

Stapleford and Great Shelford Neighbourhood Plan. Report of responses received from residents, workers and business owners to the Regulation 14 consultation 11 March to 30 April 2024

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		Chapter 2: About Stapleford and Great Shelford	
Para 2.7	R4	the final sentence of paragraph 2.7 could be read to endorse the ambitions of the Cambridge Biomedical Campus' Vision 2050: creating a life sciences quarter for Cambridge. Neither the existing Local Plan, nor the First Proposals for a draft Local Plan do so and neither should the Neighbourhood Plan. The sentence should be redrafted and please also look at what is said about in Appendix 8, which is better	We respectfully disagree: South Cambridgeshire's 2018 Local Plan includes Policy E/2: 'Cambridge Biomedical Campus Extension' which allocates land to extend the site. The S&GS NP recognises this existing planning policy context. Text has been added to make the position of the NP clearer on this.
Para 2.6	R99	NP para 2.6: "in- and out-bound trains typically stop at Shelford Station two to four times per hour". If only! That's the combined figure counting trains in both directions. Could be reworded as "trains typically stop at Shelford hourly in each direction off-peak, half-hourly at peak times". Same ambiguity arises in para 10.30.	Noted and accepted.
		Chapter 4: Identifying key issues	
SWOT analysis	R100	<p>Facing future pressures</p> <p>The tone often feels quite sanguine. The report paints an attractive picture of the countryside around us and it is clearly very important and highly valued. But the great majority of the land is intensively farmed arable land of pretty low biodiversity value. [...]</p> <p>My feeling is that the threats to the objectives set out in the NP are more pressing than seems to be acknowledged, even though they are generally recognised. Some already seem to be being compromised, especially the aim to keep the landscape gap between the NP area and Cambridge City.</p>	Noted and accepted, although some of the more strategic issues commented on here are outside the scope of neighbourhood planning. The SWOT analysis has been updated.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		<p>Clearly the CSET busway would have a major impact and with the extra funding announced in the budget, seems more than likely to go ahead. That would have clear impact on landscape in the greenbelt, travel arrangements (eg disruption along Granhams Road and Hinton Way), new pressures for housing development in the areas between the route and the village envelope, light pollution, etc.</p> <p>There are also developments around the Biomedical campus that impinge on the NP area. An expansion of the biomedical campus onto land in Shelford was announced a few years ago, and proximity to Nine Wells didn't deter it. [...]</p> <p>There are other issues such as East West Rail. But the Gove proposals for Cambridge expansion will further dramatically increase pressures and take control away from the existing authorities. We are likely no doubt, for instance, to see a renewal of the Jesus College 'Cambridge South' proposal for a new science park on land between Cambridge Road and the M11 (http://cambridgesouth.azurewebsites.net/)</p> <p>Growth of Cambridge will also increase the demands on the countryside in the NP area from people in Cambridge. The focus in the NP is on the value to the NP residents, but there are many more people using it from outside of our area and that will only increase. Provision needs to reflect that overall demand.</p> <p>As is stated in the report, I appreciate that these will be developments that the NP can't prevent, but can we do more to identify potential mitigating and compensating measures that could be implemented, such as other countryside enhancements or access routes? The 2019 Landscape Assessment, for example made suggestions as to how the potential impact of Cambridge South might be mitigated. Can, for instance, the NP set out proposals that could mitigate and compensate for the impact of the CSET route? Might it establish the principle that there shouldn't be development between the route and the current villages?</p>	

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
Para 4.9	R100	I don't think that we really have any 'waterside routes' except at the end of the Recreation ground in Great Shelford (4.9)? The initial route for the Sawston Greenway did include a section beside a river, but that was dropped.	Noted and accepted.
Chapter 6: Housing and the built environment			
General	R103	<p>There is no 11th Commandment which states that every new house should be constructed by a developer. Our villages are an interesting mix of design and style created over many generations. The inclusion of the opportunity to build your own house would meet the need for affordable houses for certain groups of people. These houses could be designed so that they can evolve as the family expands meaning money can be spent as it becomes available throughout family lifetime. It would also create a variety of styles and sizes (within parameters) creating interesting, individual communities. Every site which comes up for development approval should include self build and or small builder plots. There would need to be a decision on what responsibility there would be for landowners to provide basic infrastructure such as roads etc.</p> <p>Far too much profit is being paid to landowners and developers which makes housing so unaffordable.</p> <p>This Plan assumes old people want to live in old people ghettos - is that really true? How many older people really want to be removed from a mixed community of ages? The opportunity for properties to create additional accommodation for extended family or changes in family circumstances is to be applauded.</p> <p>When planning accommodation for older members of the community, it is essential to consider opportunities for independent transport and access to community facilities. They should not be pushed out on a limb.</p> <p>Older generations should in no way be coerced into thinking that they are socially or morally obliged to leave the home they have loved and nurtured</p>	<p>Noted. However, it is unclear under which circumstances self-build houses and plots would be more affordable for certain groups of people because, given the pressure on land for development, new plots big enough for a property to expand on over time are likely to be too expensive to buy in the first instance.</p> <p>We respectfully disagree. See Policy S&GS 4 and para 6.57 ("specialist housing schemes [are] located within the development framework and in locations that are easily accessible to shops, services and community facilities").</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		<p>for their entire working life and which finally they are proud and entitled to own and enjoy amongst friends and neighbours.</p> <p>There should also be careful consideration given to allowing existing bungalows often occupied by older residents, to be converted into large houses. Retaining existing single storey housing within the communities enables natural 'downsizing opportunities' and should be positively encouraged.</p>	Noted.
General	R104	<p>Paradoxically a lot of the existing housing locally is extremely tired and run down, compared to modern standards, as the report alludes, with poor insulation, old-fashioned plumbing, bins cluttering up the streetscape, little bike storage and insufficient charging points for electric cars. We should consider lobbying for more grants to upgrade local housing stock. Installation of secure bin and bike shelters, including with charging points for batteries, should not require planning permission.</p>	Noted.
		Policy S&GS 1: Housing Mix	
General	R31	<p>Many homes started as small units that could have been defined as 'affordable' but have been extended, sometimes vastly. How can this be discouraged so that certain homes remain 'affordable'? How will 'local needs' be assessed? Sometimes individuals/families in need are not immediately identifiable.</p>	<p>Where 'affordable housing' is referred to in the S&GS NP it means affordable housing as defined nationally by government (see NPPF 2023 or glossary to S&GS NP). Many types of affordable housing are required to remain as affordable. This includes rural exception site affordable housing, most types of affordable rents and First Homes. It is accepted that householders have the right to extend their homes and, depending on the scale of the extension, this is subject to</p>

