

CHAPTER 4: SPATIAL STRATEGY

QUESTION NO.	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS
<p>QUESTION 7: Localism and Relationship with Neighbourhood Development Plans</p>	
<p>Do you think local aspirations can be reflected in the Local Plan? If yes, how can this be best done? If no, why do you take that view?</p> <p>Support: 58 Object: 8 Comment: 61</p> <p>(127 representations)</p>	<p>Parish Councils (responses from 30 Parish Councils)</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, but only in the context of scale of housing developments, approach to village frameworks, housing allocations, protected village amenity areas, local green spaces, exception sites for affordable housing, and new employment buildings on the edge of villages. • Yes, but SCDC should set up a suitable consultation framework for meaningful engagement with parish councils and communities. By engaging with local communities in whatever ways are possible. • Yes, and these should be developed from either formal neighbourhood plans or parishes responses, and by devolving some decisions to parish councils. • Yes, given the impact of the Localism Bill. Residents want to have their say. • If SCDC aspirations of lower carbon footprints, lower crime rates, vibrant local communities and economies, and protection of landscape and biodiversity are to be met then the Local Plan should and must reflect and respect the aspirations of the villages. • Yes, the best idea would be for SCDC to listen to the views of the people 'on the ground' and apply this knowledge to the Local Plan. • Yes, the most effective way of doing this may be to encourage parish councils to develop neighbourhood plans (where possible based on earlier parish plans updated following public consultation) that could be fed into the Local Plan rather than being subject to formal referendum [LATE REP]. • Yes, should not try to reflect the detail of local aspirations but should ensure that local aspirations are allowed to progress rather than being stifled. SCDC should take more notice of local views, particularly where they are represented by parish councils, and should give greater respect to parish councils opinions in decision making. • Yes, but there needs to be 1-2-1 dialogue with parish councils to find out what they want. It is not enough to read all the responses and then allocate

	<p>villages to rigid categories. Development in each village must be determined by the unique character of each location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, can be achieved by closely monitoring and enforcing planning policies and development activity in general. • Yes, provided that the Local Plan abides by the wishes of the individual villages affected by any proposal – Localism. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many residents don't engage with district or county council consultations as they find them too onerous, bureaucratic and not specific enough to their local area. • Unsure the day-to-day issues that the parish council are concerned with (e.g. traffic, state of the roads and pavements, local facilities) can be reflected in the Local Plan. • It is not possible to reflect local aspirations in the Local Plan as it is too generic. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If SCDC decide to weaken or remove local constraints to development, then effective help must be given to parish councils to rapidly develop neighbourhood plans. SCDC should offer grants and provide officer support to help deliver parish plans, which could then be used to feed into the Local Plan. SCDC should recognise the importance of Localism by supporting the preparation of neighbourhood plans through training, advice and grants. • Settlements have a varied and distinct local character, and therefore the Local Plan must include flexibility to allow for the differing needs of individual settlements. SCDC needs to liaise with and 'listen' to parish councils to gauge what each settlement requires. • Views of the local community can only be taken into account to a limited extent due to the timescales given for public consultation (e.g. 10 weeks) – not long enough for parish councils to effectively engage with their local communities to get a representative view, which leaves parish councils disadvantaged unless they have recently produced a parish plan. Request longer to produce a community led response to the Issues & Options Report (e.g. end of December). • Whilst it would be helpful to be able to refer developers to a Local Plan policy, the variety of opinion between parishes would not allow a
--	--

	<p>corporate view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Councils are a vital part of local government but they are already expected to do too much. The workload is increasing – who will come forward to be parish councillors in future if they will face vast amounts of work for no pay? • Parish plans do not yet exist, and may never exist due to the enormous costs involved and uncertainty over their adoption. • Caldecote Parish Council - Caldecote needs improved affordable public transport and community transport, amenities for youths (12+ years) and allotment space. • Duxford Parish Council - wishes to highlight its lack of community facilities and its need for such facilities in order to ensure the village is able to thrive in future [LATE REP]. • Fowlmere Parish Council – would like improved facilities, without changing the scale, size or nature of the village. • Gamlingay Parish Council – there are no policies or guidance on how local communities plan for burial space. • Graveley Parish Council – would like a meeting to discuss the options for plot of land including for a possible small development of housing, community facilities and protection of local green space. • Great Shelford Parish Council – would like to have more input into the scale and type of housing permitted, so that affordable housing for local people can be provided. Also desperately need additional green space. • Guilden Morden Parish Council – wishes to be consulted on any changes specific to their village before a decision is made on such proposals. • Hauxton Parish Council – has identified that the church graveyard could be full within 10 years and that the Former Bayer CropScience site redevelopment will increase the village population, therefore the need for additional burial spaces is likely to become more pressing and a new site should be identified in advance. • Histon & Impington Parish Council – there is scope for the regeneration of the area around Histon Station to provide a mixed use development of housing, employment and leisure opportunities, community facilities, and open space. It would be an exemplar of high quality 21st century design, based on the highest standards of sustainability and be a striking testament to local ambitions. • Milton Parish Council – would like more recreation space and have been looking for over 10 years with no success [LATE REP]. • Pampisford Parish Council – would like to keep
--	---

their village amenities (recreation ground, allotments, spinney and village hall) in perpetuity – at present they are rented.

Other respondents

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:

- Yes, by appropriate consultation and effective engagement with local people, however bureaucracy and limited time and resources are likely to restrict this. Could be achieved by parish councils engaging with all households making clear all the options available, not just what the parish council think is best for the village.
- There are no good examples of neighbourhood plans at the moment, so parish councils will be looking to the Local Plan to meet their needs.
- Local aspirations should be taken into account, preferably without parishes having to produce a costly and cumbersome neighbourhood plan. Few villages have the resources to produce a neighbourhood plan.
- Neighbourhoods should always be able to influence development – district wide plans are important to support global development, but the local community usually knows best where there is spare capacity. Local people with local knowledge know best. Democracy is strongest at the local level – parish councils are the obvious way to engage with local communities and take account of their opinions.
- Yes, but local aspirations should be carefully assessed on a democratic and inclusive basis – consulting widely and locally across diverse community groups. Exhibitions (with the opportunity for 1-2-1 discussions) and confidential questionnaires can help determine local aspirations and can limit the disproportionate impact of any anti-development lobby.
- Local aspirations must be taken into account but they must be balanced against the need to continue to help the sub-region's economy to prosper.
- The primacy of planning decisions should lie with the Local Plan, to stop the fragmentation of planning decisions.
- Yes, provided that the local planning authority has the courage to listen. Public consultation should be undertaken by parish councils as the elected representatives of the communities. SCDC should include the summarised requirements within the Local Plan.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Localism provides the opportunity for local communities to plan their areas in a more positive manner, and this is best done by allowing communities to bring forward proposals for their areas and for the Council to support them even if the suggestion is not necessarily one that the Council has identified. • Yes, the Local Plan should introduce more flexibility regarding development in the smaller villages, particularly outside the Green Belt. The new Local Plan can allow limited development where people want to live without causing unacceptable damage to local communities or the local environment. • SCDC should take more notice of parish / community plans. • Yes, the Localism Bill and new planning regime is supposed to introduce “bottom up” decision making. However, ultimately the wider picture has to prevail especially if the aspiration of a community is that it simply wishes to be left alone. • The new Local Plan should be devised with the maximum amount of local consultation, if only to spare parish councils the expense and trouble of producing neighbourhood plans (which would also district council resources). • Cottenham Village Design Group believes that there is potential for a Local Plan to reflect neighbourhood aspirations by incorporating specific strategic guidance and aims for each village. Planning gain could then be used to achieve these aims. It is better than the local planning authority remains in charge of land allocations. • The key role of the local plan is to reflect local communities’ aspirations for meeting development and infrastructure needs locally. If you ignore local views then you are not meeting the needs of the people who live in the area. • Yes, but it must reflect local residents opinions, not just those of local businesses. • Local aspirations and the views of the local community should always be reflected in the Local Plan, even if this prevents developers and land speculators from delivering profits. When developers and the local community disagree, the views of local people should always take precedence – the views of local people are generally well expressed via the parish council. • SCDC has to have overall responsibility to ensure that housing and employment needs in the district are met, while taking account of local concerns as expressed by parish councils. Following consultation with all local stakeholders, SCDC
--	--

	<p>must take a joined up overview to ensure an integrated approach across parishes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, local aspirations should be reflected in the Local Plan if the concept of Localism is to have any real meaning. • Yes, but the Local Plan would need to have a reasonable degree of flexibility to allow for the differing needs of individual settlements. • Yes, through regular meetings with parish councils and local exhibitions where major changes are proposed (as at present). • Local aspirations should be incorporated into the Local Plan and the views of parish councils in particular should be given increased importance. • Yes, but a balance must be struck between the need for development and the need to maintain a quality of life for residents. • Yes, not 'can' but 'should be', by consulting widely, taking note of aspirations outlined in parish and community plans, and by research what other councils have done to understand local aspirations. • A lot of time and money has been spent on producing parish plans and great care was taken to make them democratic, therefore it should be possible to use these to establish local opinion. • Parish councils should take the opportunity to put forward proposals backed by local residents e.g. Cambourne swimming pool campaign. • Yes, the Council should accept what parish councils say, whether they have undertaken formal consultation or not. This will inevitably produce some wrong decisions but Localism should be allowed to play itself out. • By inserting the local aspirations more deeply into the plan making process, you will avoid policy conflicts and irrelevant neighbourhood plans. A separate process should be undertaken to specifically gather comments from parish councils on the strategy within their area. • Yes, councillors are elected to serve the people – listen to them. • Yes, but the Local Plan should make it clear that the Localism Act has not changed the application of section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local aspirations and views of the community should not be reflected in the Local Plan if they prevent the Council from delivering its objectively
--	--

	<p>assessed needs for homes and jobs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long consultation forms allow for detailed responses but few people will find them accessible or have the time to fill them out. More direct and varied ways of involvement are needed. • No, Cottenham Village Design Group does not believe that local aspirations can be successfully reflected in the Local Plan. Supplementary planning documents and village design statements are still needed at a local level to record and reflect how local opinion should be represented in further development. • Local opinion must take precedence in most instances, which is best handled locally. Local decisions should be made at the local level. The district council cannot be trusted to make fair local decisions. Planning authorities do not have a good track record of taking local views, including those of parish councils, into account. SCDC should devolve the responsibility to parish councils – Localism. • There is insufficient time in the plan making process to tackle the delicate and complex negotiations necessary to bring forward sites with proven local support. • Assumes a consensus on local aspirations which is unlikely to be the case. • No, as too few people are involved. • Local aspirations cannot be reflected in any development plan, as most people will object to any large development – NIMBY phenomenon. Local opinions will be welcomed when they fit with the views of the Council, and ignored when they do not. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton needs homes for over 55s or retired near to services and facilities, it does not need more homes for families. • Understand that the residents of Caldecote require improved traffic calming, additional facilities and allotments. In the absence of other funding, these improvements will only be delivered through additional development. • Parishes should be encouraged to develop their own plans and assistance needs to be given to help them. • Many villages are losing their services and facilities as they become unviable, they should be allowed to reverse this decline by allowing additional development of their choosing or by redefining their village framework. • Would like to be consulted on issues where most of
--	--

	<p>the village would like no change except in exceptional circumstances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Needs Survey for Orwell in April 2009 includes a number of comments expressing a desire to see more development in the village. • Any encroachment of development into the Green Belt around Stapleford would be contrary to the parish plan and the wishes of Stapleford residents. • It must be ensured that views sought by consultation at a local level are representative, and that before any decisions are made local people are adequately informed and are aware of the implications – this may be a longer process but would hopefully be fairer and more considered. • The Council will need to give consideration as to how neighbourhood planning can be properly supported and a commitment in the Local Plan to provide support would be welcomed.
<p>QUESTION 8: Sustainable Development</p>	
<p>Do you think the local plan should include a specific policy focusing development on the re-use of previously developed land in sustainable locations, that is not of high environmental value?</p> <p>Support:105 Object:11 Comment:27</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previously developed land should be the priority. • Green-field developments should be minimized and if possible avoided. • Preference should be to preserve employment sites. • Should be looked upon favourably, particularly where there would be significant benefits to the community, such as the removal of scruffy buildings, areas in the countryside and their replacement with modest dwellings which would create a softer settlement edge. • More emphasis needs to be placed on the 'Brownfield first' policy for reusing urban land that is available. No review of Green Belt. • Brownfield sites should be considered as high priority since they are also usually close to populated centres with facilities. • Be realistic that most development will have to happen on Greenfield sites. • Old airfields should not be regarded as "brownfield" , especially if an old airfield has been used for agriculture since it ceased to be an airfield. • Policy should not be used to enable garden grabbing. • Need to define 'of high environmental value' • Development should be focused on under utilised employment sites that are operationally constrained by adjoining land uses, such as residential properties and schools. • Redevelopment of Waste Water Treatment Works at Hauxton is brownfield site policy should facilitate. • Cambridge City Council - supports the delivery of

	<p>development on previously developed land in sustainable locations, where the land is not of high environmental value. It should be noted, however, that despite the sustainable location of areas on the fringes of the city, many of these areas are of high environmental value. Additionally, the City Council is concerned that this issue does not provide sufficient coverage of the issue of sustainable development, which is a much broader concept, encompassing a range of environmental, social and economic aspects in order to achieve the greatest benefits for South Cambridgeshire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenham Parish Council - SCDC might consider asking its town and parish councils to show, in map form, the types of land and its uses within their boundaries. • Barton Parish Council, Caxton Parish Council, Coton Parish Council, Croydon Parish Council, Dry Drayton Parish Council, Fen Ditton Parish Council, Foxton Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council, Great Abington Parish Council, Great Shelford Parish Council, Histon and Impington Parish Council, Litlington, Little Abington, Madingley, Oakington and Westwick, Over, Pampisford, Papworth Everard, Swavesey – Support. • Bassingbourn-cum-Kneeworth Action Group - District and parish councils to work together on identifying sites, not just responding to land put forward. • Caldecote Parish Council - If to protect Greenfield sites, then yes. The definition of sustainable is unclear but appropriate infrastructure and transport and road links must be in place, and consider impact on neighbouring villages. • Haslingfield Parish Council – Need to consider impact on surrounding villages. • Cambridge Past, Present and Future - Should be a survey of how existing and potential brownfield land is used. Where buildings are sub-standard or where space is wasted, for example on extensive surface car parking, consideration should be given to demolition and rebuild to higher density. • CPRE – Support. • Natural England - We welcome recognition of the need to prioritise development on brownfield rather than Greenfield land. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could distort the delivery of housing sites within an area which does not have many opportunities for the reuse of previously development land. • Should not override the principles of sustainable location. • There should not be a 'brownfield land first'
--	--

