambridge City Council Property & Building Services: Has made representation previously and wishes site to be considered – sustainable edge of Cambridge, opportunities for a co-ordinated housing development with the adjacent allocated housing site in Cambridge City Council area and new proposed Science Park station makes the site highly sustainable. <p><u>New Sites (Rural Centres)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fulbourn, Land to the rear of 12-18 Teversham Road: rural centre making it suitable for development, within development framework boundary, smaller site than rejected Fulbourn sites. • Impington, Land off Lone Tree Avenue: suitable for residential development, access off Lone Tree Avenue, outside of the flood plain, but within Green Belt. <p><u>New Sites (Minor Rural Centres)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gamlingay, The Cinques: 2 new sites, The Cinques somewhat disjointed, some consolidating development would benefit the hamlet. • Waterbeach, Land adjacent to Bannold Road: considered that all land north of Bannold Road (H9) together with land west up to Cody Road should be confirmed as proposed housing allocation, opportunity to master plan in association with neighbouring land. • Waterbeach, Bannold Road: Object that our Clients land was not included for consultation purposes; the site was not promoted by the landowner through the 'call for sites', it probably should have been and these representations seek to rectify that. The site represents a suitable location for development, and other sites within the
--	--

vicinity of Bannold Road have been identified as potential development options.

New Sites (Group Villages)

- **Caldecote, Land to the rear of Highfields Road:** object that site was not included for consultation as a potential development option (also submitted during Issues & Options 1 rep 36683). The site represents the final parcel of land to be delivered as part of the previous village growth strategy.
- **Caldecote, Land at Highfields Caldecote:** development boundaries should be established around site, its proposed extension and adjoining two dwellings, should include sufficient land to east to provide an extension to the mobile home park (also submitted during Issues & Options 1 rep 36719).
- **Dry Drayton, Cotton's Field:** working alongside Parish Council to consider the benefits of allocating land for affordable housing.
- **Fen Ditton, High Ditch Road (part of SHLAA Site 061):** smaller site with different characteristics to previous larger submission, impact on Green Belt can be mitigated, existing buildings on site, natural infill.
- **Fowlmere, Land to the rear of Pipers Close:** previously submitted during Issues & Options 1 (rep 45412) with no evidence in SHLAA update of inclusion, consequently the Council has not fully complied with the Regulations. Site should be designated for housing to meet local needs, currently Green Belt, however it does not fulfil any of the objectives and functions of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF.
- **Guilden Morden, South of 33 Dubbs Knoll Road:** small quantity of affordable housing, would reflect size and character of village, acceptable within the infrastructure capacity, enhance character and settlement distinctiveness of this part of Guilden Morden (also submitted during Issues & Options 1 rep 31808).
- **Steeple Morden, North of Bogs Gap Lane (part of SHLAA Site 209):** smaller site for 3 dwellings than previously submitted SHLAA Site 209.
- **Whittlesford, Land northwest of Church Lane:** should be considered for housing, including affordable housing and a care home, scheme would sit well on the site without detracting from or causing nuisance to nearby dwellings.

New Sites (Infill Villages)

- **Great Chishill:** 5 new sites, (1) Land south of Barley Road, west of the village - Would allow

	<p>some expansion and add to the grouping at the windmill area; (2) Land south of Barley Road on village's west edge -This would "round-off" the village; (3) Land east of May Street on village's south edge - This would "round-off" the edge of the village; (4) Land south of Hall Lane on village's east edge - Seems the logical place to allow expansion. (5) Land east of New Road on village's north edge -This site could be developed without detriment to the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landbeach, Land off Chapmans Close, Cambridgeshire County Council: within easy reach of A10 and A14 and Waterbeach Station, currently vacant greenfield, and available for residential development, including affordable local needs (plot A) and a small number of private market housing (Plot B). • Little Gransden, The Drift: planning permission for a bungalow previously turned down, building plans at other end of the street. • Shepreth, Land at Bexwell Farm: The site is currently developed, consisting of several farm buildings and a farm cottage. Replacing these buildings with a residential development would represent a growth adjoining the existing village settlement boundary and railway line. The site is not within the Green Belt or subject to any other strategic consideration that has potential to make the site unsuitable for development. • Shepreth, Meldreth Road, Cambridgeshire County Council: bordered by landscaping and railway line to west, agricultural land beyond. To south west, area received planning permission for 12 affordable houses and associated open space including BMX track. Beyond is existing scheme of 14 affordable units. Land currently vacant greenfield - opportunity for residential led mixed use development (medium density 30dph). Further phase of solely affordable housing would be inappropriate, logical rounding off. • Whaddon, west of Church Street, Cambridgeshire County Council: site benefits from mature boundary of vegetation, although in an Infill Village, within close proximity of services and facilities of nearby Group Villages and Minor Rural Centre, easy access onto A10 and M11, and train services towards London and Cambridge from nearby Meldreth station. Land currently vacant greenfield - opportunity for residential led mixed use development (medium density 30dph).
--	--