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
			planning permission too. Generally, this would only apply to occupier owned housing.
General	R91	Straightforward Social housing for rent. Should be available. Affordable should be what it says whether affordable social housing or properties to buy. With the mixed social/affordable 'hybrid' it should be possible to move on to full ownership. With shared equity house purchases it should be made straightforward to move up to larger houses as necessary (eg when a couple have children - a problem encountered within our family, first trying to fit boy and girl in 2 bedroom house and later hospital type bed after serious accident).	Where 'affordable housing' is referred to in the S&GS NP it means affordable housing as defined nationally by government (see NPPF 2023 or glossary to S&GS NP). For some types of affordable housing that are delivered as part of S106 agreements (i.e. not rural exception sites), the right to buy may apply. As family circumstances change (e.g. larger home needed), selling and buying a new property is challenging. There are specific challenges around shared ownership properties and these will depend on the shared ownership product. The government provides online guidance for people in this position. See https://www.gov.uk/shared-ownership-scheme/selling-your-home
General	R104	As the report states, the area has become extremely imbalanced in terms of its provision for wealthy older homeowners, as opposed to younger age groups. Planning permission is still being given very routinely for very large, expensive, detached housing on central village sites where it would be more appropriate to build the 2- and 3-bed semi-detached housing that is	Noted.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		really needed. An example of this is the current development of four very large homes priced at well over £1m between Great Shelford and Stapleford. The assumption moving forwards should be that new housing is more suitable for young families on a budget.	
		Policy S&GS 2: Prioritising local needs in the allocation of affordable housing	
General	R54	Permitted housing should be affordable for local jobs, whether existing or new.	Noted.
General	R74	I have no idea how this could work. How can you stop someone from buying or selling a house in a free and open market?	The prioritisation of allocation would only apply to the affordable housing products.
General	R86	I do not know how practical it is to keep housing affordable and for families with local ties, in perpetuity - is this even possible ?	The prioritisation of allocation is possible to apply to affordable rented products and these can stay in place long term. It is also possible to apply a local connection test to affordable ownership products such as First Homes.
General	R96	I agree with the intent but wonder how a "strong local connection" will be enforced.	The prioritisation of allocation would only apply to the affordable housing products.
		Policy S&GS 3: Rural exception housing	
General	R17	I have reservations about building on exception sites outside the development framework (Q6) as it could be a 'thin end of the wedge' into green belt development	Noted.
General	R74	as soon as you have an exception, developers will take advantage of it. Also, I am disappointed at the lack of reference to the green belt, which stipulates that development should only be allowed under exceptional circumstances. I firmly disagree with this policy.	Noted.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
General	R96	While I support the goal of more affordable housing, I do not agree that there should be rural exceptions for any developments, even small, affordable ones.	Noted.
		Policy S&GS 4: Meeting the needs of the older population	
General	R54	Not sure what you mean by 'sheltered housing' but that which is provided by the local authority is no longer 'fit for purpose' with a warden visit a couple of times a week basically for maintenance matters.	Noted.
General	R74	I find this policy confusing. Both parish councils have opposed the building of elderly care homes in the past few years, correctly in my opinion, but this policy appears to go against that. Further, if the area already has a population that is older than average, why would you encourage more elderly people to move here. That can only be to a great detriment of the local economy. I disagree with this policy.	The NP is not encouraging more elderly care homes or retirement communities, but neither can we prevent planning applications for them. In the event that they come forward, we need a policy to influence them. Hence, Policy S&GS 4 has been amended so it is clear that the NP would only support new schemes if certain criteria are met, including that schemes are located in the development framework. Further supporting text has also been included to clarify the situation regarding existing supply and schemes in the pipeline.
General	R96	Great Shelford is already widely perceived as having a very high density of older people. For the sake of a balanced community, I do not think we need to encourage more Care Home developments.	The NP is not encouraging more elderly care homes or retirement communities, but neither can we prevent planning applications for them. In the event that they come forward, we need a policy to

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
			influence them. Hence, Policy S&GS 4 has been amended so it is clear that the NP would only support new schemes if certain criteria are met, including that schemes are located in the development framework. Further supporting text has also been included to clarify the situation regarding existing supply and schemes in the pipeline.
General	R104	Where housing for older people is being developed, as described in the report, it is increasingly within a quasi-feudal framework in that developers such as Churchill retain certain rights over the properties and charge extremely high monthly service charges for facilities older people may or may not want or need, such as extremely lavish members-only gyms, beauty salons and lounges. They also charge high 'event fees' when owners die or need to sell, to further maximise their profits. This is an inappropriate business model given it does not give elderly residents much choice, if these are the only kinds of properties being developed for them locally. A better model is that used at Peacocks, where people can choose what services to buy in for themselves, at a more reasonable cost.	Noted.
		Policy S&GS 5: Residential annexes to facilitate multi-generational living	
General	R19	While agreeing that residential annexes should be allowed for multi-generational living, it should be legally enforced that such annexes can not be sold separately from the main building and then developed into a new building.	Noted.
Para 6.57	R52	what if there are new occupants of the primary home but the original qualifying person remains in the annex (admittedly unlikely, but possible) - can s/he stay?	No, the primary home and annex would be sold as one property.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
General	R97	Would support small infill developments in centre of village to assist section 8, multigenerational living	Noted.
		Policy S&GS 6: Development and design	
General	R16	I wonder if the vernacular prompts could be extended to include the following examples of good contemporary architecture in Stapleford? The Granary, 35 Bar Lane, 8A Gog Magog Way to encourage and embrace modern materials and designs?	Our Design Guidance and Codes 2023 has a role here – a supporting document to the S&GS NP. Note that 8A Gog Magog Way is an art deco property and nearly 100 years old, so would no longer be considered an example of contemporary architecture.
Para 6.70, p45	R24	"The purpose of Policy S&GS 5 is to add local context to Policy HQ/1: Design...". I think the reference here should be to Policy S&GS 6	Noted and agreed.
General	R59	Please don't build new properties with a flat roof as that stores up trouble in the future. It is a shame when a bungalow in the village comes on the market most of them are knocked down and replaced by a huge house. This should not be allowed [NB: Consultee put sentences 2 and 3 against S&GS11 but they better fit here]	Noted.
General	R64	All development must be subject to and enhance clean water availability.	Noted.
General	R103	Regarding development and design – there is nothing within this section to set policy on mitigation for the existing community for development permission. There needs to be some reference to expecting any new large-scale development to provide benefits for the existing community in terms of funding for access or provision of green spaces together with access. Peripheral bridleways (the best form of inclusive access other than restricted byways) should be required to be provided. This can benefit all residents as well as ‘softening the edges’ of built form so long as rural and natural surfacing is adopted – examples can be seen at Cambourne and the	Noted. But the purpose of this policy is to influence the look, feel and quality of the form of new development, not to specify mitigation for development permission. This is dealt with elsewhere in the NP, e.g. in Policy S&GS 17: Delivering community

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		eastern side of the Marleigh Development, Newmarket Road, Cambridge. People love to feel they have a connection with the countryside even when they are in inner urban areas. The benefits of the countryside on mental and physical wellbeing is very well documented. Seen from the raised areas such as the Drift Track, Stapleford is nestled in a 'green duvet'. That is something which needs preserving and demanding for the future.	infrastructure priorities alongside new development.
		Policy S&GS 7: Mitigating and adapting to climate change through building design	
General	R4	more emphasis should be given to grey water solutions (distressingly rare, at an individual household level) and separation of foul and grey water drainage systems	Separation of foul and grey water drainage systems is essential and a requirement for any new build. However, it remains an issue with older properties.
General	R12	very important	Noted.
Para 7.14, p51/52	R24	"The Net Zero carbon toolkit. People considering new development proposals in the Plan area are encouraged to use the toolkit". Could the NP be stronger on this and insist that developers must demonstrate that they have used the toolkit?	The NP is seeking to be as strong as it possibly can be. However, there are a range of toolkits available and best practice is likely to progress during the plan period.
General	R27	could you set the water usage number at 80, as in Eddington, rather than 110 and hoping people will drop to 80? And can you specify natural drainage methods more specifically ie wetland areas, ponds?	The NP is seeking to be as strong as it possibly can be. Policies in the NP have statutory weight and must be complied with so wording needs to be precise. Our policy refers to minimising water usage in line with the Local Plan. Supporting text to the policy says 110 litres per person, ideally 80 litres.
S&GS 7, no. 2	R32	SGS6-7 Says that proposals should be guided by the Design Guidance. This in turn says solar panels should be on less visible roof slopes. They	Noted. Supporting text (7.22) addresses this.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		need to be on the most effective slope for catching sunlight. I would like policy 7.2 to override this guideline. Climate change is the greatest threat the world faces.	
S&GS 7, no. 3	R32	SGS7.3 is inadequate to address the increasing problem of overheating especially in top floor flats. I would like to see provision for through ventilation and reducing solar gain on roofs, especially flat ones.	Accepted. Policy text has been amended.
S&GS 7, no. 1	R52	is it possible to say 'Development proposals MUST adopt' etc	We can't in the case of Clause 1; but we can in the case of Clause 2.
General	R64	All development must be subject to and enhance clean water availability.	Noted.
General	R65	Zero emissions as a target is unrealistic for lost cost housing and sometimes positively disadvantageous as elderly occupants struggle to adapt to it	Not accepted. Low carbon and net zero homes will be cheaper to run.
General	R71	A lack of water is a major concern in East Anglia in general and the Cambridge area in particular. Development must take this into account.	Noted. This is acknowledged in the NP.
General	R74	I find the Climate Change policies disappointing in that they don't go far enough. Where possible we should be encouraging people (or even compelling developers in the case of new builds) to insulate properly houses, have local electricity generation such as PV, and low-carbon hot water heating such as ground or air source heat pumps and solar thermal panels. We should also be encouraging people to have local storage such as batteries in order to smooth out the natural variability of solar and wind power. Much of the current housing stock will be here in 100 years and we cannot load the cost of upgrading the building stock onto the future generations when it will be even more expensive than it is now. Asking planning applicants to submit a statement simply isn't enough and I don't think it will achieve anything.	Noted. Policy S&GS 7 requires all proposals to follow the energy hierarchy and this is substantiated by supporting paragraphs setting out guidelines. Unfortunately, the NP is restricted on how prescriptive it can be.
		Policy S&GS 8: Renewable energy schemes in Stapleford & Great Shelford	
General	R12	very important	Noted.
General	R74	I find the Climate Change policies disappointing in that they don't go far enough. Where possible we should be encouraging people (or even	Noted. Policy S&GS 7 requires all proposals to follow the energy