	<p>presumption due to the need for a high level of greenfield releases to meet development needs from the start of the plan period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to ensure that 'unsustainable' previously developed sites do not come forward for development, since these will result in a higher level of car usage together with an associated increase in the level of carbon emissions and vehicle congestion. • Urban fringe sites which are located in sustainable locations in close proximity to good public transport linkages and employment opportunities in preference to previously developed land located in isolated unsustainable locations. • Not always the best option for residential development because it might be surrounded by non-compatible land uses, or not be suitable for development. • As this issue is the only one addressed under the banner 'sustainable development' it underlines the failing to acknowledge and explore the fundamental problems of climate change and resource depletion. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Already in NPPF, no need to repeat principle in the Local Plan, unless the proposed policy is distinctive to South Cambridgeshire. • Reasonable idea, unless it leads to communities being merged together in a run of housing. • Not solely for housing developments, it should be consulted locally to see what are the local needs • Only if brownfield land is properly defined and excludes private gardens. • The Plan needs to qualify how land might be classified as being 'not of high environmental value'. • Also consider low grade agricultural land • Availability of infrastructure must be considered and the effect on local villages • Brownfield land suitable for re-development should be defined and identified. • For the plan to stipulate brownfield sites should be prioritised for all forms of development could prohibit future renewable energy developments. • The only sustainable development is no development. • Previously developed land could still be inappropriate for residential development. • Parish councils should have a role to play in proposing developments which do not accord with whatever policies are adopted. • Cambourne Parish Council - No existing employment land should be lost. • The Wildlife Trust - welcomes the recognition that
--	---

	brownfield land can be of high environmental value and that such land should not be automatically developed.
QUESTION 9: What is the best approach to the development strategy for South Cambridgeshire?	
<p>i Cambridge Focus</p> <p>Support:38 Object: 30 Comment: 3</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 3 (where a specific preference was expressed):</p> <p>Support: 44 Object: 17</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should seek to identify suitable sites to be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge to accommodate new development; • Land should be allocated to replace Cambridge East; • The Cambridge-centred development strategy that was brought forward through Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia, the Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Structure Plan, and subsequent development plan reviews, should be maintained; • Develop a strategy which continues to redress the imbalance between housing and jobs in and close to Cambridge; • Development should focus on existing urban areas, the most sustainable pattern of development; • Cambridge is by far the biggest attractor settlement in the sub-region because of its employment, servicing, education, health, retail, leisure and cultural offering; • NPPF - <i>“In preparing local plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.”</i> • There are approximately 42,000 employment car trips per day originating in South Cambridgeshire: of these, approximately 14,000 travel to Cambridge city (ie 34%) and a further 1,700 travel to Cambridge Science Park (ie 4%). • Trips generated would be shorter trips; • Sustainability Appraisal does not adequately highlight benefits of opportunities for walking or cycling; • Limited capacity within Cambridge itself, and could result in loss of employment land in Cambridge with damaging results; • Locating development on the edge of Cambridge, rather than at a location outside of the city, not only reduces trip distances, but it also enables people to choose non-car modes of travel as a realistic alternative to the motor car; • Recognise the links with Cambridge, particularly in terms of providing employment to support the successful economy of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, and housing so that the workforce can live close to where they work;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • job growth has significantly outstripped house building in the immediate vicinity of Cambridge and the area has seen significant house price rises. This has resulted in long distance commuting; • despite the shift in emphasis since the adoption of the 2003 Structure Plan, housing delivery has remained below the levels required to meet ongoing housing requirements and address the long-standing issues of acute housing need and the lack of affordability of new housing; • Most hi-tech companies have proved unwilling to move too far from Cambridge amid concerns that the benefits of expertise and technology linkages would be reduced and it would be further from their core labour supply; • It is clear from existing attempts at new settlements that they are not self supporting and that residents continue to commute to Cambridge; • Jobs and services are hard to deliver even to medium-sized settlements like Northstowe and Cambourne; • Market towns are already playing significant role in sub-regions growth strategy, it is important they are not overloaded. They also have significant levels of out commuting; • Cambridge has a track record of delivering urban extensions; • larger scale development should be focussed to Cambridge where there is existing infrastructure it can build onto, to assist with community cohesion and reduce the upfront infrastructure costs compared to a new settlement scenario; • Easier to deliver transport infrastructure; • Opportunities to enhance and supplement existing infrastructure, to benefit the existing settlement; • Of all the major allocations in the current South Cambridgeshire development strategy, Northstowe is the only one where development has not yet commenced unlike all the urban fringe allocations which are delivering housing; • Urban area alone could not accommodate all of the development needed, and greenfield sites on the edge of Cambridge need to be identified too; • Existing urban extensions around Cambridge are expected to be complete by 2019/20; • In responding to EERA on 3 June 2009 through the East of England Review process Cambridgeshire County Council, supported by all authorities within the County including South Cambridgeshire, indicated that new settlements were not supported; • The industrial business parks further away from Cambridge are failing to fill up. The nature of highly specialised jobs heavily present and supported in
--	---

	<p>Cambridge area means that in reality people are going to only commute more along worse public transport routes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People coming to Cambridge jobs want to be in Cambridge; • Realistically it is likely that a combination of greenfield urban extensions and growth at sustainable village locations will be required i.e. Options 9i and 9iii; • Would help protect character of the area; • Gamlingay Parish Council – Steer new development towards Cambridge; • Great and Little Chishill Parish Council - retain maximum green belt but with some flexibility on in-fill; • Waterbeach Parish Council - development should be prioritised on the edge of the city, even if this meant a review of the Green Belt which should no longer be regarded as sacrosanct; <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt around Cambridge has already been thoroughly reviewed in the recent past and that the Green Belt around the city needs to be protected for its own sake, or the Green Belt policy will become meaningless; • contrary to the NPPF requirement for permanence for the Green Belt to be reviewed again less than ten years later; • all the sites which were marginal in terms of their contribution to the objectives of the Cambridge Green Belt have already been released; • Exceptional circumstances cannot however be reasonably considered to exist when there is clearly sustainable development potential elsewhere; • A development strategy which focuses development in settlements which already have good service provision is sustainable as there would be limited requirements for significant upfront infrastructure; • Green Belt helps with the separation of villages and improves the environment; • Important to protect the character of the villages around Cambridge; • The Green Belt protects valuable agricultural land; • Sustainable commuting should be supported from villages along the Guided Bus Way, where affordable market housing can be delivered in a self-contained community with its own character and identity with unrivalled transport links to the City; • Land in and around the city should be used for
--	---

	<p>employment with housing pushed out into the surrounding area where there are good transport links;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge has grown almost 50% in terms of new houses over the past 20 years, and further incursions into the Green Belt should be restricted. Conflict with the Holford Plan. Congestion in the City; • Cambridge is a compact city, concerned to see any major change in its character; • Cambridge still has market town infrastructure, further development will compound problems; • Realistically Cambridge can no longer be regarded as a practical hub for further development. If an alternative hub cannot be found in East Anglia then the government should be persuaded to select another county/area of the country; • Growth should be spread around Cambridgeshire; • Croydon Parish Council - the Green Belt should be left as a buffer zone, or eventually Cambridge will join up with it's satellite villages; • Fen Ditton Parish Council – disagree, opportunities like guided bus give further opportunities to sustainable travel; • Grantchester Parish Council - the compact green and rural feel of Cambridge is an essential element of its character and what makes Cambridge unique in the UK. Danger of killing the golden goose, as many people move to Cambridge because of its unique compact and green nature; • Great Shelford Parish Council - green belt has only recently been reviewed and there are already 4000 houses being built to the north of the village; • Haslingfield Parish Council - flies in the face of maintaining the exceptional visual quality of both South Cambs and the famous University City; • Madingley Parish Council - removing more land from the green belt and swamping the village with new houses should NEVER be allowed to happen. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would require infrastructure investment, with significant lead in times. • You cannot build close in to the city and expect traffic to run smoothly or efficiently without coming up with some radical transport plans
<p>ii New Settlement focus</p> <p>Support:57 Object: 35 Comment: 10</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambridge is full, and doesn't have the infrastructure to support further growth; • Protect the older villages that are at risk of losing their historical identity;

<p>Questionnaire Question 3: Where do you think that development should be focused? (where a specific preference was expressed):</p> <p>Support: 486 Object: 111</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less pressure on existing village infrastructure; • Opportunity for new infrastructure, which is difficult to do in existing settlements ; • Transport links into Cambridge from these sites are sustainable and limit the impact on existing villages. Excellent public transport and cycle links should be a requirement; • Waterbeach has opportunities for transport links to Cambridge Northern Fringe; • Avoids development of the Green Belt; • Development with its own shops, parks, medical centres, schools etc; • Need sustainable communities with a mix of employment and housing, otherwise we are just exacerbating the transport problems ; • The only option for providing both housing and employment in the same location, enabling minimal journey times to work, reducing traffic to Cambridge; • NPPF. Para 52: <i>“The supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing towns and villages that follow the principles of Garden Cities”</i> • Should be of sufficient size to deliver sustainable development; • Need careful consideration of impact on surrounding villages; • illogical to locate a second new settlement to the north of Cambridge since it would concentrate development and infrastructure pressures in one geographical sector. Should be new settlement in south, close to high tech cluster. (Hanley Grange); • Alongside sustainable growth in villages; • Support if close to Cambridge; • Should be in less heavily populated area of south cambs; • Waterbeach New Town promoters consider the site can delivered and is viable; • CPRE - Can use brownfield sites; • Croydon Parish Council – provided they use brownfield land and facilities are provided; • Fen Ditton Parish Council - opportunities like guided bus give further opportunities to sustainable travel; • Foxton Parish Council, Great Shelford Parish Council, Haslingfield Parish Council, Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – support; • Gamlingay Parish Council - Existing settlements are nearing their capacity in relation to infrastructure and services and new settlements enable for development to be properly planned and serviced without creating additional stress in
--	---

existing communities.

OBJECTIONS:

- Long lead in times, unable to make significant contribution in plan period;
- Northstowe was identified in 2000, first phase only recently approved;
- Northstowe growth rates considered over optimistic;
- Complex infrastructure delivery and finance issues, particularly in current market conditions;
- Strategy focusing on a single large settlement has proven to be flawed;
- Of previous allocated major developments, only urban extensions have delivered;
- Would put pressure on Northstowe, compete with it for resources and threaten its viability;
- Takes time for a new location to become an established part of the housing market;
- Takes time for employment provided within new settlements to become an attractive location for businesses. It is often the case that they remain a less attractive location compared with more established business centres within and on the edge of towns;
- Cambridge will remain the preferred location for businesses;
- Responding to EERA on 3 June 2009 through East of England Review process Cambridgeshire County Council, supported by all authorities within the County including South Cambridgeshire, indicated that new settlements were not supported;
- Cambridge Development Study (2009) concluded that 'new settlement options' considered, which included Waterbeach, presented significant challenges for ecology, flood risk and waste water treatment. Concluded, 'new settlements do not need to be considered at this stage' (paras 10.6.4 and 10.6.5);
- Strategy should remain Cambridge focused;
- new development strategy for South Cambridgeshire needs to recognise the links with Cambridge, particularly in terms of providing employment to support the successful economy of Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire, and housing so that the workforce can live close to where they work;
- Reduce local biodiversity;
- creation of new settlements where a sense of community has to be artificially created should be avoided;
- Learn lessons from Northstowe first;
- Would impact on nearby communities;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grow villages on a small scale. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can provide a reliable annual contribution to housing supply as part of a wider housing strategy; • The plans are based on assumptions about jobs growth, which I believe will prove to be optimistic which will limit the need for major new developments; • Need to assess what has happened with Cambourne, e.g. infrastructure delivery, before going down this route; • The success of Cambourne is a good example of what can be achieved. It should be used as an example and not spoilt by further expansion; • Do not support the use of greenfield land for new settlements due to the adverse environmental impacts, loss of agricultural land needed for growing food and the loss of open countryside;
<p>iii Sustainable Village Focus</p> <p>Support:28 Object: 28 Comment:14</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 3 Where do you think that development should be focused? (where a specific preference was expressed): Support: 40 Object: 39</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development in Villages should be provided to meet local needs; • Support local services and facilities, and their long term viability; • Support delivery of housing; • Can benefit from existing infrastructure, to support early delivery; • Past strategy focusing on a few large developments flawed; • There are available sites which mean Green Belt review not needed, limiting urban spread of Cambridge; • Villages are an attractive place to live and offer residents a high quality of life; • Support, but there are villages outside the Green Belt, so does not need a Green Belt review; • Many SHLAA sites categorised as not sustainable because of distance to Cambridge; some small development could achieve three dimensions of sustainable development; • Locating more housing within villages will support local rural economies and help to maintain the vitality and viability of their services, amenities and the communities as a whole; • Important that villages are not allowed to stagnate; • Some development, appropriately designed of a scale and kind that is benefitting of the rural villages should be encouraged; • Increase in housing stock should be addressed primarily through small increases in each community. Less pressure on one area; • Gamlingay Parish Council - Due to Gamlingay's location 16 miles to the west on the border of

	<p>Bedfordshire, the policy on sustainable locations makes our village in particular one of the least able to serve the development pressures of Cambridge;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following villages were suggested: Balsham, Bassingbourn, Caxton, Cottenham, Comberton, Croydon, Eltisley, Fen Ditton, Fen Drayton, Fowlmere, Foxton, Great Abington, Great Eversden, Great Shelford, Hardwick, Harston, Heydon, Highfields Caldecote, Histon and Impington, Linton, Litlington, Little Abington, Longstanton, Melbourn, Meldreth, Milton, Orwell, Over, Sawston, Shepreth, Thriplow, Waterbeach, Willingham. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not develop in the villages; • Unsustainable as would mean people have to commute, increasing Co2 levels by car and bus use; • Current Cambridge focus seeks to align housing and jobs; • Very few of the "so called sustainable villages" are in fact SUSTAINABLE in real terms; • Many settlements have limited range of services; • better to focus on improving the existing housing stock or in filling; • Important to protect the character of the villages around Cambridge, which can only be done by preserving the Green Belt; • villages have made a substantial contribution to housing needs over the past 30 years but they cannot be expected to continue this role and maintain their essential characteristics and environmental quality; • Would threaten village character and environmental quality; • Would not necessarily need a review of Green Belt, there are other villages, in particular along the major public transport artery of the Guided Bus Way; • Village development should not be concentrated in a few rural centres but some low-cost housing should be provided in all villages to cater for local people; • Rejected SHLAA sites in smaller villages should be considered; • Fen Ditton Parish Council – object, support sustainable new settlements; • Great Shelford Parish Council – Green Belt has already been reviewed. More housing in village would be away from services and facilities; • Haslingfield Parish Council - character and environmental standards necklace villages currently enjoy should be maintained.
--	---

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three strategy options have a degree of merit; • Significant growth in villages would lead to an unsustainable pattern of development, separating housing and jobs. Going back to a dispersed strategy would be a step backwards; • Village development to meet local needs, strengthen local facilities and support early delivery, in tandem with a Cambridge focus; • Development across a range of key villages in addition to Cambridge focussed urban extensions will ensure early delivery of housing to address current under delivery; • Support some development of the largest sustainable villages but this should not be of such a scale that their character is changed; • Croydon Parish Council – Support sustainable villages, but not a Green Belt review; • By not allowing development in existing settlements, there is danger of stifling growth and economic development in the most sustainable locations of the district.
<p>iv Combination of the above</p> <p>Support:62 Object: 17 Comment:16</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 3 Where do you think that development should be focused? (where a specific preference was expressed): Support: 41 Object: 3</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoids over reliance on one source; • Maximise potential economic benefits to the district; • Combination of the new settlement focus and sustainable villages focus options; • Combination of Cambridge edge and sustainable village focus; • Continue the sequential approach to development; • Little choice but to spread the impact over all 3 options; • Avoids placing too much pressure on one area; • Areas that have been less affected by development in recent years should be considered first; • Ensure plans are deliverable; • Need for sites early in the plan period to meet 5 year land supply; • Look for opportunities to use previously developed land; • Development should be focussed along the train lines and the guided busway; • Support balanced approach in order to meet delivery requirements. Previous focused strategy places district at risk of under delivery; • Focus on where good transport links can be delivered; • A combination of options, but protect the Green Belt; • HCA - as joint promoter of the new town of

	<p>Northstowe, is well placed to contribute to the new settlement element of this strategy;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having a greater share of development spread in many small locations is better than concentrating development in new towns and urban extensions, since the latter relies too heavily on "town planning"; • The Local Plan should not preclude the allocation of smaller, greenfield sites for residential development on the edge of 'Group Villages' that are deliverable and unconstrained and if located within the green belt, exceptional circumstances exist to justify release; • Should not preclude under utilised sites on the edge of Rural Centres; • Should not preclude Green Belt review for sites adjoining or within Minor Rural Centres; • Should support development of former agricultural buildings on the edges of Group villages, or under used employment sites; • Major efforts should be made toward creating employment and housing development in market towns away from Cambridge; • Consider Cambridge Airport again, as could meet a lot of housing need; • Focus on where there is employment, and sustainable transport; • No more development on the southern fringe of Cambridge; • Previous strategy focussing development to north of Cambridge and major development sites has meant employees working in south of District have found it harder to find housing close to work; • Bourn Parish Council – should be more detail on employment and service criteria; • Cottenham Parish Council – Avoid too much dependence on new settlements. Alternatives are available to Green Belt development; • Grantchester Parish Council - combination of New Settlement and Sustainable village focus (ii and iii), although we would support additional development of the Marshall's Cambridge East site perhaps for higher density industrial use, thereby freeing up additional sites within the City for development. New sustainable settlements and growth of existing technology and business park surroundings with excellent public and sustainable transport links should be prioritised; • Hauxton Parish Council – Develop city and keep Green Belt as buffer. Limited expansion of existing communities should be encouraged to make them sustainable - such as providing the housing which village residents need; • Ickleton Parish Council – Build on existing
--	--

	<p>strategy, but with flexibility;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milton Parish Council – Minimum development at Waterbeach. Road upgrades first; • Litlington Parish Council; Over Parish Council, Papworth Everard Parish Council, Weston Colville Parish Council, Whaddon Parish Council – Support; • Steeple Morden Parish Council – Bulk of development should be at Cambridge and the New Settlement. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A combination of extensions to Cambridge and development within sustainable villages. Object to reliance on new settlements; • No Justification for City fringe green belt land when other sites are available; • Fen Ditton Parish Council – object; <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bulk of new development should be Cambridge focussed supplemented by a further new settlement later in the plan period if needed. Village developments limited to needed to fulfil the aspirations of the local community, not provide dormitories for Cambridge; • What can be sustained is development across a range of villages in addition to Cambridge focussed urban extensions to ensure early delivery of housing to address current under delivery; • Coalescence of villages should not be promoted through allowing new developments between existing villages; • Green Belt should not be compromised; • Locate development near to services, vital villages are not allowed to stagnate;
<p>Please provide any additional comments</p> <p>Comment: 105</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 3 Where do you think that development should be focused? Total comments received: 707</p>	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As South Cambridgeshire District Council completely surrounds Cambridge it is important that the two Councils work together when determining the spatial strategy and levels of growth; • Unless South Cambridgeshire plays it full part in meeting the city's needs – in a sustainable manner – the national interest will be compromised and the District Council's own vision will not be fulfilled; • Need to take account of constrained supply in Cambridge; • It was previously stated that Cambridge was full, but there has subsequently been significant development. Should re-examine capacity within

