

Harston Neighbourhood Plan

Response to examiner's clarification note Part 2 – Parish Council comments on specific Regulation 16 representations

Examiner questions:

- Does the Parish Council wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?
- I would find it helpful if the Parish Council commented on the representation received from East West Railway Company Limited.
- The District Council make a series of comments both on the policies and other general matters. It would also be helpful if the Parish Council responded to this representation.

Parish Council response:

Yes. The Parish Council wishes to respond as follows:

Bidwells on the behalf of Jesus College.

Here, the Parish Council notes that these comments are not directly relevant to the Harston Neighbourhood Plan, rather they relate to the work being driven the Parish Council to deliver a rural exception site.

British Horse Society, Cambridge Ramblers and Local Access Forum

We note the similar concerns shared by the above organisations, towards the use of the Active Travel term. The understanding underpinning the Harston NP always been that a key part of this focuses on outdoor recreation in our parish.

To address these concerns we suggest adding a note to the glossary in the NP as follows:

Term	Definition
Active travel	Refers to journeys on foot, cycle or other 'wheeled' modes of active travel (e.g. mobility scooter, wheelchair, pushchair, cycle freight, on horse), although other non-motorised users may also use the network. <u>In Harston, active travel includes travel for social, domestic, business and recreational purposes.</u>

To further alleviate concerns regarding the need to emphasize recreational routes more and give recognition to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP), we propose additional text to be added to paragraphs 12.7 and 12.8 as follows:

Paragraph 12.7 in submission Harston NP:

“.....Active Travel Toolkit. Many of the routes proposed (on map 18) are to enable different length circular walks/routes around the village as encouraged by Cambridgeshire’s Green Infrastructure Strategy, Cambridge Nature Network and The Cambridgeshire Rights of Way Improvement Plan. This not only gives better access to the countryside but improves physical health and mental health through enjoyment of the countryside”.

Paragraph 12.8 in submission Harston NP:

The existing active travel network is greatly valued in Harston. 85% of those responding to the applicable question in the 2023 householder survey agreed that ‘attractive countryside and countryside paths’ was a positive aspect about living in Harston. People appreciated they had improved well-being both from being able to physically walk/cycle, horse ride in the countryside and from being able to enjoy the countryside around them as they moved/travelled. There are however some key weaknesses. Generally, the off-road routes do not connect up different parts of the village well. This has the following disadvantages:

The Parish Council also proposes to include an additional ‘Community Project’ to complement Policy HAR 21. As such we propose:

- a) a box to be added following Policy HAR 21 as per below
- b) text to be added to Chapter 16 as per below
- c) Current Community Project 5 ‘Harston pavilion’ to be renumbered to Community Project 6.

Text box to be added after Policy HAR 21

Harston Community Project 5

To complement Policy HAR 21, Harston Parish Council will continue to work with landowners and stakeholders to seek improvements to the quantity and quality of the active travel network.

As part of future discussions, the Parish Council will seek to ensure routes are as inclusive as possible and seek to ensure permissive routes are for at least 20 years/ a long period of time.

Proposed supporting text to be added to Chapter 16:

Harston Parish council will continue to work with landowners, local authorities and other relevant bodies in order to secure an improved network of recreational circular/active travel routes around the parish. They will explore ways of coming to agreement with all involved to create a structured approach to improving the network. They aim to make the routes as accessible as possible to as many as possible and long lasting to secure the known physical and mental well-being benefits to residents.

Mr R Gould

We note the detailed comment made by Mr R Gould. Here, the Parish Council acknowledges the Harston NP will need reviewing regularly. The Plan may be able to respond in more detail in future to EWR proposals when full detail is known.

Ms Charlotte Clarke

Whilst the Parish Council acknowledges the significance of the impact of East West Rail if it goes ahead, the Parish Council does not consider this a reason to postpone the Harston NP at this point in time. If East West Rail goes ahead and once its implications for the parish are more fully understood, the Parish Council acknowledges an update to the NP will likely become appropriate. In the meantime, the Harston NP is a very helpful document to use in terms of preparing effective responses to the East West Rail consultations.

Andy Lawson

With respect to the comment relating to the Telephone site, the Parish Council considers this site is too small to deliver both housing and a car park. The Parish Council preference is for a car park to be delivered due to this being the only potential site in a central location in the village that could assist with alleviating the pressure for public parking.