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		compelling developers in the case of new builds) to insulate properly houses, have local electricity generation such as PV, and low-carbon hot water heating such as ground or air source heat pumps and solar thermal panels. We should also be encouraging people to have local storage such as batteries in order to smooth out the natural variability of solar and wind power. Much of the current housing stock will be here in 100 years and we cannot load the cost of upgrading the building stock onto the future generations when it will be even more expensive than it is now. Asking planning applicants to submit a statement simply isn't enough and I don't think it will achieve anything.	hierarchy and this is substantiated by supporting paragraphs setting out guidelines. Unfortunately, the NP is restricted on how prescriptive it can be.
		Policy S&GS 9: Protecting and enhancing biodiversity and nature networks in Stapleford and Great Shelford	
General	R12	very important	Noted.
Para 7.41, p60	R24	page 60. clause 7.41 "Gog Magog Hills, summarised as chalk grassland and woodlands including Wandlebury Country Park, Cherry Hinton Chalk Pit8, Roman Road, Beechwoods and Magog Downs". Should just be Magog Down no plural 's' needed. Page 60/clause 7.41 County Wildlife Sites should include Magog Down.	Noted and accepted.
General	R27	need to stress that isolated pockets of a species isn't enough, there need to be wildlife corridors, so developments need to allow wildlife to get to other existing green areas like Wandlebury, etc	Noted and agreed. The policies recognise the importance of biodiversity corridors.
S&GS 9	R32	SGS9 this section is toothless. "Mitigation and management" are inadequate to compensate for loss for damage to established habitats. Clause 2a) is the only one of any use. Developments which do not meet it should be refused; notwithstanding Clause 5. Developers would be delighted to "compensate" instead of not damaging habitats and biodiversity in the first place. Replacement or substitute sites are rarely the same value as established ones.	Concerns are noted. The policies are worded so that compensation is a last resort. It is agreed that mitigation hierarchy is separate to BNG and that wherever there is significant harm, permission should be refused. This is set out in the policies.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
General	R60	protect existing green belts	Noted. However, the status of green belt is a matter for the higher level plan and national policy.
General	R64	All development must be subject to and enhance clean water availability.	Noted.
General	R66	Biodiversity Net Gain: I have ticked "Disagree" here, because I spy the weasel words "Where possible" in relation to ensuring BNG is achieved *on site*. I am firmly of the opinion that this provision is not strong enough. The practice of out-sourcing BNG metrics to an offsite location is the latest travesty of Greenwashing practice, and will be used by developers and others to get approval for actions that will destroy local biodiversity. Therefore, I think 'where possible' should be removed here, and all BNG must be achieved on site, for every development.	Noted. However, the legislation in place does not allow for this. The achievement of BNG on site will not be possible in every case on every site.
General	R96	I wholeheartedly agree with protecting and enhancing biodiversity and nature networks, but the proposed policy suggests that net bio-diversity gains should be "on-site where possible". This is not good enough. Damage mitigation and actions leading to net biodiversity gain MUST be local.	Noted. However, the legislation in place does not allow for this. The achievement of BNG on site will not be possible in every case on every site.
General	R100	It is fair to propose that biodiversity gains arising from Biodiversity Net Gain should be concentrated on development sites where possible (although some would argue that that would minimise the potential for BNG to deliver larger scale conservation enhancements). But can we have a BNG policy that also proposes that, where enhancement is not possible on-site, it should be directed to enhancements within the NP area?	Noted and accepted. The policy has been amended to strengthen and emphasise this.
		Policy S&GS 10: Trees and development	
General	R39	Future maintenance of trees should include a proviso that they are not allowed to grow out of proportion to the site and to the detriment of neighbours. Our garden, for example, gets less sun each year because of the unchecked growth of trees in neighbouring properties.	Noted. However, this is challenging to influence through planning policy.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
S&GS 10, no. 3	R52	should 'future' (maintenance) be defined (no of years)? If trees have to be replaced, will clock start again from date of replacement?	The policy has been amended to clarify an updated maintenance regime will be required alongside replacement trees.
General	R64	All development must be subject to and enhance clean water availability.	Noted.
General	R73	I approve of the emphasis on preservation of trees and natural habitat. I note, however, that many trees are on private land, often remote from public highways, and have not been granted TPOs, despite their ecological or scenic significance. This needs to be addressed.	The TPO process is not one that NP policies can influence, but work can still happen outside of the NP. For information, in 2024 Stapleford Parish Council established the 'Stapleford Tree Project' which, amongst other things, aims to identify, protect and preserve existing trees of particular value to the community, and work with residents/owners to place TPOs on a number of them.
General	R82	Only plea is that where replacement trees are mentioned they be defined as native species and to be of a type that invests for the future generations. I am specifically thinking that a flowering cherry cannot for instance replace a mature Oak or similar.	Noted and agreed. Clause 2 has been amended slightly to emphasize the importance of species. Climate change resilient planting and native planting is included in the policy too.
		Chapter 8: Our rural setting and landscape	
General	R103	Roadside planting – there has to be a caveat on this statement concerning protection of hedging from destructive weeds such as ivy, cleavers, bindweed, wild hop. No mow May etc. has to be balanced against the danger of allowing invasive weeds to thrive to the detriment of other important flora.	Noted. These issues relate more to maintenance practices by Parish Councils and CCC Highways than to planning decisions. S&GS Policy 11 and LCA 2019 do not specifically deal with roadside

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		The other important use of roadside verges is as safe havens for non motorised users. Planting policies should recognise the need for and incorporate provision for safe access from vehicular travel. This could be provided in the form of a mown path away from the carriageway. Safety of road users also needs to be taken into account in terms of visibility at junctions, roundabouts etc, acknowledging the fact that not all road users' line of sight is at car driver level.	planting so much as protecting and enhancing unbuilt zones of the Plan area.
		Policy S&GS 11: Protecting Stapleford and Great Shelford's landscape character	
S&GS 11	R4	the drafting of Policy S&GS11 is complex and difficult to follow. It needs careful review	The Policy has been reviewed in detail by SCDC and some amendments (notabl to Clause 5) have been made in light of this. The duplicate paragraph has been removed.
Para 8.12, p72	R24	Another reference to Magog Downs [should be Magog Down]. Should sub-clause f also cover Magog Down as a county wildlife site?	Noted and accepted.
S&GS 11, nos. 1-4	R29	policy 11, items 3 & 4 duplicate 1 & 2	Noted and accepted.
		Policy S&GS 12: Important views	
General	R26	Local viewpoints do not seem to carry much weight within development decisions. I hope that this plan will give us more input than hitherto.	Noted and agreed.
General	R41	I suggest extending the important views 'V' and 'Y' in Stapleford, to include the view from all the land in between those two spots.	Noted. This land is not publicly accessible so has limited value for public enjoyment. Therefore, it has not been included.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
General	R46	it would be very beneficial for the character of the countryside to connect views V and Y	Noted.
General	R51	To include preserving the view from Freestones Corner (Reed House) intersection, so that the green space area, with historic site and the Gt Shelford painted sign is preserved. There have been several large grey phone/utility boxes erected in this area to its detriment.	Noted. There is, however, a need to identify the best views with either landscape or visual value or both. The view has been disrupted through siting of the infrastructure and has not been included.
Para 8.16	R99	<p>I thought it was unnecessarily sarcastic to refer to the railway footbridge at Shepreth Branch Junction as the "bridge to nowhere" in para 8.16 item K. Apart from being somewhere where young children and not-so-young adults watch trains, it's a useful route for residents of More's Meadow and nearby roads (Cambridge Road, The Hectare, Bridge Close etc) to access the DNA path towards the CBC and central Cambridge. As an aside, I've asked Network Rail's project manager for the Cambridge South project if they would consider improving the surface of the path between the footbridge and More's Meadow as a thank-you for the disruption in that area caused by the remodelling of the railway junction. Another enhancement would be gullies beside the footbridge steps to enable cycles to be wheeled up and down.</p> <p>Looking forward, if the schemes the NP proposes in para 11.14 (Jenny's path to the cemetery) and 11.18 (footpath alongside Granham's Road) come to fruition, the bridge makes even more sense as a way of linking the two and forming part of an orbital NMU leisure route around the Great Shelford / Stapleford conurbation.</p>	Noted and accepted.
General	R103	The view from the Drift Track towards Stapleford does not appear to have been included in this list. That is a hugely important view which is more accessible to more residents than, for example, any of the view from Magog Down since the Drift Track is more easily accessible than Magog Down – no parking fees and less far to walk.	Noted. Whilst we agreed that broken long views through high hedgerows from the Drift track exist, we consider them to be a subset of the longer view from