	<p>city itself;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Cambs has a number of different property markets, each with their own requirements, which should guide spatial distribution; • New settlements will not provide the step change in delivery the district needs; • Primarily a New Settlement focus with only small developments allowed in the villages; • There are a number of closed or closing military bases in the area, why not develop these or other brown field sites. • New village at Bourn would provide a small new settlement option that would not take as long to bring forward nor need as much investment in infrastructure as other larger options. • Option ii overlooks Cambourne where there is already an established centre that provides a basis for improving and delivering greater self sufficiency and taking a more long term approach to the completion of this new community; • Worst strategy is to build new settlements. These almost always lack community cohesion, encourage car use, and are built on greenfield sites, reducing local biodiversity; • Account needs to be taken of the strategic viability of some of the proposed development sites; • New settlements demand large scale infrastructure which is seldom delivered. Focus on organic growth of settlements. • Should be greater flexibility to include development opportunities at Group and Infill villages; • Small development projects in every village; • Should be greater number of smaller sized developments rather than focus on a few large developments; • provide for more housing development sites in or on the edges of villages and a review of village frameworks should be considered; • Preserve the ethos of smaller villages. Concern about loss of village character, pressure on infrastructure, damage to countryside and rural heritage; • Need a balanced strategy we delivers growth at a number of levels in the settlement hierarchy; • The 4 options suggested do not go far enough and preclude locations where development can take place in an acceptable way contrary to the guidance in the new NPPF; • Should focus development where there is access to rail; • Focus development where there is access to the guided busway; • Need to ensure retail is available;
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 9i and 9iii because the scale of the housing requirement in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire will mean that both sustainable urban extensions and development at the larger settlements and within suitable villages; • Sites should be deliverable viable, well served by sustainable transport, and protect the environment (including Green Belt); • There should be no Green Belt review, it is important for character of the city; • Any spare land close to the city should be used for employment, and additional houses placed further out in locations where there are good transport links; • Contribution of sustainable settlements is important in early delivery of housing growth. Many are large (in terms of population), have a strong services/facilities base (e.g. schools, public transport accessibility, employment, shops), lie within close proximity to Cambridge, and have capacity to accommodate substantial housing and employment growth; • Any adjustments to Green Belt should be compensated by land elsewhere of equivalent value and should only be sacrificed if it is clear the land is not meeting purposes of Green Belt; • Test of employment accessibility in the SA should not just be to Cambridge, ignores the wider pattern of employment; • Need to recognise links with Cambridge, so workforce can live close to where they work, to reduce length and amount of car journeys; • Biggest threat to quality of life is rising dependency on car allied to cheapest housing being far from major centres of employment; • Give farmers some say in the development of their farms and holdings, such as allowing them to build a house or two or barns on their land; • English Heritage – No case for significant review of Green Belt. Will compromise Green Belt if this becomes routine; • Natural England - Seek to identify the most sustainable locations for development, ensuring all land of high value multi-functional green space is protected and enhanced and ensuring development minimises impacts and maximises enhancement opportunities wherever possible. We welcome recognition of the importance of the Green Belt; • The Wildlife Trust - Whichever combination of options is chosen, the selection should be based on an overall assessment of environmental capacity and the full range of environmental and sustainable development considerations, including
--	---

	<p>the impacts on the natural environment and biodiversity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huntingdonshire District Council - New settlements should be sustainably located in relation to public transport and impacts on trunk roads carefully examined. It will need to be clear what improvements to A14 and A428 are required having regard to the proposals contained within Huntingdonshire District Council's documents affecting these roads. Need to consider cross boundary retail impacts; • Hertfordshire County Council - some development is likely to come forward within villages or rural service centres, in close proximity to Hertfordshire. Welcome an ongoing dialogue on cross-boundary implications of any emerging strategy; • Suffolk County Council - Council wish to see full assessment of impact of growth on routes into Suffolk - A11, A14 and A1307. Welcome focus development to provide strong public transport links to Cambridge, and suggest consider ways to develop routes across county borders; • St.Edmundsbury Borough Council - does not consider it appropriate to suggest which would be the most sustainable strategy for South Cambridgeshire. The pertinent matter is whether the strategy would have a detrimental impact on St Edmundsbury. However, it is considered that a Cambridge focus would not have an impact, unless it had a detrimental impact on the travel arteries between Haverhill and the city; • Caldecote Parish Council - The main focus should be on extension of or building new settlements. West of Cambridge has already had significant development, and infrastructure beginning to suffer. Other areas should be considered first; • Comberton Parish Council - SCDC should favour development of New Towns (Waterbeach barracks), and or New Village (Bourn Airfield). Both of these have the ability to be built 'from scratch' on brown-field sites with access to good transport links and to incorporate district-wide affordable housing. Any village development should be focussed on villages that want to expand, have good A-road transport links, and with spare capacity in the infrastructure; • Dry Drayton Parish Council - objective should be to make existing villages more sustainable, and not just to confine development to larger villages; • Great Abington Parish Council - prioritise options i and iii but not rule out option ii completely; • Great Chesterford Parish Council - Concerned
--	---

	<p>in-filling in any of proposed sites, and cumulative effect of all sites, will have on already congested access roads, key junctions and journey time to Cambridge;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Histon and Impington Parish Council - urges adoption of a policy of encouraging developments close to guideway route. These houses may have less parking spaces than developments more than 1.5km from guide way stops. Northstowe will fit within our distance criteria but sites such as a northern site in our villages would not; • Papworth Everard Parish Council – Only the most sustainable villages at the top of the hierarchy should be included; • Steeple Morden Parish Council - Support the current policy of development in major centres. <p>Themes raised in questionnaire responses to question 3 (number of respondents in brackets):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect the Green Belt (119) • Use Brownfield land (66) • Where appropriate infrastructure exists or can be provided (62) • Small scale / gradual/ natural growth of villages where community accepts growth (36) • At Northstowe (28) • Waterbeach / Waterbeach Barracks (21) • Bourn Airfield (19) • No development (18) • Infilling (17) • Cambourne (11)
<p>QUESTION 10: Green Belt Purposes and Functions</p>	
<p>Do you think the Green Belt purposes and functions remain appropriate for the new plan?</p> <p>Support:89 Object: 15 Comment: 39</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The functions of the Green Belt remain appropriate for the new Local Plan; • Green Belt is essential to identity and character of Cambridge; • Green Belt boundaries should not be reviewed further; • Green Belt performs important function and should be maintained; • Protects agricultural land, supports recreation, maintains separation of settlements • The concepts of "a soft green edge to the city" and "a distinctive urban edge" are contradictory; an urban edge would be hard and grey; • The Local Plan should address Green Belt landscape enhancement; • Rural heritage of the Green Belt is key to quality of life; • To prevent urban sprawl and protect setting of historic city, remain highly relevant for new Plan;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The compact nature of Cambridge is one of the reasons that Cambridge is easy for walking and cycling; • Needs to be reviewed on a regular basis, can not be regarded as sacrosanct; • Once established it should not be reviewed; • The Green Belt is meaningless if it isn't accessible or designated a nature corridor/reserve; • CPRE - Green Belt land review was less than 10 years ago, it is unnecessary to review it now; • Caldeote Parish Council, Cambourne Parish Council, Comberton Parish Council, Fen Ditton Parish Council, Fowlmere Parish Council; Foxton Parish Council, Grantchester Parish Council; Great Abington Parish Council, Great and Little Chishill Parish Council, Great Shelford Parish Council, Haslingfield Parish Council, Hauxton Parish Council, Histon and Impington Parish Council, Ickleton Parish Council, Litlington Parish Council, Little Abington Parish Council, Milton Parish Council, Oakington and Westwick Parish Council, Over Parish Council, Pampisford Parish Council, Rampton Parish Council, Stapleford Parish Council, Steeple Morden Parish Council, Weston Colville Parish Council – Support. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not consistent with PPG2, and NPPF; • Many of the suggested purposes and functions of the Green Belt stated are more related to landscape quality issues and are not directly related to Green Belt. Many areas of the Green Belt do not perform any of these functions. The Plan must distinguish between these issues and the purposes and functions of the Green Belt should be consistent with the NPPF; • Outdoor sport and recreation should also identified as a function of the Green Belt around Cambridge; • Green Belt purposes and functions should not restrict development at the expense of other factors, such as village amenity and open space; • It will be critical to carry out a full and detailed Green Belt review, in accordance with requirements in the NPPF, to ensure that full consideration is given to the development strategy and that any areas proposed to be released from the Green Belt have been fully assessed, particularly in terms of purpose and function; • Purpose and functions not suitable as Green Belt review is needed to meet development needs; • The area of the Green Belt needs to be expanded significantly, with more safeguarding form development and promotion of biodiversity; • The Wildlife Trust – Purposes are insufficient, an
--	---

	<p>additional key purpose for the Cambridge Green Belt should be to provide a wildlife-rich environment and high quality green infrastructure that makes a significant contribution to the enhancement of our natural environment and biodiversity and the delivery of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy;</p> <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 4.24 is incorrect. William Holford and Myles Wright did not recommend the establishment of a green belt for Cambridge. They recommended a limitation on the growth of the borough (as it then was) and to achieve this suggested a limit to building development. If anyone can be regarded as the instigator of the Cambridge Green Belt it must be W.R. Davidge, the town planner who made recommendations in 1934. • Review may be necessary to meet housing needs; • Should be retained in all but exceptional circumstances; • The potential for wind energy generation in the Green Belt should also be considered and provided for in the Local Plan; • They need careful scrutiny - e.g. preserving Cambridge as a compact city runs up against the expansion needed because of its success. How big is compact? • Green Belt policy is clear, need to set out functions is a little redundant; • English Heritage - The purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt set out are appropriate and true to those in the NPPF, in previous national policy in PPG2 and in the original ambitions for the Green Belt when it was designated. It will be helpful to set these out clearly in policy since the purpose of protecting the character and setting of Cambridge is quite distinct from the role of other Green Belt containing metropolitan areas. The function of maintaining a connection between the historic core and the surrounding landscape through relative proximity could also be added. The Landscape Design Associates Green Belt Study (2003) refers to the way in which short distances between the urban edge, gateways and the historic centre help to define, and allow appreciation of the identity of Cambridge as a historic city; • Environment Agency – In addition, the areas of green belt around Cambridge and its neighbouring settlements can form a 'strategic green infrastructure linkage'. By this we mean linkages of a significant nature and on a strategic scale; • Natural England - would welcome an approach which seeks to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt by providing opportunities for outdoor
--	--

	<p>sports and recreation, increasing access, improvements and enhancements to visual amenity and biodiversity;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coton Parish Council, Madingley Parish Council - no "exceptional case" for further destruction of the green belt around the fringes of Cambridge; • Cottenham Parish Council - There is no need for further encroachment into the green-belt of SCDC; • Conservators of the River Cam – Should refer to the River Cam as a feature; • Grantchester Parish Council - Every effort should be made to prevent arterial traffic routes from fragmenting these green spaces. Joining them to provide sustainable walkways and cycle paths around as well as into and out of the City should be added as a function/purpose; • Whaddon Parish Council – Green Belt has already lost its purpose due to amount of development taking place.
<p>QUESTION 11: Do you consider that more land, beyond that already released and committed, on the edge of Cambridge and potentially at larger villages, should be released from the Green Belt to achieve sustainable development?</p> <p>Please provide any comments and explain why you think there are exceptional circumstances?</p>	
<p>Support:53 Object: 178 Comment: 44</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 4 What are your views on releasing land from the Green Belt to allow more development on the edge of Cambridge or larger villages? Total comments received: 697 (comments on broad locations recorded under Question 12)</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We consider that special circumstances exist to justify a review of the Cambridge Green Belt boundary and the subsequent release of land for development and/or safeguarding. Firstly, there is a need for housing and affordable housing in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire. Secondly, land previously released from the Green Belt to meet development needs - Cambridge East - which was expected to make a substantial contribution to future housing land supply will now no longer be available during the plan period and so alternative sites are required. In addition, the Green Belt studies undertaken in 2002 are now out of date and assessed broad areas only in terms of whether the land met Green Belt aims, but did not assess in detail whether parcels of land could be removed from the Green Belt without affecting the purposes for including land within it. A detailed and up to date review of the Green Belt boundary should be undertaken now for this Local Plan • Because employers are looking for sites closer to Cambridge • There are exceptional circumstances that justify the release of Cottenham Sawmills from the green belt, namely, the change in circumstances at

	<p>Cambridge East and Northstowe and the resulting need to provide additional village development, and the considerable housing need within Cottenham.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is considered that more land should be released from the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge as this is the most sustainable approach to meeting the Councils housing and employment needs for the Plan period. These objectively assessed needs for further growth and the high levels of housing need constitute exceptional circumstances which justify the release of Green Belt Land. Paragraph 84 of the NPPF acknowledges that the release of Green Belt land on the edge of urban areas through Local Plans can be appropriate where this is the most sustainable form of development. • Cambourne Parish Council -Support • We consider that there is a greater need for growth than proposed in the Issues and Options document and that this need provides the exceptional circumstance to release land from the Green Belt. • Cambridgeshire County Council - We support the release of land from the Green Belt in order to (a) achieve development in the most sustainable existing locations and (b) where it can deliver much needed new housing (including affordable) within the first half of the Plan period (as would be the case with a suitably large development of up to 500 homes on the edge of Cambridge/Rural Centre or up to 100 homes in a Minor Rural Centre/Group Village. • More land, beyond that already committed, should be released from the Green Belt in order to achieve sustainable development. Through the managed release of land in suitable locations, such as Site 24 in Cottenham, pressures on green space within villages can be alleviated whilst ensuring there's minimal impact on the wider Green Belt and its aims • There are exceptional circumstances that justify the release of Land north of High Street and west of Chapel Road, Great Eversden, from the green belt namely, the change in circumstances at Cambridge East and Northstowe and the resulting need to provide additional village development, and the considerable housing need within Great Eversden and Little Eversden. • The Cottenham Village Design Group would however like to see the Green Belt reviewed in some areas such that if development of the village does occur it happens in beneficial and sustainable areas. The areas to be reviewed
--	---

	<p>would be relatively small, any reduction should be made up by improvements in access etc elsewhere. It remains especially important for the residents of Cottenham that there is no coalescence with Histon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You have 5000 on your housing list. You will have to sacrifice SOME green belt somewhere • Cambridge and S Cambs growth probably represent such exceptional circumstances. But some of the villages close to Cambridge are quite charming and sensitive to being ruined by having 500 houses built on their edges, so you may have to focus on those that would not suffer so grievously. My votes are for Milton, Fulbourn and Waterbeach. But Cambridge fringe long before these • More land should be released from Green Belt to achieve sustainable development • There are exceptional circumstances that justify the release of Land off Cambridge Road, Waterbeach (the site in its entirety), namely, the change in circumstances at Cambridge East and Northstowe and the resulting need to provide additional village development, and the considerable housing need within Waterbeach. An additional circumstance is the recommendation within the Council's Employment Land Review that future B1a office accommodation should be focused within the Cambridge Northern Fringe. • Green Belt review would be welcomed alongside preparation of Plan, not on an ad hoc basis. Would ensure all development options thoroughly investigated and coherent and focused policy approach. Justification to release Green Belt sites on edge of existing villages to sustain existing services and to meet local affordable housing needs. All settlements in Green Belt should provide a degree of growth. Importance of retaining integrity of Green Belt acknowledged, review is necessary in response to housing need and land supply situation. Without it the chronic shortage of housing will not be addressed. • It is critically needed to provide more housing and to some degree more sites for development of business. Furthermore, an increase in housing construction will help stimulate an economy that is still not providing adequate employment possibilities to all residents. AND, housing that is vitally needed, especially affordable housing, will be created! • Exceptional circumstances exist to justify the release of more land from the Green Belt to achieve sustainable development. These circumstances are the high housing need; limited
--	---