East West Rail

The Parish Council notes that East West Rail refer to a number of policies in the NP and comment that efforts will be made to avoid, minimise and mitigate impacts. They also state they will undertake further surveys and continue to build their evidence. So far, the Parish Council has received little sign of further evidence being collected and notes this might be due to ongoing uncertainties with respect to design, the route, landscaping measures, banks, cuttings, bridges etc. As firm details are not yet available it is difficult for the Parish Council to respond to specific points.

South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC)

The Parish Council has a number of comments relating to the representations made by SCDC. These are set out in the table below. In a number of cases, the Parish Council has suggested some changes to the Plan as a way of addressing concerns raised in the representations. These are also indicated in the table below.

Consultee paragraph	Parish Council comment	Suggested change
	Policy HAR 1 'New development and design'	
SCDC (paragraph 7)	To address the concern set out in paragraph 7 of the response from SCDC we suggest the following amendment to Policy HAR1 <i>"Inappropriate boundary treatment, such as tall brick walls and tall fencing fronting the street that undermines the rural character of the village or is otherwise unsympathetic to the street scene will not be supported. This includes tall brick walls and tall fencing fronting directly on to the street, unless it can be demonstrated as not being harmful to the public realm and with reference to site context such as a long set back necessitating provision of enclosure to the plot."</i>	Yes

Consultee paragraph	Parish Council comment	Suggested change
SCDC (paragraph 8)	With regards paragraph 8 in the SCDC response relating to Policy HAR 1, Clause 5 is included because this is addressing an issue in Harston where development often results in impacting adversely on neighbours. We are otherwise comfortable with their suggested changes for Clause 5	If needed
	Policy HAR 2 'Protecting and enhancing important landscape features within the built-up environment'	
SCDC paragraph 9	We agree that Clause 1 in Policy HAR 2 should refer to Map 5 rather than Map 2 as per paragraph 9 in SCDC's comment	yes
SCDC paragraph 10	We agree with SCDC (see their paragraph 10) that the third bullet in Clause 1 in Policy HAR 2 should be amended as follows <i>"Existing grass verges where they contribute positively to the pedestrian environment <u>or local landscape character</u>"</i>	yes
SCDC paragraph 11 Re Clause 2	We agree with SCDC (see their paragraph 11) that the Clause 2 opening paragraph would be improved with the suggested wording as follows: <i>"Regardless of location all proposals involving new build, including householder extensions, will be required to explain submit a Landscape Compliance Statement which demonstrates how they will retain or improve existing landscaping on a site. Landscaping schemes should be provided at the outset of a development, ensuring planting areas and species achieve good outcomes. The following considerations apply ..."</i>	yes
SCDC paragraph 13 Re Clause 3 years.	We suggest the supporting text to Policy HAR 2 can have text added to explain the issue flagged up by SCDC in paragraph 13 of its response. For example: <i>"Clause 3 in Policy HAR 2 requires an applicant to make provision for future maintenance of a landscaping scheme. To implement this part of the policy, planning conditions are likely to be attached to development consents and applicants are likely to be requested to submit a Maintenance and Management Plan"</i>	Yes
	Policy HAR 3 Protecting and enhancing the landscape character and setting in and around Harston Village	
SCDC paragraph 14 re Paragraph 6.26 in NP	With regards to SCDC's comment on paragraph 6.26 we suggest this concern would be addressed through the following amendment: <i>"This gateway is located at the intersection of the railway line and Station Road and on approaching Harston from Newton, once the crest of the Newton Road hill has been reached, there is a view down into Harston that appears as a well</i>	Yes