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		Whilst the Green Belt views from Gogmagog Way and Mingle Lane through the 'gaps' are much appreciated by residents, these cannot be guaranteed since they are on private land. The Drift Track has public access and plans are in place to add it to the Definitive Map as a public right of way. The views from the Drift Track should therefore be high on the list of protection as they should be available in perpetuity. [Consultee response includes map pin-pointing appropriate viewpoint and directions]	Little Tree Hill at Magog Down, which is already in the NP and a similar protected view is also described in the Greater Cambridge Landscape Character Assessment 2021.
		Policy S&GS 13: Important Countryside Frontages	
General	R58	I would consider the frontage to open country at the Granary on Bury Road	Noted. However, this frontage is not considered to meet the criteria for an ICF as set out in South Cambridgeshire's 2018 Local Plan i.e. where land either "penetrates or sweeps into the built-up area providing a significant connection between the street scene and the surrounding rural area" or "provides an important rural break between two nearby but detached parts of a development framework".
General	R60	protect existing green belts	Noted. The status of green belt is a matter for the higher level plan and national policy.
General	R74	this seems to be an ineffectual policy. Not sure it adds much.	Noted.
General	R96	I have selected "no comment" answer because I do not understand this section.	Noted.
		Policy S&GS 14: Local Green Spaces and Protected Village Amenity Areas	
General	R6	I disagree with the assessment G1 in the Stapleford and Gt Shelford Landscape Assessment and will lead to building on the adjoining fields	Noted. Maps in LCA 2019 showing landscape character types and

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		known as Ten Acres - this land should be used for further development of the Rugby Club or as a second Recreation Ground for residents north of the railway bridge on Cambridge Rd.	areas (3rd from last page in the appendices, as well as between pages 22 and 23 of the main document) and relevant accompanying text have been amended.
General	R27	you say that developments shouldn't impinge on green spaces "unless in special circumstances", I can think of no special circumstance that should allow that to happen.	Noted and understood.
General	R49	Local green spaces. Where are the Great Shelford Village charities Community garden and allotment amenities shown and protected?	It is agreed this land is a highly valued community asset. However, having considered site characteristics and landowner concerns, the designation of this site as Local Green Space is not considered to be of benefit to the community it serves.
General	R59	On the top of Hinton Way on the left hand side going into Cambridge were two properties that were burnt down about 30 years ago. One being 'Uplands'. It is a lovely wildlife/park area. It would be wonderful if bought or given to Stapleford to be our own park. Just a thought!	Noted. However these areas remain in private ownership and are neither easily accessible or visible. The purpose of the land and properties for community use falls outside the scope of the NP.
General	R90	I particularly feel that the Peterhouse field in the centre of Stapleford and the allotments should be protected from development and kept as green space and allotment space. Sorry for the brief comment but just realised the time! Thanks for doing all this	Noted and agreed.
		Policy S&GS 15: Preserving our dark landscape	
		<i>No free text comments about this policy received via online feedback form</i>	

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		Policy S&GS 16: Delivering community infrastructure priorities alongside new development	
General	R27	public transport - can you make developers contribute to this eg a local minibus to join up with existing buses and trains, or subsidising a bus service like the 31 that isn't economic.	The point is understood and supported by text in supporting paragraph 9.23. Note, however, that developer contributions of this type are arranged at district level through the implementation of Policy T/I in South Cambridgeshire's 2018 Local Plan. There is nothing specific on this to add through the NP.
General	R58	the provision of additional off-street parking at the Granary and at the church could be called out under S&GS 16 or 18 and could be associated with the provision of additional allotments or renewables such as solar over car parking	Expansion of on-site parking at the Granary is constrained by river meadows and Corpus' leased farm yard and arable land. The Granary co-ordinated with the primary school in 2023/4 to arrange event parking on land behind the school but this was not supported by elements of the local community. It is now trialling ticketed events spread over several days, in part to reduce parking pressures. On a much smaller scale, we note church parking issues along Mingle Lane and Gog Magog Way. The GCP's Sawston Greenway updates along Mingle Lane will need to address this.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
General	R64	All development must be subject to and enhance clean water availability.	Noted.
General	R64	S&GS 16. Discussions about expansion of Cambridge Biomedical Campus should be co-ordinated with Trumpington.	Noted. However, the S&GS NP itself can only deal with issues arising in and impacting upon the Plan area.
General	R91	It seems increasingly difficult to gain access to GPs/health professionals at Shelford HC; whether due to pressure of patient numbers, disruption following covid or the 'attitude' of Granta is unclear. Development proposals should support health facilities; maybe time for a unit in Stapleford? A commitment needed from NHS locally.	Noted. These specific issues are outside the remit of neighbourhood planning, but the S&GS NP does outline growth pressures for primary care services within the Plan area and in principle supports expansion of Granta Shelford Health Care Centre.
General	R96	In general, I agree except that infrastructure should also include amenities such as pubs and new recreational spaces such as children's playparks.	Noted. New play space is a priority in Policy S&GS 16.
General	R97	Particularly support [...] section 19 and 20 support for maintaining services within walking distance, such as shops and health facilities	Noted
Para 9.23	R99	Para 9.23: "Three bus services link the Plan area to Saffron Walden and Cambridge". I think the situation is: to/from Saffron Walden: Stagecoach citi 7 once per hour Monday to Saturday; on Sundays there is one journey each way operated by CG Myall & Sons as service 132. The citi 7 runs hourly on Sundays but only as far as Sawston. to/from Cambridge: Stagecoach citi 7 every 20 minutes Monday to Saturday, hourly on Sundays, plus one journey each way operated by A2B as service 31. The other three daily journeys of the 31 terminate at Addenbrooke's.	Noted and amended

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		So the text "During the week there is one bus per hour into Cambridge" is not correct; there are three buses per hour Monday to Saturday (reducing to hourly in the evenings).	
General	R104	The Health Centre needs to grow to offer more services as the village grows, including x-rays, ultrasounds, and things like health and rehabilitation classes, audiology and ophthalmology, and maybe even dentistry, possibly in conjunction with the private sector. The opening hours also need to be longer. Such development may include the compulsory purchase of the Rayment land in the middle of the village, which sits unused, to everyone's detriment. We need to encourage and support Granta in any attempts to do this and resist any danger of our health centre being closed and all having to go to Sawston.	Noted.
General	R104	There are few facilities for teens apart from the solitary basketball hoop, which has lines worn away on the tarmac. We need to continue to develop the 1920s wild swimming area by the river to allow them to be physically active in a relatively safe environment, and we should also consider developing outdoor gym facilities around the recreation ground – for example pull up bars and so on, as exist in Trumpington Meadows, rather like this: https://beactivegyms.co.uk/adult-outdoor-gym-equipment/ . A full basketball court somewhere in the village that can be easily accessed in their free time, and also be used for other sports, would be very popular. Generally speaking, we need to create more spaces for young people to go and meet up where they don't have to spend any money, and make the spaces that we have really work harder, to encourage them to learn socialisation skills rather than predominantly engage with one another over the Internet. The Dernford Quarry outdoor swimming planning application should be revisited as well, as this could be a real local asset.	Noted and agreed. NP text to refer specifically to all users (teens, younger adults, older adults). Note that some of the facilities commented on here do exist at Stapleford Rec. Dernford is outside of our NP area and hence our remit here.
General	R104	We need to create a balanced and useful high street that has shops we can actually buy things in, and provide resistance to the tendency to let out retail spaces for things that can be easily achieved online, such as estate	Points noted. However, they largely fall outside the scope of planning policies which exist to