	<p>supply of non-Green Belt sites; failure of other larger sites to deliver; pressure on the open countryside beyond the Green Belt, and; strategic location of parts of the Green Belt to important transport corridors. One such area where the Green Belt should be reviewed is in the vicinity of the redundant Waste Water Treatment Works in Hauxton. The release of this site would secure the necessary strategy to remove the incongruous industrial structures at this site referred to by the Inspector for the Site Specific Proposals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ickleton Parish Council - It seems sensible to review the Green Belt from time to time. If there is a case for releasing parts of it to achieve sustainable development this should happen, but there should be compensatory extensions to the Green Belt so that its overriding objectives continue to be met. • Paragraph 84 of the NPPF acknowledges that the release of Green Belt land on the edge of urban areas through Local Plans can be appropriate where this is the most sustainable form of development • Villages such as Milton are ideally placed to accept additional housing, but the Green Belt boundary is tightly drawn and there is very limited scope for additional development without a review of the Green Belt. • Litlington Parish Council – Support • Little Abington Parish Council - Where it is essential then Green Belt land may be released, but additional land, in proportion to the land released, should be added to the Green Belt as close as possible to the released area to ensure that the purposes and functions of the Green Belt are not compromised. • Around Cambridge = YES. Around the villages = NO. • The Green belt should be preserved however if land within the belt is already compromised by nearby development or for example adjacent to Addenbrooke's or a Park and Ride sensitive and high quality development that enhances the site and area could be supported • At larger villages, but only where there is local support • Through the managed release of land in suitable locations, such as Land north of White Field Way, Sawston, pressures on green space within Villages can be alleviated whilst ensuring there is a minimal impact on the wider Green Belt. • It is almost inevitable that Green Belt land will have to be given up. London's Green Belt serves only to encourage commuting from beyond the
--	---

	<p>Green Belt. Cambridge's Green Belt, if maintained in its present form, will contribute to doing exactly the same. Already Cambourne and later Northstowe cannot avoid being primarily commuter villages. If people working in Cambridge are expected to live in Cambridge rather than commuter villages, then selective removal of the Green Belt is essential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptional circumstances do exist in that this can be achieved without significant net loss to Green Belt overall. First preference and priority should be given to developing sustainable sites and previously developed land, such as Bourn Airfield before releasing Green Belt sites. • Whaddon Parish Council - Yes, but only in circumstances where it is sustainable and in keeping <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the retention in Green Belt of land surrounding Fulbourn and between Fulbourn and urban edge of Cambridge (BL7/8). Green Belt continues to play an important role in protecting the setting of city and preventing urban sprawl • Keep as much Green Belt areas as we can, especially woodlands and farmland. Wildlife and agriculture should be protected and more food produced locally. • The key priority of the Local Plan should surely be to save the Green Belt and build on brownfield. Cambridge and all the surrounding villages are what they are today (and don't suffer from urban sprawl) because of the focus on protecting Greenbelt and building on brownfield land • Special circumstances are not a valid reason for releasing further green belt land for development. The reasons for its creation have not changed. There is no guarantee that accommodation built on released green belt land will be lived in by people already living in the area; nor does building in itself provide sustainable long-term employment • Building more housing on green-field sites is not "sustainable". Replacing green areas with housing only increases the environmental impact of the population, unless compensated by an equivalent currently built area released to make a green-field site elsewhere (implying an extra cost in restoration of the site to a natural state). • The run off water from the houses will have to drain into the Cam, creating the flooding of the future. In Eastern England, there is an acute shortage of water to service the proposed developments. The proposed development includes 12,500 houses in the Green Belt. The
--	--

	<p>Green Belt should remain green. If land is developed either side of the A603 between Barton and Newham, then the task of commuters getting into Cambridge each morning will become increasingly horrendous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I object to any further development of Green Belt land in Stapleford, due to the resulting increase in traffic and accompanying impact on safety for pedestrians, especially for children walking to school. Further development in the Green Belt would also change the rural character of the village • Green belt must be protected. It must not be 'nibbled' at. Allowing development in some areas sets precedent. It becomes difficult to justify objection to future development if some is allowed now. Once it's gone, it's gone. These decisions cannot be reversed • We do not believe that the exceptional circumstances required by the NPPF exist to justify release of further land from Green Belt to meet housing and employment needs. We particularly object to the growth of Group Villages within Green Belt and suggest an alternative strategy should be considered with allocation of sites in other Group Villages and flexibility for development on edges of Group and Infill Villages. This alternative strategy will ensure Local Plan is compliant with NPPF by ensuring Green Belt area 'safeguards the countryside from encroachment' which is a defined purpose set out in NPPF. • The purpose of the green belt is to protect areas around a city from development, and to maintain easy access to city amenities from people who live in the countryside and vice versa. If land is constantly taken away from it, the green belt serves no function except to frustrate the lives of ordinary people living within it and to concentrate development opportunities into the hands of big developers • Caldecote Parish Council - The majority of Caldecote residents felt that the Green Belt should be protected • Needs to be clear reason to take land out of Green Belt. Presumption otherwise against it • No. The Local Plan should include a 'presumption against development' in the Green Belt in accordance with the NPPF. The 'very special circumstances' justifying development must not prevail when reasonable alternatives for development land are available outside the Green Belt. For this plan period adequate land for housing and employment can be provided in the
--	---

	<p>Cambridge sub-region without the need to release more Green Belt land. Development within the Green Belt should be allocated only where it has the least visual impact on it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Cambridge Green Belt land review was less than 10 years ago, so it is unnecessary to review it now. We do not believe that economic growth makes for an exceptional circumstance which overrides the purposes of the Cambridge Green Belt. • Caxton Parish Council - protection is needed • The Cambridge Green Belt, already narrow and fragile, should not be further eroded. Development, to be sustainable, does not necessarily have to be located close to or even adjoining, an existing city or town provided that there are, or will be, good public transport links. There might be scope to allow very limited development in some of the green belt villages if by doing so it preserves or enhances their viability as successful local communities (by providing, for example, additional custom for local shops and public houses). • Coton Parish Council - The SCDC Issues and Options Paper offers significant brown field development sites for Cambridge and the District, more than enough to cater for both the City, and District growth. There is therefore no "exceptional case" to be made for further destruction of the green belt around the fringes of Cambridge City. • Cottenham Parish Council - If a project already permitted needs a little more land (to a maximum of 10 acres) in order to be completed then such an exception might be made, but in broad terms 'No!' - and this certainly applies to Cottenham's green-belt. A different view might be needed for plan period 2032 - 2050 but further erosion of green-belt around Cambridge will add to urban sprawl and, particularly in the north-east, run the risk of absorbing more villages into the suburbs of the emerging Greater Cambridge. The existence of alternative sustainable sites would leave the green-belt untouched. • Trumpington and Great Kneighton developments demonstrate vividly the damage that is done by eroding the green belt • Croydon Parish Council - How many "exceptional circumstances" will there be before all the Green Belt is swallowed up. Once it has gone, it can never be replaced. There must be other areas where growth can be made in order to ensure a sustainable development strategy for the wider Cambridge area, and these should be used
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green belt is essential for biodiversity. Destroying these habitats will greatly decrease biodiversity and natural wildlife. • Cambridge's success, as a 'boom town' in terms of employment opportunities and proximity to London means there will always be a perceived housing shortage and an argument for more housing provision, regardless of existing houses and the number of new homes built. Cambridge is already affected adversely from over-development and the quality of life for existing residents is at risk. Considerable and expansive housing developments are already in progress on greenfield sites and greenbelt land in Cambridge. No further areas of green belt should be lost. • Fen Ditton Parish Council - Disagree. Brownfield development north of Newmarket Road to be considered. Additional minor expansion south of Cambridge based on highway and guided bus may be considered since the Green Belt is now being encroached on so heavily • Foxton Parish Council - Green Belt should be kept as it is • Fulbourn Parish Council - Opposed to changes to the Green Belt around the village and between the village and Cherry Hinton in order to retain the environmental and ambiance of Fulbourn and to protect the open countryside which extends into built up areas of the village. • In the SHLAA/SA it mentions that Outer Rural Areas play a lesser role in contributing to the distinctiveness of Cambridge. In my view the distinctiveness of Impington has to be considered and developing this site would have a negative impact. • Grantchester Parish Council - Not on the edge of the City - No. However, we do support additional land being released from areas surrounding larger villages and business and technology parks. Business and technology parks outside the City should become centres for new communities and require proper facilities, such as shopping, eating and social facilities. Many existing parks are not well catered for and have limited eating and shopping choices. In order to improve this dynamic, policies should support shopping, eating and facility planning in the new and existing settlements, which naturally take time to establish. • Great Shelford Parish Council – There is plenty of development land, therefore exceptional circumstances do not exist • Haslingfield Parish Council - The justification is that Marshalls chose to keep their business on its
--	--

	<p>current site rather than move and this has lowered the projected number of properties that can be located there. This illustrates the difficulty of forward projection over such a long period. Possible sites will appear (Waterbeach & Bassingbourn barracks) and others (Marshalls) will disappear but it is certain that if green belt land is removed, it will never be reversed. At the time of the last incursion into the green belt at Trumpington Meadows, promises were given that no further changes would be proposed - yet here we are again.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hauxton Parish Council - There are vacant shops, offices and industrial sites throughout Cambridge. These should be filled before there is any incursion into the greenbelt. Sites have been developed for employment but no employers have moved in. • Support retention in Green Belt of land to the west of Station Road, Site Option 28. Long established in Green Belt and its importance to the character of Fulbourn village and its historic rural setting has been confirmed at numerous reviews. The way that the open countryside penetrates right into the heart of the village between Station Road, Church Lane, Apthorpe Street and Cox's Drove is an important feature and should be retained. • NPPF underlines the importance of the permanence of Green Belt boundaries. In the case of the Cambridge Green Belt, this was the subject of a thorough review as part of the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan Review in 2003. It would be entirely contrary to the NPPF requirement for permanence for the Green Belt to be reviewed again less than ten years later. Green Belt locations already considered through Structure Plan, and sites making marginal contribution to Green Belt already released. Those which are left are critical to the maintenance of the Green Belt purposes and functions. SCDC and CCC have failed to take local authority boundary blind' approach to producing the most appropriate planning strategy for the greater Cambridge area to 2031. If the legitimate development needs of the City Council could be met anywhere in the joint plan area, the pressure for inappropriate Green Belt releases would dissipate • Histon & Impington Parish Council - Physical separation from Histon and Impington very important: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A14 to South • East to Milton - Mereway Farm warehouses must not be site of further development.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distance from Cottenham northwards - further development in this area must be resisted. • North West to Oakington (and beyond to Northstowe). No infill in this area. • East to Girton - NIAB land south of A14 for development, but development on land north of A14 should not be permitted. <p>NPPF clear that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. No exceptional circumstances driving the alteration of Green Belt in Histon or Impington.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the release of additional land from the Green Belt for development in circumstances where that development would fill-in completely, or partially, gaps between Cambridge and villages that are currently separated from Cambridge by undeveloped land (e.g. Fulbourn and Teversham). This development would detract substantially from the established character of these villages as being separated from Cambridge, and lead to the loss of valued amenities. I specifically object to Broad Locations 6-8, which would inevitably result in the eventual subsuming of Shelford, Fulbourn and Teversham into Cambridge • We do not believe the exceptional circumstances required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) exist to justify the release of further land from the Green Belt to meet the housing and employment needs of the area. Object to the growth of Group Villages within the Green Belt area and suggest that an alternative strategy should be considered with the allocation of sites in other Group Villages outside the Green Belt such as SHLAA site 020. • I object to development at Comberton into the Green Belt. Significant expansion into the Green Belt will destroy the rural character of the village. Development should be at self-contained brownfield sites, not in existing villages. • Milton Parish Council – No more land should be released from the Green Belt • Natural England - Natural England have particular concerns with proposals for release of Green Belt land where this is likely to have an adverse effect on biodiversity, landscape and access/amenity, including impacts on designated sites such as SSSIs and County Wildlife Sites (CWS) and wider biodiversity and strategic GI. Appendix 2, Assessment of Broad Locations on the Edge of Cambridge, identifies that most of the locations support areas of at least local biodiversity / GI importance and most include landscape essential to preserving the special character and setting of Cambridge.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alconbury Airfield with its financial advantages would be a better place for development. Concreting over large swathes of South Cambs should be drastically reduced. • Oakington and Westwick Parish Council – No • The Green Belt around Cambridge should be preserved and protected from any further erosion. Most people who live and work in and around Cambridge value Cambridge for the way it is, as a compact city, and would be concerned to see any major change in its character. It follows that, other than sustainable development within existing City boundary, if additional housing numbers are required, they should be sought outside the Green Belt. • Over Parish Council – Do not support • Pampisford Parish Council - Do not support • Completely new villages further out of Cambridge like Cambourne are the answer, the housing cost is cheaper for first time buyers if the village is further away from Cambridge and the village can be made greener and more efficient instead of just adding bits to centuries old villages that can't properly sustain the growth. • "Exceptional circumstances" required by NPPF cannot apply when there are other viable alternative options outside the Green Belt like Waterbeach Barracks. Exceptional circumstances should apply only to small-scale cases, like expansion of ARM, where there are obvious benefits to the people of the area - or similar case where there is an obvious employment benefit to people of Cambridge. If every time Local Plan is reviewed yet more land is taken, then the status of the Green Belt is so degraded as to become worthless • Any encroachment on the Green Belt (other than for recreational use) would be contrary to the Stapleford Parish Plan and the democratic way in which the Plan was produced • Rampton Parish Council – No, except for small ad-hoc releases • No, there are vast areas of brown field land at Waterbeach, Oakington and Alconbury plus Cambourne needs expanding to achieve its critical mass. • You'll either end up with dense housing on the edge of villages, degrading their character and setting or you'll have poor utilisation of what was farm land if built at low densities • Development should not occur within the Cambridge green belt as it is vital to the character of the city and the transport infrastructure could not cope with any more houses in this area. If
--	---

	<p>there has to be new development it should therefore go to the larger villages which have already lost their rural character, but this development should always come with appropriate facilities for the people who are going to live there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responses to the Parish Plan state Fulbourn must retain its character as a village. This means preserving the Green Belt between the present western boundary of housing and the encroaching boundary of Cambridge. Ida Darwin should remain in the Green Belt. Villages like Fulbourn which are close to extending urban conurbations should have their character protected by retaining existing Green Belt. • I object to erosion of Green Belt land in Waterbeach, particularly when there is a brownfield site (The Barracks) currently under consideration for housing in the same village • The continued inclusion of the Scotsdales site in the Green Belt is anomalous given that it does not contribute towards any of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt and serves no useful planning purpose and is therefore unreasonable and unnecessary. The Council should therefore exclude the site from the Green Belt. • Stapleford Parish Council - Parish Council does not wish to see encroachment or erosion of Green Belt in and around village, with possible exception of recreational use. Consistent with Stapleford's Parish Plan. Key objective 'To preserve and enhance the country feel of Stapleford' by 'Resist any encroachment or erosion of the Green Belt for other than recreational use'. Maintaining Green Belt to create a clear break between Cambridge as a city and surrounding villages should remain a continuing goal for Council. • The Wildlife Trust - There are significant environmental constraints associated with the proposed options for release of green belt land, including compromising delivery of the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy. For example, option 7 overlaps with the Gog Magogs Countryside Area, which is a high priority for the creation of chalk grassland and other habitats and the expansion and linkage of a series of designated sites including SSSIs, Wildlife Sites and Local Nature Reserves; and option 10 would take away the last opportunity to create strategic green infrastructure for the NIAB developments. • The Trumpington Residents' Association does not believe there are exceptional circumstances for revising the inner boundary of the Green Belt. The
--	---

	<p>decisions taken in the 2000s to release land in the Southern Fringe are resulting in a well-designed series of developments with a strong urban edge and transition from countryside to the city; any further development would be very detrimental. The remaining Green Belt provides an even more vital separation between Trumpington and Great Shelford, Hauxton, Harston and Grantchester. The new edge to the agreed developments has an important role in preserving the setting and character of the city</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of the Green Belt on the edge of Cambridge is needed. We object to the fact that a review of the Green Belt around <u>all</u> villages is not identified as an option, and feel that the remit should be widened not just to encompass the larger villages. • This is a loaded question, to have 'development' you obviously need space. It is a self answering question. Sustainability is a word that means little, but gives 'Development' a veneer of acceptability. • Weston Colville Parish Council – Retain the Green Belt <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any proposed development of greenbelt needs to take into account where the greatest demands are - such as in Cambridge itself. This would mean that development of greenbelt around the outlying villages, which are not easily accessible by cycle or bus routes, are not realistic proposals • It may be necessary to release further land on the edge of Cambridge to prevent development being forced away from the City into the surrounding villages. Green Belt should be safeguarded around the necklace villages. A major function of Green Belt is to prevent the merging of settlements and the absorption of more villages into the Cambridge conurbation • Barton Parish Council - The SCDC Issues and Options Paper offers significant brown field development sites for Cambridge and the District, more than enough to cater for both the City, and District growth. There is therefore no "exceptional case" to be made for further destruction of the green belt around the fringes of Cambridge City. • Cambridgeshire County Council - In the event that any change is made to the Cambridge Green Belt in Cambridge South the opportunity to address the outstanding need for a new Household Recycling Centre (HRC) to serve new and existing communities should be taken • It should be possible to develop on outskirts of Cambridge without great deal of change to Green Belt. Any adjustments should be compensated by
--	--