Consultee paragraph	Parish Council comment	Suggested change
	wooded village, snuggled below on flat land <u>nestled below the chalk ridge on an area of flat land</u> , with further chalk hills seen beyond in the distance. The HLCA 2024 does however note that a stronger sense of arrival into Harston is felt further along Station Road, when the vista opens up to reveal the war memorial on Memorial Green.	
SCDC paragraph 15 Re section following 6.34.	To address SCDC's comment here, we suggest the following amendment. Add after last sentence in 6.34: '... is provided below'. <u>Map 8 shows the locations of most landscape features mentioned, otherwise the map number is given for feature locations.</u> (eg map 14 for gravel pits and river terrace; Map 5 for The Green) For fringe area 2 remove reference to map 8.	Yes
SCDC paragraph 16	In paragraph 16 of SCDC's response it is asserted that the descriptions of the views provided in Appendix 4 'appears to explain the sense of place provided by each view, rather than the specific key or significant features that are contained within the view' This is wholeheartedly rejected and is not a true reflection of the careful process undergone in identifying the locally important views, neither does it indicate firstly that the Plan area has been visited in person by the author of the comment or that the detail set out in Appendix 4 has been thoroughly considered. Landscape character appraisal is about what makes up the sense of place for locals that we wouldn't want to lose e.g. a locally valued view is often made up of a combination of features (where individual features may well be found in other locations). It is entirely incorrect to imply there is a relatively low threshold for designation. In the process of identifying views, a total of 40 views were initially identified by locals and displayed for consultation, some shown in photos found at: https://harstonvillage.uk/neighbourhood-plan/landscape-character/ For the purpose of the wider landscape character appraisal work, volunteers undertook survey work in July 2023 and as part of this they recorded landscape character area value including visual aspects such as notable views. This survey work helped with the consolidation of the most significant views. The views	No

Consultee paragraph	Parish Council comment	Suggested change
	<p>were reduced to a much lower number ahead of two workshops that took place in September and early November 2023 with landscape architect Alison Farmer, following which they were further reduced (a number of in-village views were taken out).</p> <p>The views have all been identified following a consistent methodology. Firstly, views were characterised (in terms of built and natural features and landmarks) and then evaluated (in terms of how the view influences perception of place, the function of the view and the rarity of the view). Views were also evaluated in terms of their sensitivity to change.</p>	
SCDC paragraph 16 continued	<p>For each view included in Appendix 4 in the submission HNP, detail is therefore provided on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location • Description + key features • Why valued- (including how it provides a sense of place important to locals) • Sensitivity to change and guidelines where applicable. <p>As this hasn't been readily understood by SCDC, we suggest we could address this through inserting subheadings into Appendix 4. Here is an example.</p> <p>Example of village landscape views</p> <p>“View A Location: by Harston House wall, church Street.</p> <p>Description: View looks north over an old, enclosed pasture, with old historic buildings and old walls framing either side. Beyond the hedge/tree bound pasture can be seen arable farmland over gently rising (chalk) topography.</p> <p><i>The view changes and becomes much longer once the trees have shed their leaves. Then you can see the soft vegetated edge of the back gardens in the distance along the west side of the High St (in right half of photo) that frame the view.</i></p> <p>Why is it valued: Both winter and summer views are valued as they allow the feel of the countryside to enter the built village, and local residents enjoy the changing vegetation and colours.</p> <p><i>This open frontage is a defining characteristic of this historic part of the village as the horse pasture, a visually important open space, reinforces the separate character of arable</i></p>	yes

Consultee paragraph	Parish Council comment	Suggested change
	<p>farmland beyond from the historic core of the village around Harston House while providing for the latter's rural setting. The pasture and well conserved old farm buildings used to be associated with Harston House's farm, long since gone, so are valued for their historic link.</p> <p><u>Sensitivity to change and guidelines:</u> A previous proposal for the Melbourn Greenway to divert through this area has been put aside as it lacked popularity. Transition areas between built village and Green Belt, that frame the view to right, need to ensure their vegetation is not removed.</p> <p>Example of wider landscape views:</p> <p>View L Location: Just east of level crossing on Newton Rd. Description: This view looks northeast, through a gap in the hedgerow, over a rolling wide open landscape of different colour arable fields with more intermittent field boundaries, to the wooded top of St Margaret's Mount in the distance. The hedgerow line across the view disguises the road from Newton to London Rd, in Harston.</p> <p><u>Why is it valued:</u> This wide open view with large skies give a real sense of place with the wooded high end point of the chalk ridge providing an interesting contrasting landscape for locals to see, appreciate, walk and ride near compared with the flat land the village is located on. A view of St Margaret's Mount can also be seen from various points along the footpath north of the railway line before it reaches Shelford Road and emphasizes the way the chalk ridge surrounds the village to the southeast and east, reinforcing our sense of place. The obelisk monument on top of St Margaret's Mount, which has links to Harston Manor's history, and old C19 clunch/chalk pits that used to contain lime kilns, cannot be seen from Harston but can be walked to.</p> <p><u>Sensitivity to change and guidelines</u> East West Rail will cut across this view if it goes ahead creating a visual disturbance and loss of tranquillity, as well as disruption to natural habitats and wildlife.</p>	
SCDC paragraph 16. SCDC also comment that a number of views are from Important Countryside	In paragraph 16 of its response SCDC suggest that the fact an Important Countryside Frontage has been identified removes the point in recognising a locally valued view that might also exist. This argument is rejected. The ICF designation is defined in South Cambridgeshire's 2018 Local Plan as being land as having a strong countryside character either because:	No