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		agents (why does a village need five of them?) We really need things back such as a cycle shop, shoe shop, florist, bank with cashpoint, clothes shop, gift shop, women's hairdressers and so on. The demise of the Deli as a cheerful village meeting point and watering hole is keenly felt – can they be encouraged to return to the earlier model now the pandemic is over? Can we all offer support as a village to co-create a business model that works for them? Maybe something to complement the working-from-home culture?	influence different land uses at planning application stage. A planning policy cannot dictate the type of shop/occupier beyond this.
General	R104	The post-financial-crash, austerity-driven limited hours of the library are very sad to see and we should work towards returning to a more regular opening pattern including late opening one or two days a week – again, is it possible to push towards some kind of revived financial model? There is much more scope for this to be deployed for alternative uses, as in Finland, particularly for loaning out things like musical instruments, small household gadgets you don't need very often, and perhaps toys, as well as providing other things like relaxed homework/revision clubs and congenial book clubs for people in the village. What social entrepreneurship opportunities might there be?	Noted and agreed. Library provision is included as a community facility that could be part of S106 contribution in Local Plan.
		Policy S&GS 17: Facilitating active travel in Stapleford and Great Shelford	
General	R1	I am very pleased to see mention of the river bridge, but there's insufficient emphasis on maintenance of existing valued facilities, especially permissive paths (e.g. Jenny's path) or adding further small links (e.g. from the Rec past Peacocks towards the church).	Noted. See also Policy S&GS 19 regarding rural routes.
General	R3	Active travel begins with walking - must push for safe pavements, they have more potholes than our roads	Noted and agreed.
General	R4	an e-bike and e-scooter docking station in the village (probably at the station) would be great	Noted. This will be monitored by the Parish Councils taking into account safety issues.
General	R12	very important	Noted.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
General	R24	p106 - "Haverhill Road between A1307 and Stapleford. Improvements to path alongside Haverhill Rd between A1307 and Stapleford". At one time, this was due to be supported as part of Phase 1 GCP improvements to the A1307. Later, moved to Phase 2, part of the work associated with the CSET busway. I am sceptical that GCP will ever support this.	Noted.
General	R31	Why is there no mention of Sustrans Route 11? This is part of a national cycle network and we should be proud that it runs through both of our villages.	The NP does refer to this. The choice of active travel routes is noted as a strength in the SWOT and the DNA route is shown on Map 14. The supporting text to Policy S&GS 18: 'Facilitating active travel in Stapleford and Great Shelford' explains the need to improve the DNA path, especially with respect to pedestrian safety.
General	R37	More needs to be done to ensure safety of pedestrians and cyclists. The surface conditions of the roads and pavements needs to be addressed	Noted and agreed. See supporting text to S&GS 18: 'Facilitating active travel in Stapleford and Great Shelford'. Also note that the Great Shelford Parish Council has collated a lot of data on this and has shared findings with the county.
Para 10.14	R52	Consider adding an extra bullet point about pavements being maintained in good condition for pedestrians, with smooth surface and not too great a camber (I have mobility difficulties and use sticks; pavement design/maintenance is crucial for safety).	Noted and agreed. See supporting text to S&GS 18: 'Facilitating active travel in Stapleford and Great Shelford'. Also note that the Great Shelford Parish Council has collated a lot of data on this and has shared findings with the county

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
General	R54	There is too much emphasis on ACTIVE travel and not enough on better public transport, both from and through our area. You acknowledge the likelihood of an ageing population - as people age they are increasingly less likely to be able to undertake active travel and need motorised transport. Currently in this area policymaking exhibits a blatant disregard of the needs of those (disabled, frail elderly etc) who cannot cycle or walk, and their carers who need to get them to appointments etc; this plan appears to 'fall in with' that approach.	Public transport is very important and is addressed as far as we can through the NP in Policy S&GS 16
General	R56	The state of the roads and pavements in the area are just unacceptably dangerous and must be addressed as priority part of this plan.	Noted and agreed. See supporting text to S&GS 18: 'Facilitating active travel in Stapleford and Great Shelford'. Also note that the Great Shelford Parish Council has collated a lot of data on this and has shared findings with the county.
General	R64	All development must be subject to and enhance clean water availability.	Noted.
Map 15	R66	I have ticked "Agree" here, BUT I wish to make the point that where Active Travel facilities 'link into the existing PRow network', those existing Rights of Way absolutely MUST be protected from any roadification in the name of facilitating Active Travel. Any perceived need for hard-surface paths outside of the existing roads network must be provided for by brand new infrastructure, rather than being allowed to trump the protection of the existing natural capital represented by our sparse existing green routes. Re S&GS 18, Protecting and Improving routes into our countryside: I have ticked "Agree" here, BUT I would like to comment that on the list of aspirational new routes (Map 15), the suggested spur from the Drift Track towards Villedomer Woods at Magog Down is of no use to cyclists or horse-riders, since the Magog Trust continues to ban both types of users from entering its site and using its paths. Obviously it would be great if a	Noted. We have approached relevant land agent(s) about a spur off the track near the black barn and various other aspirational routes. Our requests did not receive their support.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		change of heart by the Magog Trust would change this situation (which would then in turn allow cyclists and horse-riders to link to the PRow networks on the Wandlebury side of the A1307) but in the absence of such a change in attitude, I would like to see this Plan aspire to a spur from the Drift Track onto the existing Public Bridleway along the 'Black Barn track', so that all rightful users will be able to [legally] make a short looped route. Finally, I am very surprised to read that Stapleford Primary School 'has a travel plan in place...' because there seems to be very little evidence of that having any effect in practice. Far too many parents - and teachers - are still speeding into Bar Lane to drop off and pick up by car, when they must nearly all be living within very easy walking or cycling distance, and the surrounding roads are now all 20mph limits. Unfortunately, I think this just shows that available infrastructure is simply not enough to make people change their habits regarding mode of travel. Maybe we do need to reduce the *convenience* of car travel by putting in place more restrictions such as a School Street scheme. Either that, or a massive education programme among the young children, in the hope of using "pester power" to nudge the parents into more active habits of travel.	
General	R74	I agree with all the active travel policies and I wish it was possible to go further. Encouraging more people to get on bikes and to walk more will help everyone in so many different areas of modern life.	Noted
	R91	S&GS17 and S&GS18 As a 70 year old with 90 year old parents I wish there was more reference to essential motor transport requirements; routes, access arrangements, parking places for those transporting or supporting the elderly. With all the retirement developments in this area this is likely to become increasingly necessary.	Noted. The importance of DDA compliant parking is recognised by the two parish councils. Great Shelford Parish Council is seeking to address this in the future at the Memorial Hall.
General	R97	Particularly support [...] section 19 and 20 support for maintaining services within walking distance, such as shops and health facilities	Noted.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
Para 10.30	R99	NP para 2.6: "in- and out-bound trains typically stop at Shelford Station two to four times per hour". If only! That's the combined figure counting trains in both directions. Could be reworded as "trains typically stop at Shelford hourly in each direction off-peak, half-hourly at peak times". Same ambiguity arises in para 10.30.	Accepted, change made to the Plan.
General	R103	The DNA path and Linton Greenway routes needs to be multiuser track not cycle-tracks. If they are not wide enough to accommodate horses, then they are not fit for purpose for cyclists. Current proposals do not meet the road user hierarchy nor the Highway Code changes. Also need to add the Sawston Greenway needs to be available to horse riders throughout its length – currently horses are abandoned on the side of the A1307 and over Stapleford Bridge. Again, if it is not safe enough nor wide enough for horses then its suitability for cyclists needs to be questioned.	Noted. The DNA path is not part of the PROW network and there are many issues with it in its current form. Conflict between users means that the priority is to widen the route so that cyclists can be segregated from pedestrians and wheelchair users. It is unlikely to be safe to mix equestrians with other users so close to a busy railway and as continued expansion of the CBC makes the path even busier.
General	R103	No improvements anywhere for carriage drivers [...] horses are carbon neutral and many more of them may be seen out and about carrying out sustainable everyday journeys either as being ridden or being driven.	Noted
Para 10.8	R103	10.8 'Active travel' refers to journeys on foot, cycle or other 'wheeled' modes of active travel (e.g. mobility scooter, wheelchair, pushchair, cycle freight), although other non-motorised users may also use the network. It aims to reduce reliance on private cars, particularly for short journeys and by single passengers, and to reduce congestion and our carbon footprint. This statement is not correct. Active Travel in Cambridgeshire is for walking and cycling on urban surfaces such as tarmac. Equestrians are NOT INCLUDED in Active Travel, nor is anyone wanting to Ramble, jog, dog walk, cycle, ride a horse or drive a carriage on natural surfaces in the	Noted. The definition and modes of travel is as per Cambridgeshire County Council's Active Travel Strategy (adopted March 2023).