	<p>land elsewhere of same value and only if the land is not meeting purposes of Green Belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a thorough assessment of the potential of non-Green Belt sites such as Melbourn which will influence the need or otherwise to release additional Green Belt land elsewhere • Comberton Parish Council - Retain the Green Belt and avoid urban sprawl that could destroy the character of the landscape and villages that surround Cambridge city and of Cambridgeshire itself. • The vision of wider development in the green belt must not ignore the restrictions within the City centre and its problems with rail transport, bus provision in the rural areas and car parking. It offers the jobs but the rural area will provide the affordable housing. We will reach gridlock if these two are not very carefully considered together • English Heritage - The boundary of the Green Belt has only recently been reviewed and we do not consider that it can be justified to look for further extension into this landscape. The implication of further erosion of the Green Belt would be to suggest the protection afforded is something that is transient and without basis, rather than founded on an assessment of the kind of city Cambridge should be, and its capacity to absorb growth without damage to its character and setting. The relevance of setting to historic towns through green belt designation is recognised in English Heritage's guidance 'The Setting of Heritage Assets'. The approach to setting and character in the Cambridge Green Belt Study (Landscape Design Associates 2003) is helpful in the way it seeks to analyse the way in which the city of Cambridge is experienced, including not just significant views (important though these are), but also the connection of the historic core to the surrounding landscape, the distance from the urban edge to the edge of the historic centre, the dominance of the historic core and other aspects affecting the manner in which the historic city is appreciated. Notwithstanding these comments, we would suggest that some parts of the Green Belt are especially critical to the purpose of protecting the character and setting of Cambridge because of their special visual, aesthetic and historic value. • Environment Agency - Any such proposals for increased expansion of any major settlements should be appropriately investigated to ensure that development in such locations is 'sustainable'. The principle of development within close proximity to existing services and amenities means that these
--	--

	<p>areas should be considered for allocation of growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fowlmere Parish Council - Only under the most exceptional circumstances should Green Belt release be contemplated. The priority should be to use Brownfield land inside the Green Belt. Any releases of Green Belt should be matched by extensions of the Green Belt. • Great Abington Parish Council & Steeple Morden Parish Council - Only in exceptional circumstances and if additional land is added to the Green Belt to compensate the loss. • There are exceptional circumstances which justify a review of the Green Belt to remove land at Trumpington for the Cambridge Sporting Village and development would not significantly impact on green belt purposes • More land, beyond that already previously released at larger villages should be released from Green Belt to achieve sustainable development. A number of sites that could come forward for development to meet housing needs are constrained by Green Belt. This includes our client's site on land to the south of Villa Road in Histon. This site could provide for a mix of housing, including affordable, to meet needs. It is considered there are exceptional circumstances to release some Green Belt land if affordable schemes are brought forward to address housing requirements. • The Green Belt should be reinstated in SCambs at Cambridge Airport • Madingley Parish Council - The SCDC Issues and Options Paper offers significant brown field development sites for Cambridge and the District, more than enough to cater for both the City, and District growth. There is therefore no "exceptional case" to be made for further destruction of the green belt around the fringes of Cambridge. • The Green Belt must be safeguarded around the necklace villages. We must prevent the coalescence of necklace villages such as Great Shelford, Harston, Hauxton, Little Shelford and Stapleford into a Greater Cambridge conurbation. • Sites outside the Green Belt should be examined before releasing Green Belt land. Land outside the Green Belt is not subject to the same national protection and less constrained sites and villages should be considered preferable locations for new residential and commercial development. Longstanton, already set to expand massively with the delivery of Northstowe, is an ideal place for additional small scale development • The Wildlife Trust - Assessment should be based
--	---

	<p>on an analysis of the environmental capacity of the area, its existing environmental value and its potential to contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment and quality of green belt for biodiversity that is required to meet the objectives of published environmental strategies. It should also be based on an analysis of the environmental sustainability of the different development strategies considered earlier in this document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbeach Parish Council - Decisions should be based on the need to protect the environment and setting of Cambridge, the avoidance of development on recreation /open space land and in areas with better infrastructure. <p>Questionnaire reponses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We think that if there is no brownfield sites Green Belt should be used around existing villages • Any development of any Green Belt area is extremely sensitive and would require extremely careful and well researched planning. However development south of the City would assist commuters to towns south of the City and London areas, of whom there are many. • Protect the green belt as far as possible - focus any development on energy efficient / environmentally friendly housing stock built with sustainable best-in-class infrastructure on brown-field sites. (That also implies near the northern fringe where jobs are due to be created)" • No greenbelt should be touched - especially in Comberton. The vast majority of people are against the proposed development sites. It would be very detrimental to the village's character and heritage and to peoples livelihoods who live adjacent to the sites. Loss of amenity, loss of privacy, loss of views, loss of value in their homes. Not to mention the drastic negative affects it will have on the village services such as longer waiting time to see a doctor - increased safety issues for children crossing our roads, more environmental damage, more flooding, more sewage capacity issues, inadequate transport links meaning more car use etc. • The purposes and functions of the Green Belt are still relevant however there are several areas that are currently designated as Green Belt that do not fulfil the functions of the Green Belt. In order for the Council to meet its full objectively assessed housing needs, it is important that a full Green Belt is undertaken to consider the potential of each of the villages, large and small, to meet their own housing needs and contribute to the overall District need. • Comberton Parish Council - Supported by 301
--	--

	<p>signatories (of which 267 signatories have been individually registered). All 10 options would go against the spirit of the 2009 SSP inspector who noted: "The most relevant principles...are those concerned with the maintenance of views of the historic core of Cambridge, providing green separation between the urban expansion and existing settlements, and protecting green corridors." SCDC should resist the temptation to take away from the green belt. This could cause 'urban sprawl' and destroy the very character of the villages that surround Cambridge City and of Cambridgeshire itself. Be bold - protect the green belt as far as possible - focus any development on energy efficient / environmentally friendly housing stock built with sustainable best-in-class infrastructure on truly brown-field sites. (That also implies near the northern fringe where jobs are due to be created)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huge effort should be put into maintaining existing Green Belt and, when it has to be sacrificed, one or two larger sacrifices would be much better than lots of 'small' sacrifices which would detract from the districts good qualities as a whole. • Clearly some Green Belt release is needed, but this should be limited by a more favourable approach to expansion of existing villages beyond the Green Belt provided they have some services and for proximity to public transport • Linton Parish Council - Land should not be released from Green Belt • I think any further development should be nearer the city so that people can use public transport. The bus service to Bourn / Cambourne is still fairly poor in my opinion and of no use in the morning as the traffic is so bad on Madingley Hill. • Villages should be allowed to expand and develop. The boundaries should be redrawn to allow infilling and back-land development on unused land. Keeping development within villages "tight" fosters community spirit, impossible to achieve with ribbon development. Large developments attract national companies that complete the build and then leave the area. Smaller developments are completed by local tradesmen that live and spend in the community • Important not to develop on green field sites. Aim to use brown field sites such as use of town centres which have a large amount of unoccupied retail properties. • Don't release any more Green Belt land. Look to make a new village if absolutely necessary instead • Rationalise Green Belt development to achieve
--	--

	<p>lowest CO2 impact. Develop 'garden suburbs' in market towns and larger neighbour schools in rural centres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop near Cambourne • The Green Belt should be kept round Cambridge, otherwise there will be urban sprawl. The villages were planned as villages and should be kept as that as much as possible or South Cambs will become unrecognisable. • In general - it makes sense to release Green Belt land (after brownfield / infill has been exhausted) as it is likely to be close to supporting infrastructure. However it should be supported by green infrastructure / good alternative landscaping and green spaces provided to replace. • In future, good farmland will be absolutely vital and should be cherished now. Think of future generations. What about water supplies and drainage? • Housing is more of a priority than beautiful scenery • Development in any of the ten identified locations would degrade the setting of the city and the resultant urbanisation would change and damage the character of Cambridge. Similarly, the Green Belt around the villages should be protected as it has an important role in maintaining "village feel" as development changes the character of these villages. • Leave the Green Belt as it is, as Cambridge City centre and local infrastructure cannot support additional residents • Do not lose Green Belt unless within the A14 or M11 • Some review of the Green Belt around Cambridge may be appropriate as this is where the greatest pressure for new jobs / homes will be. • Hildersham Parish Council - Although Green Belts are very good , there should be a degree of flexibility in some areas. • We need to preserve rural nature - for all, not just village residents • Development should be directed to sites outside the green belt with good transport links to the major areas of employment. • If housing is genuinely needed then it should be provided close to where the jobs are expected to be. If this requires building on the green belt then the green belt land needs to be reviewed • No building on the green belt should be allowed but building on previous brownish areas such as Waterbeach Barracks and Bourn Airfield may be acceptable, • The Green Belt immediately around Cambridge
--	---

	<p>must be preserved. If necessary land around villages further out may have to be released. i.e. the village frameworks may need to be extended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build a substantial village in the green belt near the A11 at TL530530, separate from Cambridge and surrounded by woodland and open space - compensate for building in the green belt. • The important issue is travel access: sites should be easily accessible by public transport or bike, without creating more travel congestion and conditions dangerous for cyclists / pedestrians. • Every review into releasing green belt land for development helps undermine the principal argument for the existence of the green belt: which is to preserve the approaches to an historically and architecturally significant city and protect its immediate environs from creeping urbanization. • Planning gone mad, leave the villages and Green Belt as they are • Preserving the green belt that separates Cambridge from the villages is vital. However, it would be sensible to revise the boundaries to local landscape features, such as the M11 and A14 major roads. So further building between Cambridge and the M11 would be OK. Letting the villages spread into green belt, or Cambridge to cross the M11/A14 would not be OK. • Carry out another review for the areas around Cambridge - many people came to live around Cambridge for the rural aspect - keep development as close to Cambridge as possible • Hatley Parish Council – No to Green Belt loss • Protect the big areas and sensitive ones. Shave pieces off • The green belt is there to stop more villages being absorbed by Cambridge as were Chesterton and Cherry Hinton in the past and now Trumpington. It should not be altered at any point where it reduces the protection of surrounding villages. • Release some Green Belt land near Longstanton and Northstowe to allow further development, but not around other village sites except Waterbeach, where expansion could be appropriate. • Release of Green Belt land should be minimal and restricted to those areas around larger villages that have good transport links into Cambridge e.g. Histon / Impington and Milton. No release of Green Belt land should be permitted to the N.E of Cambridge that would impact on the Wicken Fen Vision. • I think Green Belt land could be used if needed to build a bypass from Earith through to the second roundabout in Longstanton. This would bypass
--	---

	<p>Willingham.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep the homes in a bigger Cambridge as this means people in lower paid jobs have the lower Stagecoach fares as they will be within Stagecoach's definition of city. • Slight increments on boundaries of a few villages would have only a mild impact on the Green Belt and could add much needed new homes in a short distance from Cambridge. I would prefer this sort of incremental, multi-site approach to fewer, but substantially larger developments. Also incremental load on facilities already available in the villages would be easier to absorb. • No, all 10 options would go against the spirit of the 2009 SSP Inspector who noted: "The most relevant principles ... are those concerned with the maintenance of views of the historic core of Cambridge, providing green separation between the urban expansion and existing settlements, and protecting green corridors. • I have no objection to the release of land from the green belt - I find the concept of the green belt to be an overly restrictive blunt instrument. It is more important to ensure a culture of sustainable building, sustainable transport and renewable energy than to ring-fence areas of questionable ecological and agricultural value for 20 years without review.
<p>QUESTION 12: Green Belt Broad Locations</p>	<p>Cambridge City Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council Issue and Options Consultation on Broad Locations in the Green Belt</p>
<p>1. Land to the North and South of Barton Road (including land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 91</p> <p>SCDC: Support:5 Object: 55 Comment: 6</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The release of sensitive Green Belt land around Cambridge is not unprecedented e.g. North West Cambridge; • Suitable site for residential development with employment, shops, schools, services and open space provision (including a wildlife reserve and country park); • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge area including for affordable housing, such need has been exacerbated by the lack of development at Cambridge East; • Close to West Cambridge, housing development here would complement its employment floorspace; • The location would encourage sustainable modes of transport; • Low density, well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green

	<p>Belt development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial Green Belt release has only recently been sanctioned so further release should not be contemplated. There should be a settling in period of at least 10 years to allow for the impact of current developments on the edge of Cambridge to be assessed; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • The land is in a highly sensitive area of the Green Belt, which is important to the setting of the city and adjacent conservation area and forms an important approach to the city. Forms a vital part of the Quarter to Six Quadrant; • Forms part of the wider setting of the historic core of Cambridge and the large number of highly graded listed buildings within the core; • The site contains the remnants of the West Field and almost certainly contains archaeological remains dating at least as far back as the Roman occupation. New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Would destroy the last remaining vista of the historic core and the last remaining stretch of road into Cambridge not subject to urban sprawl; • The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species; • The area should not be designated for housing but for playing fields and recreation; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful • Part of setting for Grantchester Meadows and Coton Country Park • Loss of a green lung for Cambridge which is easy to access on foot; • Loss of recreation facilities contrary to NPPF; • Would bring development closer to necklace villages; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Barton Road already heavily congested; • Development would make it harder to commute into Cambridge by car along Barton Road • Would bring more traffic through Grantchester • Impact on local services and facilities; • Land close to Bin Brook is subject to flooding and development could increase flood risk downstream; • Noise and air quality concerns close to M11; • Inadequate water supply to support development;
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site rejected in the past and nothing has changed to reduce the importance of the area; • Inadequate local infrastructure including schools. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QTSC should be preserved & enhanced; • A limited area may be possible to develop if well landscaped.
<p>2. Playing Fields off Grantchester Road, Newnham (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 1 Object: 69</p> <p>SCDC: Support:2 Object: 50 Comment: 4</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Low density, well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • Substantial Green Belt release has only recently been sanctioned so further release should not be contemplated. There should be a settling in period of at least 10 years to allow for the impact of current developments on the edge of Cambridge to be assessed; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages) • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • The land is in a highly sensitive area of the Green Belt, which is important to the setting of the city and adjacent conservation area and forms an important approach to the city. Forms a vital part of the Quarter to Six Quadrant; • Would bring development closer to Grantchester • Harmful to tourism; • Impact on Grantchester Meadows; • Would lead to the loss of a green finger running into the centre of Cambridge; • Impact on local services and amenities; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Grantchester Road inadequate; • Would bring more traffic through Grantchester; • Could lead to the loss of the allotments, which represent an important facility for the community; • Would destroy the village feel of Newnham; • Would lead to unacceptable levels of traffic on Barton Road and Fen Causeway which are already heavily congested; • Development would make it harder to commute into Cambridge by car along Barton Road;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk to rugby club land, development could exacerbate flooding to neighbouring properties; • Inadequate water supply to support development; • Could increase flood risk downstream; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity; • Loss of playing fields should be resisted and is contrary to the NPPF; • The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species. The site forms an important wildlife corridor linking to the Backs and Grantchester Meadows; • Development of this site has been rejected in the past, and the reasons for this remain unchanged. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QTSC should be preserved & enhanced; • Perhaps a small development away from the River would be acceptable.
<p>3. Land West of Trumpington Road (includes land in Cambridge only)</p> <p>City: Support: 1 Object: 64</p> <p>SCDC: Support:3 Object: 46 Comment: 3</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Well landscaped, sensitive and high quality development acceptable if away from river. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • The area forms a sensitive part of the Green Belt and should remain as such. It plays a very important part in the overall setting of the city and its rural edge is a vital characteristic of Cambridge that should be protected; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); and have a negative impact on the Southacre Conservation Area; • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • Would impinge on a Green Corridor and add to urban sprawl; • Site assessed previously and rejected, nothing has changed since then to alter that conclusion; • Impact on Grantchester Meadows, important green lung for residents and visitors; • Part of the setting to Grantchester, and Grantchester Meadows; • Loss of playing fields should be resisted and is contrary to the NPPF; • Loss of green separation between Cambridge and Trumpington;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site forms an important part of the river valley wildlife corridor. The area is important for wildlife, including threatened species; • Development would lead to the loss of high quality agricultural land; • Additional road junctions required by development would damage appearance of tree lined approach to City; • The trees along Trumpington Road form part of a Woodland Wildlife Site; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity, Trumpington Road could not cope with the additional traffic generated by the development; • Inadequate water supply to support development; • Could increase flood risk downstream. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The QTSC should be preserved & enhanced
<p>4. Land West of Hauxton Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 41</p> <p>SCDC: Support:7 Object: 52 Comment: 4</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are exceptional circumstances; • Would be a sustainable development with 10.49 Ha of outdoor sports pitches, 8.65 hectare extension to Trumpington Meadows Country park a community stadium with a capacity of c8,000, indoor sports provision; • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages. M11 forms a natural Southern boundary; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Land already compromised by development; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Good access; • Minimal landscape impact. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • Development would conflict with the aim of having a "quality edge" on the southern approach to Cambridge; • Loss of landscaped foreground to the new city edge;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly visible site on rising ground; • Coalescence with Hauxton / Harston; • Development would adversely impact on the setting of the adjacent new country park, including Byrons Pool and the river; • Community Stadium not appropriate in this sensitive gateway location; • Involves loss of open space needed to form a positive southern boundary to the city, and buffer Trumpington Meadows from the motorway; • Would erode the amenity value of the Trumpington Meadows country park; • Inadequate water supply to support development; • Could increase flood risk downstream; • Would worsen traffic and make it harder to commute to work; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity; • Noise and air quality concerns close to M11; • Noise from the stadium, • Impact on local services and amenities including schools (Primary school at Trumpington Meadows incapable of extension); • New retail should be in city centre; • Allow new development to be completed and settled before more is contemplated. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor development acceptable; • Broad Location 4 should include the WWTW at Bayer Cropscience; • The QTSC should be preserved & enhanced.
<p>5. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 7 Object: 30</p> <p>SCDC: Support:9 Object: 45 Comment: 5</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages. M11 forms a natural Southern boundary; • Would provide a employment-led, mixed-use neighbourhood in a sustainable location with 45 hectares of office/research and employment development (science park), 1,250 market, affordable and key worker dwellings, local shops and community facilities, a primary school, public open space, strategic landscaping, highways and other supporting infrastructure; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Would assist the delivery of high levels of employment growth in Cambridge; • Sustainable location high in development sequence established by 2003 Structure Plan; • Good transport network nearby; • Site is available and can be delivered in plan period; • Land already compromised by development, would not harm Green Belt purposes;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Would allow for enhancement of nearby habitats and increased access to the countryside; • Yes, provided views maintained and clear separation between development and Great Shelford; • Potential for major growth which has little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • Allow new development to be completed and settled before more is contemplated, area is already overdeveloped; • Planning inspectors have ruled Addenbrooke's Road is a sensible Green Belt boundary; • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Would compromise planned Green Belt edge on Glebe Road; • Development south of Glebe Road rejected in earlier plans and nothing has changed since then; • Would lead to ribbon development; • Would lead to coalescence with Great Shelford; • Harmful impact on views of Cambridge from the Gogs; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity; • Inadequate local school places, services and facilities; • Would worsen traffic and slow ambulances going to Addenbrooke's Hospital; • Noise and air quality concerns close to M11; • Loss of amenity, open spaces and land for walking; • Could increase flood risk downstream. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not as intrusive as other options • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable • Not too bad, plenty of new housing going on nearby and decent roads • The southern limit of this site would need to be defined with care. If extended too far to the south it could swamp Great Shelford. • This is the better of the options, as it continues on from existing developments. However, it could cause congestion and the transport infrastructure
--	---