Consultee paragraph	Parish Council comment	Suggested change
<p>Frontages (ICF), such as Views A and J, and the ICF designation already provides protection to these areas of countryside from any development proposals that would compromise its purpose as an ICF.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The land 'penetrates or sweeps into the built-up area providing a significant connection between the street scene and the surrounding rural area' or - The land 'provides an important rural break between two nearby but detached parts of the development framework' <p>The policy resists development that would contribute either of these purposes.</p> <p>The policy does not make reference to the need to consider the impact of development on a locally valued view that might exist. Furthermore, there is no publicly available assessment as to why each ICF that is designated via the 2018 Local Plan meets the definition of an ICF and there is no information available to indicate whether the ICF coincides with an established Locally Important View.</p> <p>To conclude, the existence of an ICF does not negate the added value in identifying where an important landscape view may also exist.</p> <p>We can draw on a specific examples where settlement character has been adversely affected through insensitive development and were a views policy in place at the time this could have resulted in schemes which work better within their site context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View D back towards the village has already had a large building put up in garden that people are protesting about- dominating the centre of the view and sensitive edge of open space; rather than providing a vegetated boundary. • View J has already had a loss of boundary vegetation and loss of enclosure and feel of rural ness as two large houses have been built behind Neptune. This development impacts an ICF! <p>Furthermore, Green Belt matters focus on impact of openness of countryside yet many of our views are enclosed by vegetation which is important to retain.</p> <p>ICF retains frontage but says little about protecting view behind it.</p>	
<p>SCDC paragraph 16 continued</p>	<p>It is also entirely both misguided and misleading to suggest the Plan has not had regard to national policies or does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In Harston the housing requirement figure issued to it has been fulfilled through completions, yet the Plan has been proactive in identifying suitable sites for development in recognition of its parish level need and</p>	<p>No</p>

Consultee paragraph	Parish Council comment	Suggested change
	demand for housing during the length of the Plan period. This is despite the fact that the vast majority of the land surrounding the village is designated by the local planning authority as part of the Cambridge Green Belt, thereby ruling out immediately any option for Harston Parish Council to consider land in these locations (other than brownfield sites). The allocation of sites through the Harston Neighbourhood is not a decision taken lightly. The work has involved a huge amount of work, and a huge amount of volunteer hours. Starting initially with the parish-level call for sites and finishing with the completion of a full Strategic Environmental Assessment (since the local planning authority automatically screens plans in for requiring SEA even though SEA is only intended to capture land use plans that are likely to lead to likely significant environmental effects).	
SCDC paragraph 16	In paragraph 16 of its response, SCDC comment that the impact of a view into a neighbouring parish from the plan area cannot be considered when making decisions on planning applications in those parishes. We accept this comment and suggest it is addressed through the removal of View "Q"	Yes.
SCDC paragraph 17	In its paragraph 17, SCDC are requesting for the removal of Clause 3 on the basis that there is no way of determining whether or not a view has been enhanced by a development. Here we draw attention to Appendix 4 – it is set out here where there are opportunities to enhance a view.	No
	Policy HAR 4 'Conserving and enhancing heritage assets in Harston'	
SCDC paragraph 18	With respect to paragraph 18 in the SCDC comment, the Parish Council would be happy for the Clause 1 to be reworded with the addition of the word identified. So Clause 1 to read: The buildings and structures listed in this policy and described in more detail in Appendix 3 to this plan, have been identified as non-designated heritage assets. <u>Developers should consult the list of local heritage assets identified in this policy and described in more detail in Appendix 3 of this plan, in addition to consulting the local authority maps for heritage assets and buried archaeological evidence, available via the Cambridgeshire Historic Environment Record (CHER)</u>	Yes
	Policy HAR 5: Preserving the special character of Harston's historic core	
SCDC Paragraph 21	With respect to paragraph 21 in the SCDC comment, we suggest this can be addressed by adding to paragraph 6.47 that the Historic Core (CA2) is made up of CA2a and CA2b.	Yes