APPENDIX 3: SCHEDULE OF REJECTED SITES	
QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPS
Site Assessments of Rejected Housing Sites	
SHLAA Site 306: Land west of 113 Cottenham Road, Histon Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 0	OBJECTIONS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not understand how on one hand this proposal is rejected, but then representation 47253, adjacent to this site is also a proposal for public open space. Also, this site was rejected on the basis of 'unsuitable access'. There is direct access from Cottenham Road.
SHLAA Site 318: Land to the east of Linton Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 0	OBJECTIONS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site is not taken forward by the emerging Local Plan. The land promoters dispute the critique made within the Site Assessment Proforma. The main concern of the Council is expressed as landscape and historic setting impact. Accompanying this submission is a response setting out why those concerns are not well-founded. The achievability of the site is questioned by the proforma. Letters from the landowners are enclosed confirming their commitment to delivering a high quality site along with community infrastructure, not least improvements to the A1307. There is no technical reason why the proposal cannot be delivered.
SHLAA Site 321: Land at The Ridgeway, Papworth Everard Support: 0 Object: 1 Comment: 0	OBJECTIONS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that land at The Ridgeway in Papworth Everard is identified as a potential development option, with associated amendments to the development framework boundary. The site could provide approximately 215 dwellings with associated open space, outdoor recreation, and strategic landscaping. A substantial tree buffer would be provided to screen the site from the surrounding countryside. The current proposal is of a smaller scale than SHLAA Site 196. A Concept Master plan has been submitted with this representation to illustrate how the proposed development would relate to its surroundings. The Landscape & Visual Impact Appraisal concludes that development at the site would not materially impact on the character of the adjoining area.
SHLAA Site 327: Land west of A10, Milton Support: 0 Object: 0 Comment: 1	COMMENTS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Milton Parish Council: supports decision to reject this site.
SHLAA Site 330: Land adjacent to Whiteways, Ickleton Road, Great Chesterford	ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ickleton Society: Support rejection of this site for the reasons given in the Sustainability Assessment. Good quality agricultural land should

Support: 2
Object: 1
Comment: 0

not be developed in priority to brownfield sites. It is below a raised section of the M11 and would suffer from traffic noise. Access to the site would be close to the level crossing, rail underpass, a bend in Ickleton Road and two M11 flyovers which obscure the view of Ickleton road on which traffic frequently reaches speeds of 60mph. It would increase traffic through Ickleton where rat running is already a major problem.

- **Ickleton Parish Council:** Support SCDC's rejection of this site. Their reasons for rejecting it are wholly sound. A residential development here would be completely severed from Great Chesterford village and would not be capable of integration with that community. There would also be an unacceptable level of car-based travel associated with this site, much of it impacting upon Ickleton, which is already struggling with the adverse effects of current levels of through traffic.

OBJECTIONS:

- **KMBC Planning:** Will help provide housing across the housing market area which spans the two authorities.
 - Is able to accommodate more than 10 dwellings.
 - Is in a sustainable location.
 - Does not affect any biodiversity, townscape or heritage assets.
 - Would be viable.
 - Could be delivered over the plan period.
 - Does not lead to loss of employment land.
 - Will not materially impact on the working of the transport network.
 - Is not in an AQMA and noise concerns could be mitigated.

Some of the sites considered acceptable by SCDC fail to meet some of these key criteria. In terms of duty to co-operate, SCDC have made no reference to co-operating with the bordering authority of Uttlesford District Council despite it being similar to South Cambridgeshire.