<p>6. Land South of Addenbrooke's Road between Babraham Road and Shelford Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 35</p> <p>SCDC: Support:6 Object: 40 Comment: 3</p>	<p>would need to be improved to cope</p> <p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge including affordable homes; • Would deliver new infrastructure to help serve existing uses; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Yes, provided views maintained and clear separation between development and Great Shelford. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Would lead to coalescence with Great Shelford; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • No development south of the Addenbrooke's Access Road which is a clear Green belt boundary; • Undermine the new planned edge for the city; • Would create an isolated new community; • Used for recreation, important to preserve the unspoiled view of White Hill; • Harmful to views from the Gogs and Wandlebury; • Development should not encroach upon Nine Wells and to the land on either side of Granhams Road, which has landscape value; • Inadequate road infrastructure and capacity; • Would worsen traffic and slow ambulances going to Addenbrooke's Hospital; • Could constrain long term growth of the Biomedical Campus; • Would lead to ribbon development distant from existing communities; • Inadequate local school places, services and facilities; • Inadequate local school places, services and facilities; • Damage to biodiversity and Nine Wells Local Nature Reserve. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not as intrusive as other options;
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable; • Area between Shelford Road and Babraham Road is of high value landscape. Some small areas to the rear of Shelford Road could be developed with a tree belt edge continuing the boundary of the Clay Farm 'green wedge.
<p>7. Land between Babraham Road and Fulbourn Road (includes land in both districts)</p> <p>City: Support: 5 Object: 38</p> <p>SCDC: Support:6 Object: 72 Comment: 3</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical extension to City without compromising neighbouring necklace villages; • Could help meet housing and employment development needs of Cambridge; • Deliverable in plan period; • Could provide for up to 4,000 new homes in a sustainable location close to the jobs at the Addenbrooke's Hospital, Marshalls and ARM; • Would allow for expansion of Peterhouse Technology Park; • Can provide significant open space and recreation areas; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Already compromised; • Could minimise the starkness of Addenbrooke's; • Low lying land development would have less impact. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • New development would detract from the historic character of Cambridge; • Very important to the special character and setting of Cambridge as elevated with important views; • Majority of land is elevated with important views - development could not easily be screened from other vantage points; • Worts' Causeway and minor road over hill towards Fulbourn provide a well-used route for leisure access to countryside and development along this corridor would have a significant negative impact; • Harmful to setting and character of Fulbourn; • Contrary to the conclusions of earlier Green Belt studies and to those of the Inspector when considering proposals for housing at Netherhall Farm in 2006;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important for amenity and recreation; • Impact on tranquillity of the countryside; • Impact on traffic; • Harmful to views from the Gogs and Wandlebury and of high landscape value; • Damage to biodiversity and Nature Reserves. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The part of the area either side of Worts' Causeway which is on level ground would seem to be the most unobtrusive of all the sites. • Minor development on non-elevated land would be acceptable if the done with sensitivity to preserve the best of the landscape.
<p>8. Land East of Gazelle Way (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)</p> <p>City: Support: 7 Object: 15</p> <p>SCDC: Support:7 Object: 66 Comment: 6</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers; • Strong possibility provided a clear (green) corridor retained for Teversham village; • Would not involve views of the historic city; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • Loss of countryside, adverse impact on concept of a compact city; • Loss of rolling agricultural land with good views of Cambridge; • Would reduce the separation of Fulbourn from Cambridge which is already compromised by the Fulbourn and Ida Darwin Hospital sites, and Tesco, making retention of open land to the north more important; • Developing this land would turn Teversham into a suburb of Cambridge and destroy the character of the village; • Impacts of road network, local roads already congested; • Inadequate public transport to support development.

	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers; • Minimal impact on the setting of the city and good transport links. This would indicate Broad Location 8 as the least worst of the options; • Development would lead to merger with Fulbourn which should be avoided, however Teversham could be expanded north and eastwards considerably: there is little landscape value in that area.
<p>9. Land at Fen Ditton (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)</p> <p>City: Support: 4 Object: 22</p> <p>SCDC: Support: 9 Object: 45 Comment: 6</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable location to provide much needed homes and/or employment for the Cambridge area; • Could provide a foot/cycle bridge over the river Cam to link to the Science Park and the new rail station; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge including affordable housing; • Development would retain a strategic green edge along A14, thereby preserving openness of immediate area and wider landscaped setting of Cambridge; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development; • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • Fen Ditton is a historic settlement, most of which has been designated a Conservation Area. Additional housing development of any size in this area would subsume Fen Ditton into the city; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of protecting the character and setting of a historic city, development in (other) Green Belt villages would be less harmful; • Harmful to Green Belt purpose of maintaining rural setting of Fen Ditton; • Importance of Green Belt has been examined through South Cambridgeshire District Council Local Development Framework and through various planning applications, which have dismissed development as inappropriate. • Negative impact on East Cambridge road network, which is one of the most congested in the city;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing public transport links are minimal (2 buses a day) and unable to support an enlarged settlement travelling for employment; • The infrastructure could not support any further development. • Would lead to urban sprawl, Cambridge could accommodate more by building taller; • Inadequate roads and other transport links; • Would lead to congestion, existing traffic bottleneck at the bottom of Ditton Lane at peak times, and bus services are likely to be reduced in near future; • Unsustainable location, the only bus is about to be withdrawn, there is no village shop, the sewage system is overburdened and inadequate, and the B1047 already carries a heavy vehicular load; • Commons on the river corridor are essential open space for the city; • Noise from the A14; • Open and rural nature of land between Chesterton and Fen Ditton is highly prized and has been identified by local and city people as essential open space. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers; • Development might be possible if Fen Ditton village can be adequately protected and significant improvements are made to the transport system • There must be a 'buffer zone' between development and the edge of the River to preserve rural character of the Green Corridor.
<p>10. Land between Huntingdon Road and Histon Road (includes land in South Cambridgeshire only)</p> <p>City: Support: 8 Object: 14</p> <p>SCDC: Support:7 Object: 34 Comment: 5</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable location for housing and employment development including strategic open space, transport, noise and air quality issues can be mitigated; • Best of the 10 Broad Locations, least effect on the landscape; • Could help meet development needs of Cambridge; • This land is not easily accessed for recreation and too close to the A14 to be really worth keeping as Green Belt; • Well landscaped sensitive development acceptable; • Little impact on character / townscape and landscape setting of city subject to landscape and woodland buffers. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No exceptional case exists to justify more Green Belt development;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need for development here, development can be accommodated elsewhere in Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (in the City, at new settlements and in villages); • This land forms a buffer between the village of Girton and the City, without it Girton could be subsumed as a suburb to the city; • Development would have negative impacts on Girton; • Close to A14 so will not be a pleasant place to live; • Flood risk downstream, site could be used for a reservoir to serve the North-West developments • NIAB and NIAB2 have failed to provide strategic green infrastructure and allocation of this area for development would only compound the short-sighted decisions of the Councils regarding this area; • Loss of green corridor for wildlife. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to comment without knowing potential dwelling numbers; • This should be kept mostly as open space with some low density development;
<p>QUESTION 13: Rural Settlement Categories</p>	
<p>Which, if any, of the following changes to rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?</p> <p>Rural Centres:</p> <p>i. Should Cottenham be added as a Rural Centre (up from Minor Rural Centre)?</p> <p>Support:21 Object: 6 Comment: 11</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Sound” approach - accords with Village Classification report. • Comparison to other MRC – larger in terms of size (4th largest) and facilities. Grown in recent years in terms of services and facilities. • Good proximity to Cambridge and well related to employment focus at Cambridge Northern Fringe. • Cambourne and Weston Colville Parish Councils support approach. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport infrastructure is poor. • Rampton Parish Council – Northstowe would seem to reduce the need for this. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village residents should decide. • Cottenham Parish Council – NPPF purports to simplify planning process – District Council should make known its recommendation for classification, scale of development and consult with villages on any changes. • Cottenham Village Design Group – not convinced data merits change. Differences between categories seems arbitrary and not convinced of their value. Support, if change could allow more sustainable, coordinated, development

	<p>opportunities that could have a positive impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May struggle to cope with large growth in short term due to infrastructure constraints. <p>COMMENTS ON OTHER RURAL CENTRES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne should be MRC – Cambourne and Bar Hill have comparable levels of industrial development, but Bar Hill has better facilities, and equivalent (but cheaper) public transport. • Support retention of Great Shelford as a Rural Centre given the level of services and facilities. • Histon and Impington Parish Council – challenge Rural Centre status for Histon and Impington – lack of capacity in services and community facilities, road network, loss of employment, becoming increasingly dormitory. • Support retention of Sawston as a Rural Centre as it is one of most sustainable villages.
<p>Which, if any, of the following changes to rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?</p> <p>Rural Centres:</p> <p>ii. Should Fulbourn be deleted from the Rural Centre category and added as a Minor Rural Centre?</p> <p>Support:52 Object: 11 Comment: 12</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks services and facilities to meet Rural Centre threshold and smaller than other Minor Rural Centres. View supported by Fulbourn Forum for Community Action and Fulbourn Parish Council. • “Sound” approach - accords with Village Classification report. • Weston Colville Parish Council supports approach. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council objects to approach. • Should remain Rural Centre due to size, proximity and accessibility to Cambridge and A11. • Reclassification would limit growth and decline long term viability of commercial businesses and shops (as has happened in smaller villages with shops and post offices). <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If rail link were provided it should remain Rural Centre. <p>COMMENTS ON OTHER MINOR RURAL CENTRES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linton should be a Rural Centre – scores well in Village Classification report, but omits good score for public transport and lack of recognition for proximity to Haverhill and Saffron Walden. • Melbourn should be a Rural Centre – currently downgraded on bus services, but close to Meldreth station.
<p>Which, if any, of the following changes to rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?</p> <p>Minor Rural Centres:</p> <p>iii. Should the following be added as Minor Rural</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne, Steeple Morden and Weston Colville Parish Councils support this approach. • Support upgrade of Bassingbourn – strong range of services and facilities and sustainable. View supported by Cambridgeshire County Council. • Bassingbourn – demise of army barracks provides opportunity to create MRC.

<p>Centres?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Milton - Swavesey - Bassingbourn - Girton - Comberton <p>Support:22 Object: 80 Comment: 11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support upgrade of Comberton - Village Classification recognises services and facilities. • Gamlingay Parish Council consider Milton, Swavesey, Bassingbourn, Girton, Comberton to be similar size and character to Gamlingay with regard to services and facilities. • Support upgrade of Girton - Village Classification recognises services and facilities. • Milton should be upgraded to reflect scores in Village Classification report. Links to employment and Cambridge. • Swavesey – support upgrade to MRC status (or at least Better Served Group Village) to reflect scores in Village Classification report. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn should remain a Group Village – it is big enough, infrastructure and services not available to support development. View supported by Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council. • Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Action Group – Village Classification report does not support MRC status. No benefit to reclassifying as opposed removal of frameworks or increasing scale of development. Current category accurate. • Comberton should remain a Group Village – infrastructure and services not available to support development. Retain rural character. View supported by Caldecote and Comberton Parish Councils. • Change to Milton, Swavesey, Bassingbourn, Girton, Comberton is unwarranted – only score 4-5 in Village Classification report, not significantly different to Group Villages and changed primarily due to population size - approach too simplistic. • Litlington Parish Council – oppose Bassingbourn being reclassified. • Girton – facilities do not merit change of status. • Swavesey Parish Council oppose upgrade of Swavesey – poor public transport accessibility compared to MRC - long thin village with areas over 1 mile from Guided Busway. • Contrary to the Vision. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn and Kneesworth should be considered as a whole and not separate villages. • Middle Level Commissioners – concerns over development in Swavesey and impacts on drains and flooding – development will need to mitigate.
<p>Which, if any, of the following changes to rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support upgrade of Bassingbourn – strong range of services and facilities and sustainable. View supported by Cambridgeshire County Council and Litlington Parish Council.