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		<p>countryside. Neither the LCWIP, Active Travel England, LTN 1/20 nor the Cambs Active Travel Strategy caters for these groups.</p> <p>An NP cannot override Cambridgeshire County Council policy on this matter. CCC have failed to implement its own ROWIP which has identified the bridleway network as fragmented, disjointed and in need of improvement. The creation of restrictive shared pedestrian / cycle paths only further this failure. Previous transport projects simply severed rights of way and contributed to the lack of safe access for all NMU's.</p>	
Para 10.14	R103	<p>10.14 These proposals are contrary to the changes to the Highway Code and the Road User Hierarchy because they are proposed as walking and cycling routes leaving equestrians not only in the traffic flow but with the added danger of cyclists passing them on their inside. The BHS Director of Safety has stated that such schemes should never be designed. It is poor use of public funds not to include provision for the widest range of user groups. Nothing would need to be changed for on road or roadside provision other than to change the restrictive shared pedestrian / cycle blue sign to the multi user pedestrian / cycle / horse rider sign. The vast majority of horse riders are women and girls. It can therefore be considered misogynistic not to include their safety in transport provision.</p> <p>Any crossing of the Cam at Shelford, Haverhill Road provision, the existing on road provision improvements should all be delivered as multi user access to include equestrians.</p> <p>All the Greenways should be required to be delivered as multi user.</p>	Noted. The initiatives set out at paragraph 10.14 are focusing on protecting and improving the active travel network. The sub heading is amended to make this clearer.
		Policy S&GS 18: Managing the impacts of new development in the Plan area with respect to the movement of people and vehicles	
General	R27	<p>traffic - wasn't a one way system through Great Shelford discussed at some point? And air quality - developments shouldn't lead to queuing traffic which idles (CSET would cause this). You mention a ring road - no no no, building new roads never solves a traffic problem, it just attracts more cars.</p>	Noted.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		Better to spend the money on buses, connecting minibuses/dial a ride, or busways.	
General	R30	The area massively underplayed in my view is motorway and trunk road traffic noise which both blight the village? Noise walls on the motorway sections, low-noise surfaces and trunk road speed restrictions (and low-noise surfacing) are all required.	Noted. SWOT analysis has been amended.
General	R31	here is no mention of traffic rolling along Cambridge Road/London Road. Lorries that should be on the M11 often take 'short cuts'. Is there a way of preventing this?	Noted. SWOT analysis has been amended.
General	R58	the provision of additional off-street parking at the Granary and at the church could be called out under S&GS 16 or 18 and could be associated with the provision of additional allotments or renewables such as solar over car parking	Noted. The first bullet in the final clause has been amended so it refers to 'other amenities'
General	R64	South East Busway and East West Rail as currently proposed are disastrous for our neighbourhood and will significantly diminish food security. Can we campaign for re-opening of the Haverhill railway line? S&GS 16. Discussions about expansion of Cambridge Biomedical Campus should be co-ordinated with Trumpington.	Noted. Strategic transport issues are outside the remit of a NP.
General	R71	[...] traffic congestion in villages. More development means more cars. That must be taken into account. Any planned development must take into account the whole infrastructure requirements.	Noted
General	R91	S&GS17 and S&GS18 As a 70 year old with 90 year old parents I wish there was more reference to essential motor transport requirements; routes, access arrangements, parking places for those transporting or supporting the elderly. With all the retirement developments in this area this is likely to become increasingly necessary.	Noted. The importance of DDA compliant parking is recognised by the two parish councils. Great Shelford Parish Council is seeking to address this in the future at the Memorial Hall.
		Policy S&GS 19: Protecting and improving routes into our countryside	

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
General	R1	SG&S19 should include a permissive path from the far SE corner of Magog Down to the Rowley Lane river crossing - this is popularly used and very useful but unofficial. It would also be great to provide a permissive path from Magog Down to Beechwoods & then to Roman Road.	Noted. The first suggestion has been flagged up by a number of consultees and it will be explored for inclusion. The second suggestion is not considered a priority (in relation to others) and not practical
General	R24	I strongly support the three routes identified as highest priority. There should be an ongoing drive by both parish councils to work towards the approval of these routes and others which will help to create circular routes in the area that can be used.	Noted.
S&GS 19, no. 2	R29	There is a good vision of improved walking and cycling opportunities. I strongly support the bridge over the Cam at the Rec: I wanted to see more information about how this would join up with other paths, but perhaps this is because they would be outside our parish. I also strongly support the off-road path along Granham's road. Policy 19, item 2, "Proposals which include new public rights of way", add "or permissive paths"?	Noted.
Map 15	R29	Map 15, the upper path labelled "Jenny path" seems wrong?	Noted. This relates to an error in the key. To be corrected.
General	R97	Particularly support section 22 in terms of maintaining green spaces and countryside access	Noted.
Map 15	R100	<i>Several of the important routes in the NP area are permissive paths and so could easily be lost. These include the route from Rectory Farm (behind the primary school) through to Hauxton. This seems to have become Jenny's path (not the one marked on NP Map 15) (Jenny Morris had undertaken research to try and get this registered as a definitive right of way). The signs up around the parish state that the permissive rights end in 2019, so I am not sure as to what is their current status. (I note that Defra has very recently introduced payments</i>	The point about losing permissive paths is acknowledged. The policy is amended to refer to upgrading permissive routes to formal public rights of way. Please note however, the influence of the NP is limited to what is considered a planning application stage.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		<p><i>for permissive access, so these routes may be refunded). Securing these routes would be an important objective.</i></p> <p><i>Other permissive routes include the link between Granhams road and Hinton Way and connections with the aspirational route behind the rugby ground (in Map 15) that would make little sense without the permissive route.</i></p> <p><i>It is very helpful to have the access routes that people have said that they would like to see identified in the NP. Their inclusion gives them some validation and could help in future efforts to get them implemented. Can we be more ambitious and add others, such as those included in the 2019 landscape assessment? For instance:</i></p> <p><i>An off road link to connect the Beechwoods with the end of the Roman Road.</i></p> <p><i>An off road link to get to Dernford reservoir.</i></p> <p><i>An off road route out from Cambridge to Wandlebury (as proposed in the Area Action Plan).</i></p>	<p>Regarding additional suggestions for aspirational routes, the NP has had to prioritise. In 2023 a range of options were presented as part of community engagement. This process has informed the identified priorities.</p> <p>The off road link to the Dernford reservoir does not fall within the Plan area and a large chunk of the route from Cambridge to Wandlebury is out of the Plan area.</p>
General	R103	<p>No improvements anywhere for carriage drivers – please could you add ‘remove the restrictive, out of date and discriminatory TROs on the Roman Road so that it is fit for purpose and inclusive for today’s world’. Carriage drivers are often mobility challenged in some way or it can be the horses / ponies are no longer able to support a rider on their back and therefore a new career as a driving pony enables them to have a fulfilling and productive career [...] Local BHS Officer willing to help explain the complexity of these TRO’s and how they can be changed to reduce fears of anti social behaviour.</p>	<p>Noted. This falls outside the scope of the NP which can only influence matters considered at planning application stage.</p>
General	R103	<p>Surfacing of new provision – any proposals to create tarmac paths in the countryside should be tested against :</p> <p>‘Major development proposals will be expected to include a whole life cycle carbon emissions assessment to demonstrate actions taken to reduce embodied carbon resulting from the construction and use of the building over its lifetime.’</p>	<p>Noted. The supporting text to the policy will be updated to include more information on surfacing.</p>