Consultee paragraph	Parish Council comment	Suggested change
	<p>And add at end of 6.48 that Character area 2b is made up of the old railway area including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • old Station House • Redeveloped goods yard – now Sig roofing/Tanner & Hall • Tiptofts 1930s house developed in what was once Baggot Wood 	
	Policy HAR 6: Button End	
SCDC paragraph 22	With respect to SCDCs comment regarding HAR 6 (set out in paragraph 22 of SCDC's representation) please see the PC response to examiner question 3.	
<p>SCDC paragraph 24</p> <p>SCDC have spotted a typo in the reference to the public right of way in paragraph 6.59</p>	We agree with SCDC where it states in paragraph 24 of its response that PROW 116/3 has been incorrectly referred to as PROW 116/13 and would be pleased to correct this in paragraph 6.59 of the submitted Plan.	Yes
	Policy HAR 8 Improving open space provision in Harston	
SCDC paragraph 26	<p>Policy HAR 8: We note the proposed wording suggested by SCDC in paragraph 26 of its response. The proposed wording however would not make sense since it is not within the scope of a planning application to affect what happens to land that is not within the control of an applicant. That is why it is the role of plan-making to safeguard land identified as being important for open space provision.</p> <p>The Parish Council is satisfied the current wording meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>With regards to implementation, the intention is for the PC to take over management of the area as common land by putting up notices to that effect once a management committee of locals has been created. The Wildlife Trust have been to look at the site and Jesus College have stated they will consider access to the site from their land.</p>	No
	Policy HAR 9: Protecting and enhancing Harston's wider landscape character	
SCDC paragraph 27	With regard to paragraph 27 in the SCDC's response please refer to the PC's response to the examiner question 4.	
	Policy HAR 10: Protecting and enhancing biodiversity in Harston parish	
SCDC (paragraph 28)	We support the proposed amendment to Clause 6 in Policy HAR 10 as suggested by SCDC in paragraph 28 of its response.	yes
	Policy HAR 12 supporting renewable infrastructure in Harston Parish	

Consultee paragraph	Parish Council comment	Suggested change
SCDC paragraphs 31 and 32	With regards to paragraphs 31 and 32 in SCDC's response, please see Parish Council response to examiner question 7.	
	Policy HAR 13: Managing flood risk in Harston Parish	
SCDC paragraph 33	We agree with SCDC where it states in paragraph 33 of its representation that the HNP Policy should highlight the latest flood risk information on the EA's website. This can be done by adding a sentence to supporting text to Policy HAR 13, specifically paragraph 9.33 in the HNP.	yes
	Policy HAR 15: Housing mix, including First Homes in Harston	
SCDC paragraph 36 SCDC recommend an amendment to clause 2 part b	As set out in the Parish Council's response to examiner question 11, the Parish Council agrees with the amendment proposed by SCDC (in paragraph 36 of its response) to Policy HAR 15 so that clause 2, part b, bullet point 2 is amended to read: <i>Where first homes are included in the mix it they should be delivered at 50% discount, <u>unless evidence is provided that a lower discount is needed for the purpose of delivering a viable product and it is evidenced that the products would be affordable to eligible local households</u></i>	yes
SCDC paragraph 37	With regards to paragraph 37 in SCDC's comment, please refer to the Parish Council's response to examiner question 10.	
	HAR 16 Managing the movement of people and vehicles arising from new development	
SCDC paragraph 39	With respect to paragraph 39 in SCDC's comment, the Parish Council comments that the conflict is between road users exiting properties along A10 and pedestrians and cyclists on the cycleway alongside the A10, rather than cars exiting onto road traffic on A10. An amendment to Clause 3 in the policy could be made to address this misunderstanding as follows: <i>Where existing road safety issues are already established, development proposals will be expected to take available opportunities to address or alleviate these as part of their proposal, wherever practicable to do so. This includes measures designed to reduce the level of conflict between road users, <u>especially between pedestrians and cyclists using the pavement/cycleway and motorised vehicles seeking to cross the cycleway</u>) along the A10 e.g. increasing visibility at the exit points of driveways.</i>	yes
	Policy HAR 17 'Recognising and mitigating the impacts of development on traffic movements in Church Street'	