<p>Better Served Group Villages:</p> <p>iv. Should there be a further sub division of village categories to create a new category of better served group villages?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Milton - Swavesey - Bassingbourn - Girton - Comberton <p>Support:11 Object: 54 Comment: 11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn, Girton and Comberton should be added to new category. • Comberton should be upgraded – recognises better performing than other Group Villages. • Support new category and inclusion of Milton – recognises its sustainability. • Papworth Everard Parish Council support approach. • Swavesey – support upgrade to MRC status (or at least Better Served Group Village) to reflect scores in Village Classification report. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn should remain a Group Village – it is big enough, infrastructure and services not available to support development. View supported by Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Parish Council. • Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Action Group – Village Classification report does not support MRC status. No benefit to reclassifying as opposed removal of frameworks or increasing scale of development. Current category accurate. • Comberton should remain a Group Village – infrastructure and services not available to support development. Retain rural character. View supported by Caldecote and Comberton Parish Councils. • Cambourne, Over and Steeple Morden Parish Councils – oppose approach. • Current categories work well. There should be no further sub division of categories – makes hierarchy more confusing and complex. Contrary to NPPF. Group Villages perform well with support from neighbouring settlements and access to public transport. • Change to Milton, Swavesey, Bassingbourn, Girton, Comberton is unwarranted – only score 4-5 in Village Classification report, not significantly different to Group Villages and changed primarily due to population size - approach too simplistic. • Swavesey should not be upgraded – development will lead to loss of linear character. • Swavesey Parish Council oppose upgrade of Swavesey – poor public transport accessibility - long thin village with areas over 1 mile from Guided Busway. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middle Level Commissioners – concerns over development in Swavesey and impacts on drains and flooding – development will need to mitigate.
<p>Which, if any, of the following changes to rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Papworth Everard Parish Council – Papworth does not merit being a MRC. • Waterbeach Parish Council support

<p>Better Served Group Villages:</p> <p>v. If so, should the 3 Minor Rural Centres that score less than the Better Served Group villages be changed to fall into this new category?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Papworth Everard - Willingham - Waterbeach <p>Support:6 Object: 15 Comment: 9</p>	<p>downgrading of Waterbeach in recognition of less infrastructure than other MRC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weston Colville Parish Council support approach. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council oppose approach. • Comberton Parish Council finds issue with the weighting given to villages over and above capacity of services and facilities. • Papworth – downgrading status would affect delivery of services. Potential for service improvement should be considered. • Waterbeach should remain MRC – good services and facilities, serves wide catchment and close proximity to Cambridge and Ely. • Object to new category and downgrading Willingham – MRC reflects services and facilities. • No change in current categories. Creates too many categories without improving services – focus on improving connections to Rural Centres and Cambridge. • Over Parish Council objects to new sub division of categories. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rampton Parish Council – Willingham will be affected by Northstowe so changing category is likely to be irrelevant. • All 3 are reasonably large villages and well served compared to other MRC.
<p>Which, if any, of the following changes to rural settlement hierarchy do you agree with?</p> <p>Other Group and Infill Villages</p> <p>vi. Should these remain in the same categories as in the current plan?</p> <p>Support:14 Object: 23 Comment: 25</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth Action Group – Village Classification report does not support MRC status. No benefit to reclassifying as opposed removal of frameworks or increasing scale of development. Current category accurate. • Caldecote should retain Group Village status – limited, stretched facilities operating at capacity. • Caxton, Foxton, Over and Weston Colville Parish Councils support approach. • Guilden Morden Parish Council feel Group Village is correct category for Guilden Morden. • Ickleton Parish Council support retention of Ickleton as an Infill Village but each parishes should be able to opt in or out of its designation. • No changes necessary. • Pampisford is probably correctly identified as Infill Village but may be justification for allocating modest parcels of land. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barrington should be a Better Served Group Village to allow redevelopment of Cemex site and reflect level of facilities likely to be provided. • Caldecote should not be Group Village –

	<p>restrictive policy approach takes no account of potential development sites and local aspirations to improve services and facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambourne Parish Council – oppose approach. • Duxford should be a Better Served Group Village – Village Classification report shows little difference in score with others in that category. • Fen Drayton should be upgraded to Better Served Group Village – good public transport connections to larger centres and more growth would sustain and grow facilities and services. • Fowlmere should be upgraded to Better Served Group Village – good transport (trains station nearby), local services and local employment. • Great and Little Abington have a combined higher sustainability score than higher village – should be reclassified as MRC. • Great and Little Eversden have a combined higher sustainability score than higher villages – should be reclassified as Group Village. • Hardwick should be MRC or Better Served Group Village to reflect sustainable location for growth. • Harston should be upgraded to Better Served Group Village or MRC to reflect strong transport connections, high level of services and facilities and employment. • Precludes further development in villages such as Heydon where infill sites all used. Need further flexibility to avoid stagnation. • Longstanton should be Better Served Group Village or MRC – Guided Busway and good services and facilities. • Odd that Meldreth, which enjoys access to Cambridge by rail, scored differently to ‘sister’ village of Melbourn. Reflect rail access in categorisation of Meldreth. • Oakington should be promoted to MRC to reflect location and proximity to Cambridge, Northstowe, St Ives and Guided Bus. • Over should be Better Served Group Village or ‘Group Villages Close to the Guided Busway’ – to reflect strong transport connections. • Oakington, Over and Longstanton should be reclassified as ‘Group Villages Close to the Guided Busway’ as per the Member Draft – would support sustainable development. View supported by Cambridgeshire County Council. • Cambridgeshire County Council - Whittlesford and Whittlesford Bridge should be considered together as a MRC – serve rural hinterland. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Villages should remain as existing – a major factor in assessing status should be public transport. • Not proposing change in status but Village
--	--

	<p>Classification report misleading with assessment of Balsham, which has public transport link to village college and 3 village services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbeach Parish Council suggest including Chittering as an Infill Village. • Anomaly in approach to identifying villages, such as Whittlesford Bridge, whilst other areas have not been identified, such as Newton Road. • Need to consider future impact of Northstowe – Northstowe, Longstanton and Oakington will be one settlement – settlement classification needs to consider future sustainability, viability, and spatial development of the district.
<p>Please provide any comments.</p>	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barton, Coton, Grantchester and Madingley Parish Councils – object to any release of Green Belt. • Cambridge City Council - retail hierarchy identifies Northstowe at top, but surprising Cambourne not identified as having a town centre. Needs further consideration. • Cambridgeshire County Council - changes to village classification may impact on library provision – current hierarchy corresponds to County Council's Service Level Policy based on population catchment sizes. • CPRE, Comberton and Croydon Parish Councils suggest that villages should decide, taking account their character and setting. • Natural England – make no specific comments other than to request that options should have least impact on natural environment, landscape and access. • No sense changing status of remote villages away from Cambridge as they are less sustainable and have a negative impact on rural nature. • Villages should be categorised, but current levels of facilities not necessarily a guide to capacity of a village for further development. • Allow well planned development of a suitable scale regardless of category of village.
<p>QUESTION 14: What approach do you think the Local Plan should take for individual housing schemes within village frameworks on land not specially identified for housing:</p>	
<p>i Retain existing numerical limits for individual schemes</p> <p>Support:106</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain existing limits. Creates affordable housing within framework, protects village from unwelcome development, retain character and identity of villages.

Object: 22
Comment: 7

- No reason to change. Worked well and supports incremental growth in smaller villages.
- Bassingbourn Parish Council support existing limits - increasing limit would have same impact as raising status of village.
- Bourn, Caldecote, Cambourne, Caxton, Fen Ditton, Fowlmere, Foxton, Fulbourn, Gamlingay, Great and Little Chishill, Guilden Morden, Over, Papworth Everard, Rampton, Swavesey, Toft, Weston Colville Parish Councils support existing.
- Great Shelford Parish Council – as there are no limits in Rural Centres, not affected.
- Ickleton Parish Council – support more flexibility in infill villages, but not as much as 10.
- Proposed options represent too large an increase – Council would find it hard to resist large scale development.
- Small is beautiful. Large scale development should be consolidated on new settlements.
- If local communities want more development to meet specific needs use Neighbourhood Plan.
- Ideally reduce the limits.
- Limits should be maximum not an aim, with schemes dealt with on merit having regard to village character and infrastructure.
- Raising limits for villages other than Rural Centres risks unsustainable development.
- Villages should not be infilled – green areas and spaces should be protected.

OBJECTIONS:

- Takes no account of availability of suitable development sites within villages, inflexible, unsound.
- Rural Centres should also have limits – unfair they should bear brunt of additional housing. Will become urban sprawl and/or ribbon developments.
- No limits in larger, more sustainable villages, including Longstanton. Constrains economic growth and frustrates housing delivery.
- Comberton – 2 larger developments better than lots small ones - address drainage and sewerage, and provide housing for future young families.

COMMENTS:

- Some growth will add to community, but level should reflect infrastructure capacity.
- Infill villages too restrictive – should be 2 with up to 8 in exceptional circumstances, such as on brownfield land. Raise to maximum of 4.
- Comberton 8 not 50.
- CPRE – do not relate to strategic growth, local community should determine.
- Need to consider alongside reviewing the village

	<p>boundary – limits development opportunity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When plots become available ensure family houses not executive houses are built. • Review settlement boundaries for anomalies / inconsistencies. • Waterbeach Parish Council - Chittering should be Infill Village with limit of 2 dwellings.
<p>ii Increase the size allowed for individual schemes</p> <p>Support:27 Object: 29 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not opposed to increasing from 8 to 50. • Increase limits - allows more affordable housing. • Some limited scope for relaxation. • Allows a degree of flexibility, will prevent too dense development in more rural places. • Dry Drayton Parish Council – allow ‘exceptions sites’ to include market and affordable housing, which may need larger scheme to be viable. • Graveley Parish Council – increase Infill to 10. • Great Abington, Haslingfield, Litlington, Little Abington, Whaddon Parish Councils support increase. • Milton Parish Council – needs limit on smaller villages – gives guidance to developers. • Steeple Morden Parish Council – retain but raise limits to make viable for affordable housing. • Need increase in scale but ensure tight restrictions (no land taken out of Green Belt). • Infill village needs small degree of flexibility, but appropriate to village character. • Waterbeach Parish Council support an increase from 20 to 30 dwellings in Better Served Group Village category. • As long as decision made by parish council on case by case basis. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes no account of availability of suitable development sites within villages, inflexible, unsound. • Bassingbourn Parish Council – retain existing limits. • Proposed options represent too large an increase – Council would find it hard to resist large scale development. • Existing limits appropriate - do not increase. New large housing estates in villages not appropriate. Lead to uncontrolled development. • Limited small development in Rural Centres to preserve schools, churches, bus routes etc. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No limits in larger, more sustainable villages, including Longstanton. Constrains economic growth and frustrates housing delivery. • Horningsea could accommodate 2 schemes @ 5-10 dwellings each – multiply across 105 villages

	<p>and you can go some way to meeting needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider in relation to village boundaries and get Parish Councils to agree.
<p>iii Remove scheme size limits for Minor Rural Centres, and if included for Better Served Group Villages, so they are the same as Rural Centres</p> <p>Support:16 Object: 13 Comment: 4</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More flexibility rather than pre-determined categorisation – assist in addressing shortfall in supply in wide range locations and sites, without need to use Green Belt. Greater flexibility in larger villages - need to plan positively for growth. Minor Rural Centres can support larger developments – including Cottenham Gamlingay, Melbourn, Willingham, Waterbeach. Remove limit for larger villages that can support greater level of development – Sawston. Do not see how numerical limits help – only distort applications put forward. Each scheme should be dealt with on merits having regard to village character and needs. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bassingbourn Parish Council – retain current limits. Council could find it hard to resist large development if limit removed. Would destroy character and amenities of these villages. Infrastructure cannot cope. Need to keep villages as villages. Will lead to uncontrolled developments. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No limits in larger, more sustainable villages, including Longstanton. Constrains economic growth and frustrates housing delivery. Support more development in smaller villages such as Teversham and Swavesey.
<p>iv Remove scheme size limits for all categories of village</p> <p>Support:39 Object: 12 Comment: 1</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide greater flexibility in delivery of new dwellings by removing arbitrary / artificial limits – too restrictive, judge on merits. Limits take no account of availability of suitable development sites within villages, inflexible, unsound. Limits are stranglehold to potentially good and sustainable development – do not take into account merits of a development site. Policy wording can ensure development retains character / context and adequate services. Greater flexibility within and on edge of Group and Better served Villages. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain current limits – options represent too large an increase. Do not support increased development – gives free rein to development. New large housing

	<p>estates not appropriate in villages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be of scale appropriate to scale of existing village. • Would destroy character, amenities and quality of life in South Cambs. • Scheme limits should only be removed on case by case basis – devolved to parish council affected. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave it to parish councils / local community (localism) to decide. • Assess individual schemes on compatibility to planning policy – remove upper limit at Minor Rural Centres and Group Villages.
<p>Please provide any comments</p> <p>Support: 1 Object: 3 Comment: 38</p> <p>Questionnaire Question 5: Over the next 20 years do you feel the plan should allow greater flexibility so villages are able to expand and would you support more development in proportion to the scale of the village where you live? Total comments received: 703</p>	<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Shelford should continue to be Rural Centre with no limits to scale of development. • Avoid being overly prescriptive – precludes innovative design, impede new solutions and results in extensive negotiations. • Residents in Cambridge and South Cambs do not want live huge housing estates – why build them? • Caldecote Parish Council - allow replacement of existing buildings that may not be sustainable but not excessive garden developments. • Cambridgeshire County Council – support increasing limits – Minor Rural Centres to 100 and Better Served Group Villages to 50 – have facilities and services, will provide more affordable housing on open space than smaller development. • Cambridgeshire County Council – need to review library service provision and school places. Arbitrary limits – should sustain local services. • Comberton Parish Council – retain existing limits but allow individual villages in exceptional circumstances to change scale permitted on a particular site. • Cottenham Parish Council – support change to village to Rural Centre to allow mixed growth not just houses. • Crude limits unhelpful and unnecessarily restrictive. Larger developments have potential to be better planned and integrated than small piecemeal developments. Raise limits or replace with set of principles (appropriate scale). • Land should be allocated to meet affordable housing need in Duxford – tightly drawn framework restricts sites coming forward. • Croydon Parish Council – bringing more villages into higher categories will increase amount of housing that can be built – are these part of the housing projection? • No options to reduce the limits. • English Heritage – greater flexibility - character considered when deciding scale and location of

	<p>expansion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of development in villages should be related to existing size, character, relative sustainability and transport. • Infill Villages should increase from 2 to 8 / consider maximum of 4. • Scale of development meaningless if no suitable sites within frameworks. • Rural Centres such as Histon and Impington are “full up” and should only take infill or replacement development. • Middle Level Commissioners – possible upgrade of Swavesey noted – flood risk / water management systems under stress. • Natural England – minimise impact on natural environment, landscape and access. • Pampisford Parish Council – retain limits, particularly Infill Villages but allow exceptions. • Papworth Everard Parish Council – new Better Served Villages only makes sense if Option i. • Data for Oakington incorrect – no pharmacy. • Ask local people / villages - localism. • Remove limits in villages with services and facilities / capable of expanding services as prevents sustainable growth of smaller villages. • Swavesey Parish Council – does not want to change framework but need for small-scale affordable housing. • Hardwick Group Village restricted to 8 / 15 dwellings but capacity to grow significantly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Babraham – Yes, should be agreed with Parish Council. Locals to decide type, size, tenure of housing / employment. • Babraham Parish Council - No more flexibility, expanding villages could merge, losing their identities. • Barrington – restrict building to minimum required to protect quality of life, local environment but considering demands of economy. • Barton – Current policy should be retained. Already several developments, lose village atmosphere. Retain village style. Mix small and larger with range affordability. • Barton Parish Council – remain Group Village and no change to current limits. Fits with Parish Plan. • Barton, Caldecote, Childerley, Comberton, Coton, Grantchester, Hardwick, Kingston, Madingley, Toft would be destroyed if expanded more than small numbers. Infrastructure overloaded, flooding. • Bassingbourn – Reject increase housing - infrastructure at capacity – especially High Street. Keep villages as villages. Not large scale. Unsold
--	---

	<p>development – no demand. Any infill should be affordable. Fear for redevelopment of barracks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourn – local decisions about any sites outside village framework. Avoid linear development. • Bourn – careful expansion on brownfield sites, marginal extension of envelope for social housing and limited development preferable. Not airfield – pressure on roads, drainage, infrastructure. • Caldecote – No more. Small development, 200 properties. Bourn airfield too big – area could not cope, no infrastructure. • Cambourne – object to further expansion. Enough is enough. Infrastructure not designed for it. Losing identity. • Cambourne – Support flexibility and appropriate development - expansion if more facilities. • Caxton – No. • Comberton Parish Council (supported by 301 signatories) – sustainable development more than scale of village - ability to support housing with infrastructure, transport, impact on Green Belt, proximity to jobs and protect heritage and character. Not raise in limit. • Comberton development too large for road infrastructure, flood risk, sewerage, village services and perceived need. No gas. Retain Group status. • Comberton – support limited growth on certain sites on edge of village where wider roads, in return for facilities – public transport, affordable housing, shop, surgery, sewerage, drainage. • Coton – no more development, big enough. • Cottenham – lots building – thought should be given to south of Cambridge to take fair share. No more development into open countryside. Infrastructure under pressure. Threaten character. Northstowe nearby. • Cottenham – support limited further development as Minor Rural Centre, under option ii increased numbers. • Croxton / Eltisley – support more development around villages as long as low cost homes. • Dry Drayton – only small levels in centre of village. • Duxford Parish Council – Needs flexibility for individual villages. Review of framework useful. Should not be constrained by category. • Duxford – no. • Eltisley – yes, definitely. • Elsworth – large enough, do not extend. Detrimental to amenity, nature and character. • Fen Ditton – sites harm to character and setting, including separation. Impact on Green Belt. • Fen Ditton – small number of high quality houses
--	---