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		<p>The damaging effect of the construction process as well as the negative impact of sealed surfaces must be balanced against the claims for sustainable travel. Improvements for cycling can be provided without resorting to damage to the environment and biodiversity caused by tarmac. The serious impact of heat islands from sealed surfaces / tarmac should never be ignored. If a net gain cannot be demonstrated, then an alternative surface must be looked at such as hoggin. Active Travel for commuting is not the same as non motorised users for leisure and recreation.</p> <p>'Improvements for cycling' on the Mere Way byway resulted in this environmental and human disaster. These photos are taken in the same spot. [Consultee here submitted 'before' and 'after' photos of Mere Way byway]</p> <p>Whereas in Cambourne these natural material paths have been down 15 years, are well used by horses, walkers, cyclists, dog walkers, wheel chair users and pram pushers. Much more suitable for rural application. [Consultee here submitted photo of horses on natural material path]</p>	
General	R103	<p>There can be no justification for creating restrictive footpaths for countryside access. They should be to restrictive byway standard by default reducing only to bridleway status to ensure the maximum number of users.</p> <p>All the paths proposed in the Plan must be to these standards otherwise there will be objections by those excluded.</p> <p>One route seems to have been omitted from the plan. The need for a safe off road link from Worts Causeway up to the rear of the Roman Road. This has long been an ambition of both the Ramblers and the British Horse Society. It is also on the wish list for cyclists. It is to be hoped that the opportunity to secure some funding for this significant need has not been lost in the recent planning approval for the housing off Babraham Road near Wort's Causeway. Given the additional number of residents coming to the area as a result of the housing this should have been a priority.</p>	Regarding the additional suggestion for aspirational routes, the NP has had to prioritise. In 2023 a range of options were presented as part of community engagement. This process has informed the identified priorities.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		Policy S&GS 20: Stapleford and Great Shelford's Improved Landscape Area	
General	R100	Work around the Cambridge South station seems already to be encroaching onto the area that is identified as potential new open space in the NP in Map 16. I am not sure whether this is permanent.	Noted
Para 11.23	R103	11.23 Southern Fringe Area Action Plan At this juncture, it is pertinent to remind both Parish Councils of the Southern Fringe S.106 money for access which appears to have vanished. Both the Ramblers and the BHS fought hard to secure the funding for a number of multi user routes but they were all rejected despite having been approved during the many rounds scrutiny. Please could this Plan once again seek the answers to what has happened to the funding and make sure that once found, it is spent to benefit countryside access for all users.	This has been raised with the local planning authority.
Footnote 13, p.124	R103	Not for all users [re. access to Wandlebury Country Park from Cambridge]. The use of the term 'active travel' is misleading	Noted
Para 11.29, no. 3	R103	This should only be carried out after consultation with residents of Haverhill Road – for many of these residents, views of the horses and the paddocks are extremely important. Thought must also be given to how large trees could impact on the existing use of the paddocks. Historically, there were trees along this hedge line – two were destroyed by lightning strikes. The hedge forms part of the farm so thought must be given to how the hedge can be accessed from Haverhill Road for annual maintenance essential to keep the hedge in good condition.	Stapleford Parish Council has a tree working group comprising residents and councillors. Residents are getting involved via this process.
		General comments (by theme)	
Busway	R43	we strongly oppose the countryside route for the proposed busway, and support that it should run alongside the A1307, as set out in Appendix 8	Noted. Such strategic transport issues are outside the remit of a NP.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
Busway EWR	R64	South East Busway and East West Rail as currently proposed are disastrous for our neighbourhood and will significantly diminish food security. Can we campaign for re-opening of the Haverhill railway line?	Noted. Such strategic transport issues are outside the remit of a NP.
Employment Travel	R54	There is also no mention of increasing employment locally, which would reduce the need for travel - the business park is a good thing, and maybe developments should be linked to extending employment opportunities.	Noted
EWR	R104	Many of us are living in fear of the EWR running through the village and destroying all the houses on the north side of Cambridge Road to make way for the construction vehicles. If this comes to pass, can we relocate en masse to a new community all together, in one or two of the large fields on the south side of Cambridge Road?	Noted!
General	R67	I am in general agreement with the policies set out in the draft plan. Given central government's enthusiasm for expanding Cambridge it may become necessary to focus on mitigating the effects of new larger developments rather than avoiding them altogether.	Noted. The NP cannot prevent development that is planned at the strategic level but it can help to mitigate many of the effects and shape it to meet local needs.
General	R73	Much is made of the Babraham Rd gateway into Cambridge, but this will be severely damaged by the proposed drive-through phlebotomy centre at Magog Court.	Noted.
General	R101	[...] instead of making comments on specific sections/policies, I pose questions about areas in the hope that they might lead to the team reviewing those and other related areas for robustness and scope, given the onslaught of current and our perception of potential over-development, infrastructure maintenance, and collateral damage, to which our two villages have had imposed on them, and what potentially lurks on the horizon: Do the statements and policies include the need for: 1. Something along the lines of:- Whilst accepting that our community should contribute to the growth/sustainability of the UK's economy, it	1. the NP cannot prevent development that is planned and agreed at the strategic level and, because the Plan area is enclosed by green belt, cannot identify suitable sites for development. Instead, it seeks to ensure through a range of planning policies that development meets the needs and aspirations of the community

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		<p>must be proportionate, and the villages should not be made to suffer by the imposition of inappropriate (unproven need?) over-development under the name of an undemocratic body, or driven by politically inspired dogma or vanity projects. Particularly where greenbelt land is threatened at a time of forecasts regarding likely food production needs versus availability of overseas food in the future, and timber shortages (apparently, the UK is one of the highest importers of overseas timber, and which, according to something I heard on a radio programme, the Chartered Institute of Forestry says is unsustainable - I have not validated this).</p> <p>2. Anything on developing a community heating/energy source?</p> <p>3. Renewable energy and rainwater conservation requirements for any new developments?</p> <p>4. Lighting plans to reflect a desire to reduce light pollution and direct light to intended areas in the interests of effective and efficient use?</p> <p>5. In the same way that transport plans require motor vehicles to give way to cyclists a requirement that such plans reflect the premise that cyclists give way to pedestrians, even if it means stopping/dismounting; a contribution to this is for cycle paths to be separated from footpaths?</p> <p>6. Buffer zones of trees between any new large housing or other development sites and all existing residential areas on an equitable basis and with agreement of the existing residents? I understand that there is a proposal for such a buffer to be planted behind Mingle Lane properties - why only there, I wonder?. Such a policy may have been desirable before plans for the retirement village were proposed/approved.</p> <p>7. Is it possible that the Parishes could consider funding a local police presence with specific focus, e.g: traffic, anti-social behaviour or ???</p> <p>8. Require/recommend/express a community desire for developers to consider and apply "best practice", including matching projected population growth, for funding and provision of the following, in order to provide a sense of community and reduce car journeys:</p>	<p>2. yes – see Policy S&GS 8</p> <p>3. yes – see Policy S&GS 7</p> <p>4. yes – see Policy S&GS 15</p> <p>5. this issue is outside the scope of the NP</p> <p>6. see Policy S&GS 10. The Rangeford development was approved well before our NP is adopted but does have a planting plan, in part to soften the edge of the development</p> <p>7. this is outside the scope of the NP</p> <p>8. yes – see Policy S&GS 16. Note that the types of shops which occupy a commercial space are outside the remit of a NP</p> <p>9. this is a CCC issue and outside the remit of our NP but within the remit of parish councils to request</p> <p>10. this is outside the remit of the NP</p> <p>11. this is a local authority planning issue</p>

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		<p>(a) As well as “older age” facilities, children’s/youth and schooling/education facilities?</p> <p>(b) Local GP/Community and nursing facilities?</p> <p>(c) Shops for basic essentials.</p> <p>9. Entering and leaving village roadside "gate/fence" signs, and speed limit road markings on the major roads?</p> <p>10. Unambiguous, clear, concise, comprehensive and timely communication, by whatever means with regard to any activity that impacts on the residents and fabric of our communities; an area that I, in my seven decades of memory, have seen declining, particularly in the last two decades? This includes roadwork and other public signage;</p> <p>11. Appropriate working practice requirements to be:</p> <p>(a) Part of any planning approvals, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All necessary coordination with all utilities pre, during and post-construction - As an expectation of the councils, those requirements to be fully met by contractors, e.g: Responsible and neighbourly conduct of development/maintenance and construction work by adherence to: Mandated constraints on working days, noise and light levels, HGV movements, spoil heap heights, blown dust control and road and footpath cleaning; Timely infrastructure, including road and footpath repairs during and on completion of construction, maintaining and returning the community infrastructure to pre-development state or better. <p>(b) Those working practices to be monitored for compliance, and enforced by the appropriate authority, or its agents?</p> <p>[Note that formatting but not content of this response was modified slightly to fit template]</p>	