Consultee paragraph	Parish Council comment	Suggested change
SCDC paragraph 40	With respect to paragraph 40 in SCDC's response, please refer to our response to examiner question 13. The Parish Council does not agree with the proposed wording amendments to Clause 1, Policy HAR 17 as proposed by SCDC in paragraph 40 of its comment. This is because development proposals that come forward in Button End have a direct impact on traffic movements (in particular HGV movements) in Church Street.	
SCDC paragraph 41	<p>The Parish Councils agrees with SCDC (as per its comment made at paragraph 41) that minor amendments are required to Clause 2 Policy HAR as follows:</p> <p><i>"Additionally, development proposals in the plan area that will lead to additional movement of HGV or other wide vehicles (large vans) along Church Street will not be supported, unless it can be demonstrated that mitigation measures are in place that <u>ensure</u>:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• ensure that traffic can flow along Church Street without drivers of any vehicle being forced to drive on the pavement <u>and</u></i> <i>• the historic buildings, including their setting, are not at risk from being damaged by vehicles including through vibrations.</i> 	yes
	Policy HAR 20 Telephone exchange site	
SCDC paragraph 42	SCDC's comments in relation to Policy HAR 20, as expressed in paragraph 42 of the SCDC representation, are noted. However, we have worded the policy so that it does not stop other land uses from coming forward but it is stating that proposals that deliver a public car park at that site will be supported. See also the Parish Council response to examiner question 14.	
	Policy HAR 21 Connecting our village through an improved network of rural routes	
SCDC paragraph 44	<p>We agree with SCDC's suggestion for minor amendments to paragraph 12.12 as set out in paragraph 44 of the SCDC representation</p> <p><i>The creation of routes vii) and viii) 7 and 8 described could be part of a Cam trail that stretches from Trumpington Meadows, through the proposed new development west of A10 in Hauxton, onto the public path, then permissive path, then on to the river terrace, past the wood, through the underused meadow, coming out at southern end of Button End.</i></p>	yes
	Policy HAR 22 Delivering active travel infrastructure as part of new development	

Consultee paragraph	Parish Council comment	Suggested change
SCDC paragraph 45	We agree with SCDC's suggestion (as per paragraph 45 in its representation) that Policy SC/4 from South Cambridgeshire's 2018 Local Plan should be listed as an applicable policy following the policy box.	yes
	Policy HAR 28 Land at 131 High Street	
SCDC paragraph 47	The Parish Council agrees with SCDC that paragraph 14.12 should be amended to refer to the site falling partly within the development framework and partly outside of it.	yes
SCDC paragraph 48	We are happy to relocate the information regarding anticipated delivery of this site to the supporting text as requested in paragraph 48 of the SCDC representation.	yes
Paragraph 49 "Clause 2, second bullet point, requires promotion of 'circular walking routes of at least 2.7km, dedicated dogs off lead areas and dog waste bins' to mitigate for recreational pressure on SACs and Ramsar sites. It is unclear where this requirement comes from and exactly what any proposed development on this site will need to do to meet this requirement."	With respect to SCDC's comment on Policy HAR 28 (see paragraph 49 in SCDC's representation), this requirement comes from the HRA appropriate assessment. The Parish Council is liaising with SCDC on this matter and it is intended a joint response will be provided to the examiner in due course.	Likely
Appendix 3		
SCDC make minor comments on Appendix 3 requesting the section is reviewed for consistency of formatting	The Parish Council is happy to review the wording and notes that detailed summaries will, in due course be available to view on the Cambridgeshire Local Heritage Assets website.	

Typographical errors:

The Parish Council has noted the following typographical errors and would welcome the opportunity to correct them. As follows:

Submission Plan paragraph	Amendment
Paragraph 12.11	3 rd title to be amended as follows: 3. and 4. The provision of a segregated path alongside London Road from the edge of the village to the Shelford Road junction and improvements to the existing narrow path from the Shelford Road junction to the parish boundary at Hill Farm...
	4 th title to be amended as follows: <u>4 and 5.</u> The provision of a safe and attractive rural route that connects residential areas south of London Road to the community orchard,