	<p>in keeping with village, but any more than 10 per year would change character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fen Drayton – space for expansion which would preserve school. • Fowlmere – flexible approach to expand in proportion to scale of village. • Fulbourn – lots of new homes / people not integrated into village. Ida Darwin – we have taken our share – no more. Development should come from community not outside. Use existing buildings. Need infrastructure improvement. No ribbon development and sprawl to Cherry Hinton. • Gamlingay – provided clear evidence of need, communities support it and type houses meet identified need. • Girton – already swamped by large developments – negative impact on amenities, destroy character, add congestion, noise, parked cars. No more expansion except small infill. • Grantchester – case for small, sensitive, infill development - help village be more self-contained. • Grantchester – no flexibility - protect from development for conservation & tourism reasons. • Great and Little Chishill Parish Council – support existing frameworks, with the option to adjust if supported by sustainable case. Need for very limited development for young / downsizing. • Great Chishill – support some additional development - new houses are needed, led to loss of facilities. • Great Eversden – against development outside village envelope – alter character, destroy Green Belt. Preserve historic heart and rural surrounds. Need for small scale affordable housing to revitalise village. • Great Shelford – already too big - danger of merging with Cambridge. Use brownfield sites. More small houses not executive homes. Only small scale. • Great Shelford – development off Mingle Lane not one of options but developer promoting it. Provides green lung between 2 villages, haven for wildlife. Green Belt must be preserved. • Great Shelford – more flexibility to build in villages and Cambridge suburbs like Shelford. • Great Wilbraham – no more development. Any new development restricted to within existing framework where still space available. Protect Green Belt. Keep existing limits – 8 houses. • Great Wilbraham – support some small affordable housing for families on small plots within village and redevelopment of brownfield sites. • Guilden Morden – no more flexibility, no more development in village except parish-led or
--	---

	<p>redevelopment of existing buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guilden Morden – yes, people will use cars until too expensive so restricting development is not going to cut down greenhouse gases. • Hardwick – protect farmland for food production. • Yes, modest expansion of villages with space. • Hardwick – yes absolutely, it should be the first of any considerations. • Harlton – infill only with provision of adequate infrastructure. • Harston – No. • Haslingfield – No, current criteria / Green Belt boundary. Protect rural character. Only where infrastructure and facilities allow. • Hatley Parish Council - Hatley St George & East Hatley - small and pretty village – restrictions should remain. • Hauxton – already plans for 400 homes, no basic facilities, rely on travel by car. No more. • Hildersham Parish Council – greater flexibility to enable some development proportionate to size of village and facilities with support of villagers. • Hildersham – greater flexibility in keeping with scale - small mixed development & affordable homes. • Hildersham – any further development will affect character of village. • Hinxton – No. Ruin scale and historic / tranquil nature. Build close to work / public transport. • Histon & Impington – already too much development. Only develop small scale if services can cope. Pay serious attention to water table – flooding. Lose character, turning into town. • Histon – Buxhall Farm too large - cause enormous problems for road users, schools and doctors. • Histon & Impington – allow more flexibility in walking distance of central shopping area. • Kingston – No. / Allow small amount – 5-10 homes / on Bourn Road. • Linton Parish Council – Maintain existing policy / no more development – retain village not town. Under pressure for Cambridge / London commuters. Lacks infrastructure for sustainable development. Leave to Neighbourhood Plan. • Little Gransden – review village framework to include land for infill. • Little Shelford – no, small village, keep separate from Cambridge. • Little Wilbraham – modest, carefully planned, fully discussed development would be supported. • Longstanton – no more houses as short of facilities within walking distance. Try to keep village feel.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longstanton – lose identity with Northstowe – not enough separation. • Longstanton – yes, greater flexibility. • Melbourn – only on south side of village. Extra facilities in place first. • Meldreth – no expansion - community and sense of identity will suffer. • Newton – as upper ages of population increasing, only allow flexibility where shops and services. • Oakington – only in proportion to scale of village. • Orwell – retain current policies and use sites within village boundary without changing character. • Over – Longstanton Road & New Road. • Over – no more except limited infill. • Village expansion preferable to new towns / villages. Sawston has infrastructure to cope with more development – no more than 10% / 250 houses. Protect Green Belt. • Sawston / Hinxton – if villages expand danger they will merge into a town and lose identity. Why not create new village at Hanley Grange? • Sawston – already large village. Infrastructure cannot cope. Do not extend boundaries. Road access to sites on east is inadequate. • Definitely. Flexibility and liberalising of planning is essential. • Leave village out of your plans. You are spoiling country life. • Shepreth Parish Council – remain infill while increasing number of dwellings to 3 would stop building large houses on tiny plots. Retain framework to protect character. • Stapleford – having observed Trumpington and inadequate roads, retail, recreation – I have no confidence in this proposal. • Stapleford – already several developments – any more will no longer be a village. Overcrowded infrastructure – needed before development. • Stapleford – Infill / small scale only – Parish Plan. More affordable housing is needed. Bring empty houses back into use. Protect Green Belt - protect character, density, quality of life. • Steeple Morden – minimal development beyond current level. • Swavesey – modern houses crammed in and stand out - affects character. Build in areas of similar construction. Infrastructure can't cope. • Teversham – no expansion. • Thriplow – No. / Yes, support more development – made suggestions (SHLAA) and to parish council. • Waterbeach – perfect size already. New building should be restricted for local people. • Waterbeach – some expansion supported, losing
--	--

	<p>army population (not new town), only in proportion, with transport infrastructure. Maintain buffer with barracks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waterbeach – major extension and moving railway station would be detrimental and focussed on London commuters not local needs. • Only infills, like housing estate at Granhams Road. Affordable homes are only affordable once then they become a problem. • Many villages could have their envelopes rationalised, moderately increasing footprint without compromising sustainability. • Infilling makes many villages look like council estates. Enlarging is poor option, lose character. • Great Kneighton and Trumpington Meadows, NW Cambridge – avoid further development in Green Belt to west and south. Green Belt to east could be considered with extension to Green Belt. • Not only large villages, expand smaller villages. Sawston benefited. Support options 9 & 10 and employment options 6 & 7. • Only small scale social housing on exceptions sites. Protect villages from larger scale development – only allow where villages want and demonstrable demand (not say of Parish Council). • Many villages at their limit in terms of transport, housing and infrastructure capacity. Strictly limit development - brownfield or increase densities. • Whittlesford – no greater flexibility. • Willingham – Greater expansion undesirable / no need for more housing over and above already planned – no objection to windfall on brownfield sites. • It is up to the villages. Be bound by Parish Plans. • Some villages should be developed, especially those with work places - link to sustainable transport (car as last resort). • No more village development except brownfield – focus inside Cambridge and ex-farm buildings. • Council required to meet full assessed need – appropriate these met on village by village basis. Increase flexibility to expand proportional to scale of village. • No new housing in South Cambs – allow things to stabilise. No new housing for next 50 years. • No encroachment onto Green Belt - sacrosanct. • Leave villages alone, already oversized and impacting on way of life. New towns are key. • Support expansion for houses similar type to local style rather than high density small homes. • Some villages may benefit from expansion – may invigorate / lead to opening new shops. • Controlled village development only if needed.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current policies protect rural character and heritage of villages. Overdevelopment in past led to few suitable sites. Build new communities with first class infrastructure. • Bourn Airfield and Waterbeach rather than villages with road improvements to Cambridge. • Even in my small village lots of sites fenced off for development – lack of building plots is a myth. SHLAA process shows plenty of space – but many rejected. • Classification flawed giving too much weight to village college – more weight should be given to road access / other infrastructure. • Limited infill, no garage conversion. Encourage economic use of accommodation - elderly live alone in big houses. • Allow growth in villages less reliant on jobs in Cambridge to encourage growth in jobs at village level – e.g. Gamlingay, Willingham, Bassingbourn. • Allow expansion villages where public transport and services that avoid car trips. Classification outdated – 21st century internet services – villages do not need shops, banks, libraries etc. as much as schools, sports centres, surgeries.
QUESTION 15: Approach to Village Frameworks	
<p>A i. Retain village frameworks and the current approach to restricting development outside framework boundaries</p> <p>Support: 109 Object: 9 Comment: 6</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essential to allow exceptions sites for affordable housing. • Major part of planning control at village level - provides clarity and certainty. • Resists sprawl, maintains separation between villages, preserves character and identity. • Current boundaries work well, are well established after careful thought. • Protects countryside, agricultural land and Green Belt. • Without – danger of ‘first come, first served’ development – not sustainable approach to planning. • Arrington, Bassingbourn-cum-Kneesworth, Bourn, Cambourne, Caxton, Fen Ditton, Fowlmere, Foxton, Gamlingay, Great Shelford, Hauxton, Ickleton, Little Gransden, Milton, Pampisford, Papworth Everard, Rampton, Swavesey, Toft, Waterbeach, and Weston Colville Parish Councils support retention of current approach. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tightly drawn, paralysing modest development. • Additional, organic, growth needed to maintain vitality and viability of settlements. • Arbitrary boundaries, need to include all properties

	<p>to be equitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more flexible approach (consider on individual merits) not blanket constraints. • Planned development rather than piecemeal infill. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each village has its own situation which must be respected or do not block growth needlessly. • Review regularly as part of Neighbourhood Plan to reflect local needs. • Care needed not to restrict Imperial War Museum flying activities.
<p>A ii. Retain village frameworks as defined on the Proposals Map but include polices that allow small scale development adjacent to village frameworks where certain criteria are met, addressing issues including landscape, townscape, and access.</p> <p>Support: 69 Object: 23 Comment: 5</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alleviate pressure on open space within villages. • More flexibility to respond to individual's needs for additional dwelling. • Without – danger of ‘first come, first served’ development – not sustainable approach to planning. • Balanced approach – allows small local growth, avoids stagnation, but preserves villages. • Villages should help determine criteria - should ‘fit’ development into existing village character not alter it. • Cambridgeshire County Council suggest relaxation of restrictions for certain categories of development permitted outside – e.g. schools. • Part of planning control at village level - provides clarity and certainty. • Changes to exceptions sites – closer link to market housing outside framework. • Resists sprawl, maintains separation between villages, preserves character and identity. • Comberton, Croydon, Grantchester, Graveley, Great Abington, Haslingfield, Littlington, Little Abington, Steeple Morden, Whaddon Parish Councils support this approach. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads to more development, loss amenity – prevent over expanding. • Neighbourhood Plans should determine suitable developments. • No point having a village framework at all if this approach is adopted. • Criteria not defined adequately. • Fen Ditton Parish Council – objects to this approach. <p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider suitable infill sites first, only then explore small scale developments adjacent. • Needs to be pro-active planning tool not for opportunistic development. • Unlikely a District-wide formula makes sense in era of Localism.

<p>A iii. Delete the current village frameworks entirely and provide greater flexibility for some development on the edge of villages controlled through written policy.</p> <p>Support: 19 Object: 30 Comment: 2</p>	<p>ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More flexibility to provide required number of new homes, in most appropriate planned locations, and consider on merit. • Approach adopted by other authorities. • Existing boundaries artificial barrier, out of date, create unacceptable pressure within arbitrary line. • Larger population for retention and improvement of services. • Likely to deliver more affordable housing on mixed sites. <p>OBJECTIONS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents should determine what happens – Plan unlikely to reflect local issues and concerns. • Would result in ‘free for all’, removes local control, risks sprawl and eroding character of villages. • Cambridgeshire County Council suggest relaxation of restrictions for certain categories of development permitted outside – e.g. schools. • Need more flexibility but retain framework to provide clarity and certainty. • Policy would be too complicated and risk unfair application. • Create speculative development and more work for parish and local council planning officers. • Croydon, Fen Ditton, Gamlingay, Great Shelford Parish Councils object to this approach.
<p>Please provide any comments.</p> <p>Support: 1 Object: 2 Comment: 18</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caldecote Parish Council - 60% Caldecote residents support retention - 30% favoured (i). Infrastructure unable to cope with further development and alter rural character. • Should be driven by discussion with parish councils. • Where support from parish council for development outside framework, could allow an exception. • Cottenham Parish Council - retain frameworks as defined except where villages want expansion, provided prevent encroachment into Green Belt, coalescence. Policy govern nature of extension & S106/CIL etc. • Allow ‘organic sympathetic development’. • English Heritage – if greater flexibility introduced character of each village needs considering when deciding scale and location of expansion. • Great and Little Chishill – retain frameworks. If there are exceptions sites, allow market housing to fund them. Would like to explore further – may like additional, very limited development. • None of options appropriate – needs to be discussion on village by village basis. • Reuse old buildings but no new development.

B Are you aware of any existing village framework boundaries that are not drawn appropriately because they do not follow property boundaries?

Support: 8

Object: 13

Comment: 52

Include additional land / whole garden within village framework:

- **Arrington** – Church End - include unused scrub land with no potential agricultural use.
- **Barrington** – West Green – include whole garden.
- **Bourn** – Riddy Lane - include surrounding paddock land.
- **Caldecote** – inconsistencies along eastern edge and property excluded from western edge
- **Caxton** – Land off Ermine Street – extend village to include land for housing.
- **Cottenham** – land between 14 & 37 Ivatt Street – include land.
- **Croydon** – two areas of land north and south of High Street – include land in framework.
- **Dry Drayton** – Longwood, Scotland Road – include property in large grounds.
- **Eltisley** – Caxton End – include whole garden to allow single property for relative.
- **Fulbourn** – East of Cox's Drove – reflect development line and allow future redevelopment of wood yard (undesirable in residential area).
- **Fulbourn** – Apthorpe Street – include garden land.
- **Graveley** – Manor Farm – include house and grounds.
- **Graveley** – Land south of High Street (1) – include land in framework
- **Graveley** – Land south of High Street (2) - include land in framework
- **Great Shelford** – Scotsdales – include buildings.
- **Guilden Morden** – High Street – include whole garden.
- **Guilden Morden** – Swan Lane – include house and garden to allow single property for relative.
- **Hardwick** – Hall Drive - include whole garden to allow single property for relative.
- **Hardwick** – land between BP garage and village – include ribbon of development.
- **Little Gransden** – 22 Church Street – include whole garden. Also suggested by Little Gransden Parish Council as part of a larger area.
- **Little Gransden** – East of Primrose Hill – include as part of adjoining commercial use.
- **Meldreth** – North End – include whole garden.
- **Swavesey** – Boxworth End Farm – include land surrounded by residential properties.

Sites proposed for housing allocation / existing site option:

- **Barrington** – Cemex site – proposed for housing.
- **Cottenham** – Histon Road – proposed for

	<p>housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cottenham – Histon Road - Site Option 27. • Croydon – land south of High Street – proposed for housing. • Duxford – Land north of Greenacres – proposed for housing. • Fowlmere – former farm yard, Cambridge Road – proposed for housing. • Great Abington – land to the east – proposed for housing. • Great Eversden – north of Chapel Road – proposed for housing. • Hardwick – St Neots Road - proposed for housing. • Hauxton – Waste Water Treatment Works (soon to be redundant) proposed for housing. • Landbeach – land off Chapmans Close - proposed for housing. • Longstanton – east of bypass – proposed for housing. • Longstanton – Clive Hall Drive – proposed for housing. • Melbourn – Victoria Way – Site Options 30 & 31. • Sawston – East of Swaston – Site Option 9. • Shepreth – Meldreth Road – proposed for housing. • Waterbeach – south of Cambridge Road – proposed for housing. <p>Amendment suggested by Parish Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton – Land north of West Street – logical extension to include white land. Suggested by individual and Comberton Parish Council. • Ickleton – suggest frameworks need reviewing in partnership with Parish Councils. • Little Gransden – Church Street – extend to framework to include obvious infill sites. Suggested by Little Gransden Parish Council. • Little Gransden – Land at 6 Primrose Hill – include whole garden. Also suggested by Little Gransden Parish Council. • Little Gransden – Main Road / B1046 - extend to framework to include obvious infill sites. Suggested by Little Gransden Parish Council. • Little Gransden – West of Primrose Walk - extend to framework to include obvious infill sites. Suggested by Little Gransden Parish Council. • Little Gransden – Land opposite Primrose Way - extend to framework to include obvious infill sites. • Toft – Comberton Road, near Golf Club – include offices and barns. Suggested by Toft Parish Council. • Toft – High Street – include land with planning
--	--

	<p>permission for dwelling. Suggested by Toft Parish Council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toft – Old Farm Business Centre – include land with planning permission for new employment building. Suggested by Toft Parish Council. • Whaddon – four areas of land north and south of Meldreth Road, extending the road frontage. Suggested by Whaddon Parish Council. <p>Cottenham, Fen Ditton, Papworth Everard, Steeple Morden and Weston Colville Parish Councils – identify no changes.</p> <p>Parish boundary / framework issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comberton – Village College – should be included in Comberton framework (in Toft Parish). Suggested by Comberton Parish Council. • Pampisford / Sawston – London Road – include within Sawston framework (in Pampisford Parish). <p>Create new village frameworks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Croxton – Abbotsley Road / A428 - create new village framework. • Westwick – create new village framework as part of Oakington (Oakington and Westwick) to reflect the name of the Parish Council. • Waterbeach Parish Council suggest Chittering should be an Infill Village.
--	---