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
General	R102	<p>Alongside the ideas and the changes that will need to come from the neighbourhood plan, I would perhaps ask you to consider longevity. Health and longevity of the residents through the lens of Blue Zones. See Buettner D. Blue Zones, Lessons from the World's Longest Lived. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6125071/</p> <p>There is also a recent Netflix documentary (https://www.imdb.com/title/tt28523129/), much investigation and papers, including some talks at the now running Cambridge Festival (https://www.festival.cam.ac.uk/events/longevity-and-nutrition-can-we-all-really-live-100-and-beyond).</p> <p>"Blue Zones is a way to design the healthiest lifestyles possible for individuals and for entire communities." Buettner D.</p> <p>Rather than focussing village planning around the car, it should be centred on people and their health and wellbeing. This is fundamental in the Blue Zone philosophy that Buettner lays out. If he has managed to create a blue zone in Iowa (pig farming country in the US) and improve healthy longevity of its residents, why would we not consider their principles in our neighbourhood plan? It would touch on many of the key points that need addressing and people are interested in - Rural setting and landscape, active travel and traffic management, climate change and biodiversity, community amenities and infrastructure, countryside access and enhancement.</p>	Noted
General	R106	<p>I am writing as a long term resident in Great Shelford, to offer a potential site to be considered in the neighbourhood plan, at my address: [address redacted]. I have attached a site plan for your reference [redacted].</p> <p>Having reviewed online, I note there is currently a consultation for residents and wanted to propose my existing dwelling and its large residential garden to be considered for future development. We have recently actioned a pre-application to develop the site, which was positive on the majority of matters, other than the site being outside of</p>	This is understood to be a Green Belt location and national Green Belt policy will apply.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
		<p>'development limits'. The settlement boundary currently goes around my address, and then widens on the other side of Cabbage Moor. It would essentially be a small extension of the development boundary, which would allow the site to fall within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>We feel that it could be of great benefit to the neighbourhood plan and for future residents to be able to stay/move into the area and we would like the site to be considered as a part of the consultation process.</p> <p>Should you require any information from me to help assist with the assessment and consultation, please do not hesitate to contact me on [phone number redacted]</p>	
Green belt	R33	Green belt very important	Noted. The status of Green Belt is a matter for the higher level plan and national policy
Green belt	R93	I am extremely concerned about the loss of Green Belt land at the bottom of Hinton Way and the introduction of a "drive-through" facility that will undoubtedly massively increase air and noise pollution when we should be doing our best to preserve the landscape and not pollute the atmosphere.	Noted.
Green belt Busway	R61	No more development on rural arable land. No guided busways that rip into the greenbelt.	Noted. Such strategic transport issues are outside the remit of a NP.
Green belt	R76	Prevent the slow carving up of local open space by transport routes and the subsequent and inevitable infill of new housing	Noted. Such strategic transport issues are outside the remit of a NP.
Green belt	R88	Very impressed by the depth and quality of the document. Only hope that it stops further unnecessary development as local feeling against the inappropriate site for a retirement village on Haverhill Road, led to nothing and greenbelt is being mutilated by huge building works outside the edge of the village. Furthermore, will it prevent the proposed busway?	Noted. Such strategic transport issues are outside the remit of a NP.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
Green belt	R94	Where I have put “no comment” it is because it is not clear or precise enough to comment my main concern throughout this consultation is we should not give any green belt up it needs protecting as once you let developers on that land nothing will be protected they will build either side and nothing left but a concrete jungle ! Our chalk streams which we are so privilege to have would be covered up never to be seen again and forgotten for their importance. Life will not be as we know it and we should protect our green and precious land our way of life for nature and the planets animals moved out of their habitats to go where ? We must protect us and them from a concrete life which would be intolerable! Cambridge has always been a very nice place to live small but enough going on and a place of interest a good life and the government want to change all that to bring in the scientific big companies that make big money at the cost of our city changing but do the local residents want this or is it the fuelled by the influx of new people in the biochemical industry making this equivalent to Silicon Valley?	Noted. It is outside the remit of a NP to change green belt boundaries or to prevent development that is planned and agreed at the strategic level.
Traffic	R45	I appreciate traffic management is not directly in the remit, however this is a major and on-going issue for these villages and needs to be addressed. I think a 20mph limit throughout ALL roads in both villages is appropriate.	Noted.
Transport	R74	I am disappointed that the policies reflect the current push towards busses solving all manner of problems. I can't see how more busses will solve Cambridge's transport issues when the roads are already too busy to accommodate the current buses. The roads are also a mess – how will more, heavy busses fix that? I see the Neighbourhood Plan as a missed opportunity to call for a light rail network with underground sections in the city. For me, that is the only possible policy solution I can see that will solve the local transport issues in the long term. I also think the policy is a missed opportunity to advocate the Parish Council's policies of opposing CSET and EWR due to the well-documented reasons.	Noted. Such strategic transport issues are outside the remit of a NP. Our NP policies do not deal with the issue of buses, we merely present information in the supporting text about bus routes which serve the Plan area.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
Transport	R104	Public transport locally is mainly run for the benefit of those visiting Addenbrookes or the Park and Ride with everything else apparently being an afterthought. We need to use AI-based technologies to map the real-life routes of those travelling around the village and into Cambridge, so we can develop bus routes that go to and from places where we would all actually like to travel, on the days and times we prefer, instead of having to travel when and where transport planners would like us to go. For example, if people want to go shopping in Cambridge, a distance of just four miles, an hour's trip via the hospital is not realistic for anyone except the retired.	Noted
Thanks	R1	Thanks for putting this together, a huge amount of work!	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R4	A huge amount of effort has gone into preparation of this impressive draft Plan and all the background information supporting it.	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R7	This is a tremendous piece of work that we residents of the villages should commend for its thoroughness and thoughtfulness. Thank you.	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R17	An excellent and comprehensive body of work. Congratulations to Jenny Flynn and her team. I agree with almost all of the policies	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R18	This is a magnificent piece of work and I compliment and thank all the people involved. Too much to taken, really, but I think it is overwhelmingly on the right lines. Unfortunate that the government and the local undemocratic planning authorities don't put these plans as their priority.	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R24	Clear and well-structured document. Immense amount of detail. Well done.	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R27	A thorough body of work, well done. I would take some of the policies further (although you may be limited by other parts of the planning system)	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R29	Overall I think you have done an excellent job with this NP	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R30	Thanks for the hard work on this.	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R51	Many thanks to all involved who have contributed to producing this extensive piece of work for the benefit of all of us who enjoy living in the village.	Noted, with thanks.

Para no.	Consultee ref.	Comment	Response from Parish Councils
Thanks	R52	such a comprehensive and well put together Plan. Very many thanks; I am excited by it!	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R53	Only that I am in awe of the authorship - what an impressive body of work!	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R69	I can see a lot of effort has been put into it. I hope 'they' take note of it.	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R78	Brilliant work	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R82	Well done! A major undertaking.	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R88	Very impressed by the depth and quality of the document. Only hope that it stops further unnecessary development as local feeling against the inappropriate site for a retirement village on Haverhill Road, led to nothing and greenbelt is being mutilated by huge building works outside the edge of the village. Furthermore, will it prevent the proposed busway?	Noted. Such strategic transport issues are outside the remit of a NP.
Thanks	R93	I am extremely concerned about the loss of Green Belt land at the bottom of Hinton Way and the introduction of a "drive-through" facility that will undoubtedly massively increase air and noise pollution when we should be doing our best to preserve the landscape and not pollute the atmosphere.	Noted.
Thanks	R98	Although I do not agree with all recommendations, overall this is an excellent piece of work and I thank all the contributors for their effort on residents' behalf	Noted, with thanks.
Thanks	R100	This is a great achievement - very many congratulations in producing a clear and systematic document.	Noted, with thanks.